AFRICAN GROUP

“The African Group] strongly supports the call for banning nuclear weapons – the only WMD not prohibited by an international legal instrument.”
– 2 MAY

ALGERIA

“We support all of the efforts aimed at banning nuclear weapons.”
– 10 MAY

AUSTRIA

“From the Austrian point of view, to prohibit use would not be enough. We need a prohibition of possession.”
– 9 MAY

“A treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons can be established before proceeding to actual elimination – and provide a springboard for it.”
– 13 MAY

BRAZIL

“We believe that the open-ended working group should make substantive recommendations to the United Nations General Assembly … to start, at an early date, multilateral negotiations of a legally binding instrument, or set of instruments, for the prohibition of nuclear weapons as a preliminary measure towards their total elimination.”
– 2 MAY

“The significant majority of states, in one way or another, have supported the start of negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear weapons with a view to their future total elimination. Brazil is convinced that this is the most viable option for unlocking the stalemate in nuclear disarmament.”
– 13 MAY

COLOMBIA

“A treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons … would establish the political basis for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.”
– 9 MAY

“Colombia joins the proposal to move towards negotiations of a universal, legally binding instrument that prohibits nuclear weapons.”
– 13 MAY
COSTA RICA
“We believe that the most practical way to start [the disarmament process] is through the negotiation of a legally binding instrument banning nuclear weapons.”
– 11 MAY

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
“The prohibition of nuclear weapons would mark a substantial step in the right direction … In general, weapons that have been prohibited increasingly become seen as illegitimate.”
“My delegation welcomes the calls for a nuclear weapon ban treaty as the best means of packaging the elements and prohibitions that are needed to make progress in nuclear disarmament.”
– 10 MAY

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
“The Dominican Republic finds it unacceptable that nuclear weapons are the only weapons of mass destruction for which there is not a comprehensive ban – as yet.”
“We are aware that prohibition is not tantamount to total elimination, and that it must be backed up by other measures pertaining to the elimination of nuclear weapons.”
– 9 MAY

“‘We hope that the report will reflect the resounding decisions from non-nuclear-weapon states to initiate a negotiating process that is inclusive in nature and transparent.’”
– 13 MAY

EGYPT
“We continue to endorse the negotiation of a nuclear weapons convention, which would aim at the total and irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time. Yet, if necessary, a first step to that objective could be the negotiation of a treaty banning the production, development, possession, transfer and use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.”
– 11 MAY

“We are proposing prohibition as the first step – then to move on to elimination … We are not proposing a prohibition treaty just because we feel like it. Rather, it is because we have tried the other options.”
– 11 MAY

“Given the level of support [for a prohibition treaty] during the February and May sessions, we are sure that you [the chair] will reflect this in the report in a balanced and fair manner.”
– 13 MAY

HONDURAS
“I wish to reiterate the urgent need for negotiations with a view to the swift conclusion of a universal, legally binding instrument that would prohibit nuclear weapons.”
– 2 MAY

INDONESIA
“If launching a negotiation process on a [nuclear weapons convention] is not plausible, then this delegation is open to the idea of – as a first step – commencing negotiations on a treaty that categorically prohibits activities related to nuclear weapons.”
– 10 MAY

“‘We believe that a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons is a pathway towards a world free of nuclear weapons that merits our positive consideration. We also believe that a new legal instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons would represent an effective measure under article VI of the NPT.’”
– 13 MAY

ECUADOR
“A legally binding international treaty for the blanket prohibition of nuclear weapons … would set the political and legal scene for the subsequent elimination of such weapons.”
– 2 MAY

“Ecuador supports the proposal made by CELAC that we should see the conclusion of an international legally binding agreement that would prohibit nuclear weapons as soon as possible. We believe that such an instrument would be a tangible step forward.”
– 9 MAY

“‘The prohibition of nuclear weapons would fill the existing legal vacuum and contribute to the stigmatization of these weapons.’”
– 11 MAY

GUATEMALA
“Like the majority of states in this room, Guatemala supports the goal of a new legal instrument that is broad in scope and fills the legal gap.”
– 10 MAY

“Non-nuclear-weapon states should show that we are committed to filling the legal gap [by prohibiting nuclear weapons], just as we have done for all other weapons of mass destruction. The status quo is not acceptable.”
– 13 MAY

