Chairman: Mr. Towpik ........................................ (Poland)

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

Report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its sixty-fourth session

The Chairman: We shall begin the final meeting of the 2009 substantive session with agenda item 7, which concerns the adoption of reports of subsidiary bodies on the various agenda items and the consideration and adoption of the draft report of the Commission, as contained in document A/CN.10/2009/CRP.2, CRP.3 and CRP.4. Those documents have been circulated.

In accordance with the agreed programme of work, we will first consider and adopt the draft report of the Commission. Thereafter, we will hear concluding statements by delegations.

To start the process of considering and adopting of the reports of subsidiary bodies on individual agenda items, I should like to call on the Chairpersons of the two Working Groups to introduce their respective reports.

I now give the floor to Mr. Paolo Cuculi, representative of Italy and Chairperson of Working Group I, on agenda item 4, namely, “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons”, to introduce the report of the Working Group, as contained in document A/CN.10/2009/CRP.3.

Mr. Cuculi (Italy), Chairperson of Working Group I: The report of Working Group I, which is before colleagues in document A/CN.10/2009/CRP.3, is simple and self-explanatory. The Group held a number of substantive, extensive and inclusive discussions on issues related to the objective of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The debate was held in an extremely constructive atmosphere, thanks to the interactive participation of a large number of delegations. It touched upon several areas of interest for the mandate of the Working Group.

During the meetings of the Group, along with my sincere thanks for the cooperation of colleagues and friends, I indicated my intention to present a paper at the next session of the Disarmament Commission that would build upon the outcome of the discussions we had, and will have, in order to try to identify possible areas of consensus on the basis of which we could continue our deliberations and negotiations for the remainder of the Commission’s cycle.

The Chairman: If there are no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report of Working Group I, on item 4, as contained in document A/CN.10/2009/CRP.3.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: I would now like to move on to the report of Working Group II, on agenda item 5, “Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade”, as contained in document A/CN.10/2009/CRP.4. I give the floor to Mr. Johann Paschalis, representative of South Africa and
Chairperson of Working Group II, to introduce the Group’s report.

Mr. Paschalis (South Africa), Chairperson of Working Group II: The mandate of Working Group II was to deal with agenda item 5, entitled “Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade”. The Working Group held nine meetings between 20 and 30 April. At its 2nd meeting, the Working Group decided to take up as a basis for its discussions a non-paper prepared by me drawing on the views of delegations.

A great deal of work was conducted during that period, in both formal meetings and informal consultations. During the course of the deliberations in the Working Group, delegations presented comments, ideas and proposals with regard to the non-paper. Based on their submissions, I prepared a revised non-paper. Following a discussion of the first revised non-paper, delegations expressed the view that a more concise document that would highlight principles would be more likely to command consensus and better function as a declaration. As a result, I prepared a second revision of my non-paper, taking into account the views of delegations. The Working Group was able to complete a reading of half of the second revised non-paper, and it agreed at its final meeting that it would continue its consideration of the text at the next session of the Disarmament Commission, in 2010.

I would like to thank you in particular, Mr. Chairman, for your support and for your tireless efforts to help the Commission to build consensus. I should also like very specifically to thank the Secretariat and the Office for Disarmament Affairs for their valuable substantive support. I hope that, building on the work that has been done at this session, Working Group II will be able to complete its task at the Commission’s next session and produce the elements of a draft declaration. The atmosphere during this session was very constructive. It is my impression that valuable ideas were introduced in many areas. There were even many areas of convergence, which we can build upon in terms both of substance and of the way forward.

The Chairman: If there are no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report of Working Group II, on agenda item 5, as contained in document A/CN.10/2009/CRP.4.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: Now that the Commission has adopted the draft reports of its subsidiary bodies, I would like to thank the Chairpersons of the two Working Groups for their dedication. The Commission is deeply indebted to them for their effective leadership in guiding the deliberations of the Working Groups.

We will now begin our consideration of the draft report of the Disarmament Commission, as contained in document A/CN.10/2009/CRP.2. I have the pleasure of giving the floor to Mr. Piet de Klerk of the Netherlands, Rapporteur of the Commission, to introduce the draft report of the Commission.