EL SALVADOR
“‘We should ‘mainstream’ the prohibition of nuclear weapons.”
– 4 MAY

“Crystal clear in these recommendations, there is a call for a new legal instrument for the prohibition of nuclear weapons … Can this working group recommend the prohibition of nuclear weapons? Yes.”
– 9 MAY

“‘We are proposing prohibition as the first step – then to move on to elimination … We are not proposing a prohibition treaty just because we feel like it. Rather, it is because we have tried the other options.’”
– 11 MAY

“Given the level of support [for a prohibition treaty] during the February and May sessions, we are sure that you [the chair] will reflect this in the report in a balanced and fair manner.”
– 13 MAY

“‘We believe that a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons is a pathway towards a world free of nuclear weapons that merits our positive consideration. We also believe that a new legal instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons would represent an effective measure under article VI of the NPT.’”
– 13 MAY
“A prohibition on nuclear weapons would coexist with, and support and enhance, the NPT in much the same way the anti-personnel land mine ban treaty coexists with, and supports and enhances, the convention on certain conventional weapons.”
– 12 May

“Ireland
“We all know and agree that the only action which can truly address the risk [of a nuclear weapon detonation] is the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons.”
– 9 May

“Nuclear weapons remain the only weapons of mass destruction not prohibited by law. Effective measures are envisaged and required by the Non-Proliferation Treaty.”
– 10 May

“Jamaica
“We see a global prohibition as closing the legal gap and addressing the ambiguity in nuclear governance.”
– 10 May

“It is regrettable to note that, despite other categories of WMD having been prohibited, nuclear weapons, with potentially devastating consequences, are still not subject to a universal prohibition … We need to adopt a new approach towards a legally binding instrument aimed at prohibiting [them].”
– 2 May

“Kenya
“The challenge that we are facing today is that there is no instrument or agreement that explicitly outlaws nuclear weapons.”
– 2 May

“The legally binding instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons does not need to include measures leading up to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Measures to initiate the destruction of nuclear weapons in an irreversible, verifiable and transparent manner would be the subject of future negotiations.”
– 10 May

“Iraq
“Negotiations [on risk reduction measures etc.] cannot be an alternative to a convention to expressly prohibit nuclear weapons.”
– 2 May

“Malaysia
“We hope to begin negotiations on a global prohibition of nuclear weapons as a contribution to the achievement and maintenance of a world free of nuclear weapons. We are convinced that the most viable option for immediate action is to negotiate a legally binding instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons.”

“The legally binding instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons does not need to include measures leading up to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Measures to initiate the destruction of nuclear weapons in an irreversible, verifiable and transparent manner would be the subject of future negotiations.”

“Prohibition in this legally binding instrument – which we envisage applicable to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices – would
include possession, use and threat of use, acquisition, stockpiling, development, testing, transfer, transit, stationing, deployment [and] encouraging or inducing, directly or indirectly, any activity related to nuclear weapons.”

– 9 MAY

“If nuclear-weapon states are unwilling to even have discussions on nuclear disarmament issues, then a catalyst for action is needed – and a prohibition treaty does that.”

“Prohibition strengthens regimes such as the NPT by reinforcing the commitment to disarmament by non-nuclear-weapon states.”

– 10 MAY

“With a prohibition treaty, nuclear-armed states need to know that global opinion is against [nuclear] weapons, that such weapons are unacceptable, and that there needs to be a start in this process [towards the goal of elimination].”

“If this open-ended working group is not enough to make nuclear-armed states hear the call from non-nuclear-weapon states, then perhaps a prohibition treaty will.”

– 12 MAY

“People believe that the report has to be accurate, fair and balanced – [fair] especially with respect to the views expressed by the large number of delegations for a prohibition.”

– 13 MAY

“[There have been no objections to any particular elements that could form part of a new legal instrument. The report should reflect that there were no objections to these particular elements.]”

– 10 MAY

“A prohibition could be a confidence-building measure – perhaps the only credible confidence-building measure.”

– 11 MAY

“The supporters of a prohibition come from all regions of the world, not only from Latin America and the Caribbean.”