Mr. de Klerk (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Commission: It is my distinct pleasure to introduce to the Disarmament Commission the draft report of the Commission, as contained in document A/CN.10/2009/CRP.2. The draft report consists of four chapters, entitled, “Introduction”, “Organization and work of the 2009 substantive session”, “Documentation” and “Conclusions and recommendations”.

Let me first turn to the text of the report. There are a few merely stylistic changes to which I wish to draw attention. In paragraph 6, the words “Chairman” and “Vice-Chairmen” should be replaced with the words “Chairperson” and “Vice-Chairpersons”. In that same paragraph, “(Bolivarian Republic of)” should follow “Venezuela”. Those are the only changes to the draft report, apart from a small point in the report of Working Group II, which we have just adopted.

As is customary, the final draft report is a factual description of the Commission’s work and proceedings during the session. The substantive part comprises the two reports of the Working Groups, which we have just adopted and which form part of the present draft report. That part is a reflection of compromises and agreements reached by delegations through negotiations carried out in a spirit of constructive cooperation, about which have just heard from the Chairpersons of the Working Groups.

The Commission discussed two substantive items at this session. As usual, no parallel meetings were held. We in the Bureau thus had a chance to follow developments and to witness both Chairpersons and delegations try to craft consensus on complex issues on the Commission’s agenda. The two reports of the Working Groups in this the first year of the new cycle reflect the initial stage of discussions, with quite a bit of modest progress.
On agenda item 4, entitled “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons”, I can say that the dialogue on this complex issue was a good start. The Commission, in line with its deliberative mandate, considered both practical and action-oriented aspects, as well as broad philosophical and conceptual approaches to the issue, without the pressure that comes with actual negotiations. From that standpoint, all contributions and comments, whether oral or in writing, constitute a rich background that the Group can use in the next two years. Allow me to emphasize the valiant efforts of Mr. Paolo Cuculi of Italy, Chairperson of the Working Group on this item, and to wish him success in his future work.

On agenda item 5, “Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade”, Mr. Johann Paschalis of South Africa, Chairperson of the Working Group, presented the Group with a non-paper right at the start of the session. Building on positive elements contained in numerous comments from delegations on his initial text, the Chairperson took the Group down the path of steady progress. Although consensus was not achieved on the elements, the degree of convergence of different positions and approaches and the flexibility shown by delegations in general leave us with the hope that agreement will be achieved next year.

For the skilful leadership that they provided for the Working Groups, both Chairpersons deserve our deep gratitude. I also wish to take this opportunity to say that it has been a great pleasure to continue this year as Rapporteur of the Commission and, in particular, to work under the able leadership of our Chairman, Ambassador Andrzej Towpik. Finally, allow me to extend my sincere appreciation to the members of the Secretariat for their tireless efforts and kind assistance. May I also thank Mr. Timur Alasaniya, Secretary of the Commission, as well as the secretaries and advisers of the Working Groups and the members of the Commission staff who assisted us in our deliberations.

With those brief remarks, I recommend that the Commission adopt the draft report as contained in document A/CN.10/2009/CRP.2.

**The Chairman:** We shall now consider the draft report of the Commission chapter by chapter. However, before doing so, I would like to ask whether there are any comments on the text of the draft report as a whole?

**Mr. Santa Cruz Arandia** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like first to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the excellent manner in which you have guided our deliberations at this session. I take the floor to request a change in the draft report. There is a mistake in paragraph 6, in which reference is made to the Vice-Chairpersons. The list of States refers to “Bolivia”; I request that this be changed to “Plurinational State of Bolivia”.

**The Chairman:** We regret the error, and it will be corrected.

As there are no other comments, we shall now proceed to consider the report chapter by chapter.

If there are no comments on chapter I, entitled “Introduction”, paragraph 1, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt paragraph 1.

**Paragraph 1 was adopted.**

**The Chairman:** We turn next to chapter II, entitled “Organization and work of the 2009 substantive session”, paragraphs 2 to 12.

**Mr. Amil** (Pakistan): I have just a small editorial comment on paragraph 6 — unless this matter is very clearly stipulated in a document of the United Nations or elsewhere. If we look at the reports of the two Working Groups, all the functionaries are mentioned by name: the Chairman, the Secretary, the Rapporteur and all others. This is just a humble suggestion: if it does not have any negative bearing on the document or cause any procedural problem, perhaps it would be advisable to mention the representatives who have served as Vice-Chairpersons also by name. The names could be in brackets or something like that. That would be in the interest of uniformity, since other people are mentioned by name and there are quite a few Vice-Chairpersons.

**The Chairman:** I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Commission to explain the reasons why it is put that way.

**Mr. Alasaniya** (Secretary of the Commission): I thank the delegation of Pakistan for that question. The answer is very simple: Vice-Chairpersons are elected not as individuals but as countries. Specific persons are designated by those countries to serve, and they change during the session, sometimes twice, sometimes even
three times. This year, for example, there were two countries that changed their representatives. If we mentioned both representatives of those two countries, it would be not six but 12 or 14 names. That is why we put the countries and not the people.

Mr. Amil (Pakistan): It is just a question that intrigues me, because in the organizational session we hear the announcement that such and such a regional group has decided to nominate such and such a country for a given office. I did not clearly understand the distinction here, but I will go by the Secretary’s explanation.

The Chairman: There being no further comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt chapter II, paragraphs 2 to 12, as orally revised with the changes suggested by the Rapporteur and the delegation of the Plurinational State of Bolivia.

Paragraphs 2 to 12, as orally revised, were adopted.

The Chairman: We turn next to chapter III, entitled “Documentation”, paragraphs 13 and 14. There being no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt chapter III, paragraphs 13 and 14.

Paragraphs 13 and 14 were adopted.

The Chairman: Delegations are now invited to comment on chapter IV, entitled “Conclusions and recommendations”, paragraphs 15 to 18. There being no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt chapter IV, paragraphs 15 to 18.

Paragraphs 15 to 18 were adopted.

The Chairman: May I take it that it is the wish of the Commission, having adopted all paragraphs of the draft report, to adopt the draft report of the Commission as a whole, as contained in document A/CN.10/2009/CRP.2, as orally revised?

The draft report, as orally revised, was adopted.

Concluding statements

The Chairman: Now that the Commission has adopted its report, allow me to say a few words of a general nature.

The main task of the United Nations Disarmament Commission this year has been to prepare elements of a draft declaration of 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade and to submit them for consideration by the General Assembly at its sixty-fourth session. Unfortunately, we have not been very successful in fulfilling that task.

However, my feeling is that we have prepared a very good basis for the efforts of the Commission next year: first, we agreed on the agenda for the whole three-year cycle of the work of the Commission.

Secondly, we elected very good and extremely competent and devoted Chairpersons of two Working Groups, Mr. Paolo Cuculi and Mr. Johann Paschalis.

Thirdly, Working Group I had a very good discussion on different aspects of non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. It was, I would say, a very valuable review of current positions on various issues connected with this problem.

Fourthly, in Working Group II a good non-paper was presented by the Chairperson, which was widely commented on and which led to the presentation of new versions of the non-paper and to extensive discussion. I hope that now we know much better how we can move forward next year.

And last but not least, a very good atmosphere was established in the Commission, both during the informal consultations before the session and during the session. This mutual respect and understanding are a very good basis for further work.

We probably all feel that a new political environment is developing. Many of the dividing lines are starting to disappear. Understanding of the need for new global solutions to the many problems that we are facing is growing. We probably also need to review and, if necessary, revisit our approaches and thinking in the field of disarmament. As Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said recently, the changing consciousness can also help us to revitalize the international disarmament agenda.

The Disarmament Commission, as we are often reminded, was created as a deliberative body with the function of considering and making recommendations on various issues in the field of disarmament. We are expected to stimulate discussion, seek new ideas and indicate new approaches. I believe that, if it is to properly accomplish that task, the Disarmament Commission must be open to new ideas — which can also come from outside — and must hold a constructive dialogue with others.
As General Assembly resolution 61/98 states, the Commission is encouraged to invite, as appropriate, experts on disarmament for discussions at its plenary meetings. This year, we were not able to extend such invitations. But I hope that that idea will be kept in mind so as to make the discussions within the Commission even richer and more interesting.