“A prohibition on nuclear weapons, apart from making a major disarmament contribution, will be the ultimate non-proliferation measure – so, rather than weakening the NPT, it will strengthen the NPT.”

– 12 MAY

“Filling the legal gap requires an open and inclusive process … [that] would not depend on the participation of the nuclear-armed states. Nicaragua considers that, in order to create an effective and general prohibition on nuclear weapons, the international community would need to include a number of prohibitions.”

– 9 MAY

“We believe that a treaty banning nuclear weapons should contain obligations relating to the fulfilment of victims’ rights and the remediation of contaminated environments.”

“Let us focus on preparing the ground for a treaty banning these ultimate harmful and deadly weapons of mass destruction. They are immoral. They are inhumane. And soon they will be made illegal.”

– 12 MAY

“The momentum we have all contributed to toward a ban is clearly unstoppable. The only
Panama

“For Panama, it is not acceptable that these are the only weapons of mass destruction not totally banned.”

“This new convention should prohibit the possession, development, testing, acquisition, stockpiling, transfer, deployment, use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and also the assistance, financing or incitement of associated acts.”

Philippines

“While we have treaties banning chemical and biological weapons, we do not have one for the deadliest [weapons] of them all. And so work on a treaty that will ban the possession, use or threat of use, acquisition, development and testing of nuclear weapons is the most ideal and correct action.”

South Africa

“The Philippines’ position is clear in terms of its preference for a ban treaty.”

South Africa does not agree that the NPT constitutes the final framework regulating nuclear weapons… [it] does not contain an explicit prohibition on nuclear weapons.”

“A prohibition treaty would constitute a step towards our goal of a world without nuclear weapons.”
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Switzerland

“Switzerland believes that nuclear weapons should be prohibited. It must remain our goal to work towards a verifiable prohibition. There seems to be a widely shared view that a prohibition should be part of an instrument.”

Thailand

“If we want to be clear and precise in setting norms, as the international community has been with other weapons, then the prohibitions should be comprehensive. They should include prohibitions on the use, threat of use, deployment, acquisition, possession, stockpiling, transfer, development and production of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.”

Venezuela

“Venezuela supports the negotiation of a nuclear weapons ban convention, which will increase international security.”
Working Paper 5
Submitted by Austria
“Legal measures such as the prohibition of the use, production, stockpiling and transfer of nuclear weapons have not yet been considered in detail in the NPT context. However, it is clear that such measures are required for achieving and maintaining a world without nuclear weapons.”

Working Paper 8
Submitted by Costa Rica and Malaysia
“Agreement and participation of the nuclear-armed states would not be necessary for the negotiation of such a treaty [banning nuclear weapons]. Negotiations could therefore commence – in a United Nations setting or elsewhere – as soon as a sufficient number of non-nuclear-weapon states decided to do so.”

Working Paper 10
Submitted by Brazil
“A ban treaty would provide the basic prohibitions and obligations for all states parties to it and set the political objectives of the international community with regard to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons … Since it does not need to be universal at its inception, it could be a more practical way to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations.”

Working Paper 13
Submitted by Costa Rica and Malaysia
“One means of bringing the notion of absolute prohibition into norms applying to nuclear weapons is to create a new treaty that prohibits nuclear weapons in the same absolute terms in which the biological weapons convention prohibits biological weapons and the anti-personnel mine ban convention prohibits anti-personnel landmines.”

“Such a treaty would not need to contain verification provisions or to include all – or even any – of the nuclear-armed states. Certainly, the experience with biological weapons and anti-personnel landmines suggests that even a treaty with limited membership and little content beyond a straightforward prohibition could be highly effective in developing and strengthening norms against nuclear weapons. The fact that some nuclear-armed states explicitly oppose such a treaty is further evidence of its likely effectiveness as a means of norm-building.”

Working Paper 14
Submitted by Fiji, Nauru, Palau, Samoa and Tuvalu
“We believe that the debate should no longer be about whether a global ban on nuclear weapons is necessary, but rather how we can achieve it and what provisions it should contain.”

“A global treaty banning nuclear weapons would address the fragmentary and, in some respects, discriminatory nature of the existing regime by closing loopholes and applying the same rules to all states equally. It would contribute to the progressive stigmatization of nuclear weapons, and constitute an ‘effective measure’ for nuclear disarmament as required by article VI of the NPT.”