I also continue to believe that the Commission needs some sort of periodic critical self-assessment and, if necessary, improvement in and adjustment of its working methods. Nothing in the world is perfect, and I am afraid that the Disarmament Commission is no exception. I believe that, next year, the Commission may wish to devote one of its meetings to reflection on its methods of work.

I hope that those two small ideas, which I suggested in informal consultations — inviting special guests to the Commission and periodic reflection on its methods of work — will be reconsidered and that, if found suitable, they will be implemented next year. I believe that that would not only increase the credibility of the Commission, but also help to make the United Nations a real centre for deep reflection on disarmament issues.

Nevertheless, I found this session to be extremely interesting and useful and my chairmanship to be fully rewarding. I wish to thank all delegations for their very constructive and friendly cooperation.

The Commission will now hear concluding statements by delegations.

Mr. Simanjuntak (Indonesia): On behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), permit me to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the adoption of the report of the Disarmament Commission at its 2009 substantive session and on the excellent manner in which you have conducted our work this year. NAM also congratulates the Chairs of the two Working Groups, our colleagues Mr. Paulo Cuculi of Italy and Mr. Johann Paschalis of South Africa, who facilitated extensive and substantive discussions on, respectively, “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons” and “Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade”.

Regarding the substantive issues on our agenda, regardless of the challenges that lie ahead, NAM considers that the exchange of views that took place in the process of deciding on both items was a useful exercise. We sense a more productive direction this year. As you stated, Mr. Chairman, we have laid a good foundation for the next session. I venture to say that there is a window of opportunity here: next year, with the political will of all delegations, we will have an agreement on a declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade.

With regard to the important issue of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, we sincerely hope that by the end of this cycle we will have produced concrete results and that the Commission will be in a position to formulate recommendations in order to move forward in that quest. NAM will continue to participate very actively in the discussions on this issue, and we encourage other delegations to duly consider the concrete proposals that we have presented in that regard.

Let me conclude by expressing our sincere appreciation to the Office for Disarmament Affairs and to all members of the Secretariat, as well as to the members of the Bureau, for their invaluable support and assistance during this session. Finally, we wish those colleagues who will travel back to their capitals or their posts outside New York after this meeting a safe and pleasant journey back home.

Mr. Komárek (Czech Republic): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU).

First of all, at this stage, we would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your tireless efforts in the preparation of the 2009 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission and for your wise leadership during the session. At the same time, we would like to express our deep thanks to Mr. Paulo Cuculi, Chair of Working Group I, and Mr. Johann Paschalis, Chair of Working Group II, for their ample contributions to our work. The meetings of the Working Groups profited from their extensive experience, and it was thanks to them that our work moved forward. Our thanks go also to the Rapporteur for his excellent work.

We highly appreciated the very good and constructive atmosphere of our session. We witnessed a fruitful exchange of views on a broad range of questions concerning disarmament. We hope that this positive atmosphere will continue during the
forthcoming third session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

We are looking forward to the 2010 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission. EU countries are convinced that, in 2010, the work of the Commission would be more efficient if the meetings are held following the NPT Review Conference. We appeal to the Chair and to the Secretariat to do their utmost to change the order of the NPT Review Conference and the 2010 session of the Commission.

In conclusion, I would like once again to thank you, Mr. Chairman, the other members of the Bureau and the Secretariat for your excellent work.

Mr. Onemola (Nigeria): I am speaking also on behalf of the African Union. We want to align ourselves with all the eloquent words spoken on behalf of the countries members of the Non-Aligned Movement. The African Group wishes to thank you, Mr. Chairman, the rest of the Bureau and all members of the team working with you.

We have listened, we have heard, we have deliberated and we have seen that there are gaps — differing views and opinions — on how disarmament should be carried out. But we know that we can always extend a bridge. In Africa, we say that, if one’s ears kiss the ground and listen properly, they will hear the footfalls of ants. We believe that, with much more understanding and care, we can bridge those gaps. Africa hopes for more fruitful deliberations at the next session.

We wish also to thank the Chair of Working Group II, Mr. Johann Paschalis, a true son of Africa, who has done his best, and also Mr. Paulo Cuculis, Chair of Working Group I, for his indefatigable efforts. We thank them, and we wish our colleagues who have travelled to New York a safe journey home. We will see them at the next session. Finally, we thank you, Mr. Chairman. We truly appreciate your work.

Mr. Amil (Pakistan): When we set out upon the proceedings of this year’s substantive session, there were some low points, such as the difficulties encountered with regard to the agenda. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that you and your team deserve a lot of credit for your patience and your diligence, as well as for your sincere efforts to bridge the differences and bring about an outcome in which many of us were not placing much stock.

There is considerable optimism in the realm of disarmament. It is a field regarding which a kind of ennui had set in over the past many years. So we are fortunate to be standing at a very important crossroads. What happens from now on is going to shape our world and the world for coming generations. It is a process that we all observe with optimism, but also with a measure of trepidation. On balance, however, I think that optimism is definitely the better option.

We have to realize that, depending on how one looks at it, the consensus that once informed the debate in these fields is certainly not intact. One can use different adjectives to describe the situation, but the situation is far from satisfactory. Since these matters represent whether or not the world will live under an existential threat, the crucial question is whether we will have international relations in which force decides things or in which a softer approach as represented by the United Nations is used. These are very important issues, which, at the same time, have to be tackled in a constructive spirit with genuine empathy for the concerns of others, and not by glossing over them, looking the other way and assuming that others are doing less than oneself. That is the kind of spirit that yielded documents like the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, of which we are still proud and do not tire of quoting. It is the kind of spirit we would require to achieve genuine progress.

Regarding the present session, it has been heartwarming to see the constructive and interactive spirit surrounding the discussions. Again, one would be highly remiss if one were not to acknowledge and appreciate the efforts undertaken by the Chairs of both of the Working Groups. As we go into the next year, I think their contribution will be appreciated still further. The foundation that has been laid bodes well for the remainder of the cycle.

One point that one encounters, mostly in the corridors, is the alleged dysfunctional nature of the United Nations disarmament machinery, and there is this desire to do something about it. I think we all know that it is not always advisable to apply corporate logic to intergovernmental processes, and sometimes things that appear to be slow-moving cannot just be dismantled and replaced with something that, in the
minds of some, may provide a solution of some kind but that does not represent any long-term, durable basis for world peace. So we should in fact buttress the disarmament machinery with a more generous allocation of resources, and the United Nations should resist the urge to cut corners. This is very important work that is being done. The resources, human as well as financial, should be increased, and in that way the components of the disarmament machinery will be able to perform their duties still better. That is not to suggest that they are not working well, but I am sure that increasing their resources will eventually redound to the benefit of the international community.

Regarding the methods of work, again, there is a certain consternation that can arise from the need to bring about consensus. Consensus is sometimes looked upon as the glacier that is just there and does not move and does not amount to anything. But in this regard, I think that it is very important to underline that, if we look at our methods of work, we must preserve the principle of consensus, because if we dispense with the principle of consensus, the Disarmament Commission will run the risk of turning into something like so many extra United Nations processes on which the whole world does not agree, and which, again, give us some short-term or tactical benefits, but not any long-term solutions.

With those words, Mr. Chairman, once again, I offer our deepest appreciation to you, to the Vice-Chairpersons, to the Rapporteur and to the Chairs of the two Working Groups.

Let me just make a parting comment: perhaps it might be beneficial for the Bureau, with the help, of course, of the Secretariat, to do more intersessional work, because the substantive sessions of the Disarmament Commission tend to be brief affairs. So if the Secretariat can put together some idea of where delegations stand on different issues, I think that that would greatly facilitate the work of the Bureau as these discussions become more intense.

Mr. Cui Wei (China) (spoke in Chinese): In the interest of time, I will be very brief. I would like, Ambassador Towpik, to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the Chinese delegation to you and all the other members of the Bureau for your hard work. At the same time, I would like to thank, in particular, the Chairs of the two Working Groups for their constructive efforts and their contributions in facilitating the Groups’ discussions.

I wish also to express our appreciation for the proactive and constructive participation of all delegations in our deliberations this session. The Chinese delegation believes, Mr. Chairman, that thanks to your able leadership and to the ongoing constructive and cooperative spirit and the efforts of members, the Disarmament Commission will achieve positive results during the present three-year cycle on the items on its agenda. The Chinese delegation will continue to participate in all future deliberations in a constructive and cooperative spirit.

Mr. Hugo (Norway): Let me first thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your tireless efforts in leading this year’s session of the Disarmament Commission. This has been much appreciated from the Norwegian point of view. Equally, I would like to thank the Chairpersons of the two Working Groups. My delegation has felt itself to be in safe hands under their able guidance.

We have reached the conclusion of yet another session of the Disarmament Commission, and in the light of the deliberations and views we have shared over the past three weeks, allow me to make a few brief remarks.

Norway is pleased to note that this year’s session of the Disarmament Commission has been conducted in a very positive atmosphere, and we see the session as an important step in the right direction for the Commission. Yet at the same time, our debates have also shown that an improved climate as such does not automatically transform into compromise or consensus. To be able to move the disarmament agenda forward, we need to ensure that the positive atmosphere is converted into positive action — on substance as well as format.

Norway believes in the potential of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative forum that can add value to the multilateral disarmament machinery. Yet, in our view, this potential is currently underutilized. With its basic aim of trying to reach consensus on substantive issues, the Commission has found itself deadlocked for too long and as a result few countries now find it useful enough to send experts from their capitals or from Geneva to the annual session. My own delegation is no exception.
Norway believes that the Disarmament Commission is ripe for revival, and, in our view, the current international momentum on disarmament represents a long-awaited opportunity to initiate an honest debate on how to improve the format and methods of the Commission. Norway still maintains that shorter and more thematically focused sessions could help revitalize interest in the Commission in capitals. One could also discuss whether it is always necessary for the Disarmament Commission to seek negotiated consensus documents. If the main aim is to deliberate, then an extensive Chairman’s summary could possibly suffice as an outcome document, bringing the main points of the discussions into the First Committee. Norway stands ready to engage in constructive dialogue on these issues.

In closing, let me return to where I started and reiterate my initial assertion: From a Norwegian point of view, this year’s session has represented a positive step in the right direction, and our debates have at times been both interesting and inspiring. And I wish to underline that the aim of my intervention has not, in any way, been to paint a bleak picture of the past three weeks. On the contrary, the message we wish to convey is that we believe the positive atmosphere we have enjoyed during this year’s session presents us with opportunities, and that some of those opportunities relate to the manner in which we conduct our deliberations here in the Disarmament Commission.

We look forward to continuing our discussions in 2010.

**The Chairman**: I hope that the wish expressed by the representative of Norway will come true next year.

There are no further speakers on my list.

**Other business**

**The Chairman**: We turn now to the final item on the agenda of the 2009 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission. There appear to be no requests for the floor under this item.

Before I bring this meeting to an end, allow me to express my gratitude to all delegations for their constructive spirit — which was stressed during our discussion — and for the support they extended to me and the other members of the Bureau, who helped me to shoulder the responsibility of running the Commission smoothly. I am particularly grateful to them.

I wish also to thank Mr. Sergio Duarte, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, for his interest in the work of the Commission and for his invaluable contribution. I would like also to thank our Secretariat colleagues, including the team from the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, headed by Mr. Timur Alasaniya: Sergei Cherniavsky, Christa Giles, Lidija Komatina and Francine Leong. My thanks go also to the very able team from the Office for Disarmament Affairs, headed by Mr. Ioan Tudor: Curtis Raynold, Kristin Jenssen and Nazir Kamal. I thank them all very much. Also, my sincerest thanks go to the interpreters, conference officers and documents officers.

**Closure of the session**

**The Chairman**: I declare closed the 2009 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission. *The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.*