“Such a treaty would allow nuclear-free states to formalize their total rejection of nuclear weapons, not only for themselves or their region but for all states, and to contribute to the creation of an effective international regime to prevent the perpetuation of nuclear weapon possession.”

“This working group should develop a clear road map, with timelines, for initiating, conducting and concluding negotiations on a treaty banning nuclear weapons in light of their catastrophic humanitarian consequences and associated risks.”

“The negotiating process should commence in 2016 and conclude within two years. It is important to acknowledge that much preparatory work has already taken place in various forums, including in particular at the three conferences on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons.”

Working Paper 15
Submitted by the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States
“CELAC member states have decided, at the level of heads of state and government, to join the efforts by the international community to advance towards the negotiation of a universal legally binding instrument prohibiting the possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use of nuclear weapons.”
“For the majority of the international community, there is no reason why a universal prohibition of nuclear weapons should not be pursued immediately. We must not wait to witness once again the catastrophic consequence of a detonation of a nuclear weapon before we decide to start negotiations on a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons.”

“The negotiation of such an instrument should be open to all states and its entry into force should not depend on the ratification by nuclear-armed states.”

“Prohibition is not a substitution to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. CELAC countries believe that the prohibition of nuclear weapons will set a norm which should be followed by other efforts and negotiations towards the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons.”

“CELAC proposes that the open-ended working group makes the following recommendations to the United Nations General Assembly … to begin a multilateral diplomatic process for the negotiation of a legally binding instrument for the prohibition of nuclear weapons towards their total elimination.”

**WORKING PAPER 17**
**SUBMITTED BY MEXICO**

“A global prohibition on nuclear weapons is a fundamental element to complete the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime.”

“A prohibition on nuclear weapons would have a tremendous impact to the achievement of a world free of nuclear weapons, among others, by … contributing to the understanding that the existence of nuclear weapons is unacceptable by establishing a global norm that will stigmatize such weapons, discouraging horizontal and vertical proliferation …”

“A multilateral legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons could contribute to the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons.”

“A prohibition on nuclear weapons is not an end in itself; additional or complementary measures might be required once such prohibition is in place.”

**WORKING PAPER 27**
**SUBMITTED BY NICARAGUA**

“It is likely that the activities to be prohibited in this new treaty do not vary substantially with respect to those found in other international instruments on disarmament, such as those prohibiting use, possession, development, production, acquisition, stockpiling or transfer. Notwithstanding the foregoing, we need to include in this new treaty a greater number of prohibitions …”

“The main purpose of this new treaty must be to strengthen the global norm against the use and possession of nuclear weapons, as well as to facilitate the process towards their total elimination …”

“The prohibitions should be sufficiently broad and specific to prevent countries from engaging in activities that: 1) provide for the quantitative and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons; 2) contribute to a possible use of nuclear weapons; 3) are perceived as acts legitimizing nuclear weapons; or 4) undermine progress towards general and complete disarmament.”

**WORKING PAPER 34**
**SUBMITTED BY ARGENTINA, BRAZIL, COSTA RICA, ECUADOR, GUATEMALA, INDONESIA, MALAYSIA, MEXICO, THE PHILIPPINES AND ZAMBIA**

“We are convinced that the most viable option for immediate action is to negotiate a legally binding instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons, establishing general interdictions and obligations and pronouncing an unambiguous political commitment to the achievement and maintenance of a world free of nuclear weapons.”

“A legally binding instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons would be a contribution in itself to nuclear disarmament. But, in order to reach our ultimate goal of achieving and maintaining a world free of nuclear weapons, other legally binding instruments, set of instruments or protocols to the legally binding instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons shall be negotiated.”

“The legally binding instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons does not need to include measures leading up to the elimination of nuclear prohibition on nuclear weapons, as a contribution to the achievement and maintenance of a world free of nuclear weapons.”

“Taking into account the experience of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, this working paper will suggest a number of recommendations to be included in the final report of the open-ended working group with a view to enable the launching of multilateral negotiations of a legally binding instrument for a global prohibition on nuclear weapons.”

“The successful experience of the nuclear-weapon-free zones invites a reflection on their example as a source of inspiration for the establishment of a global prohibition of nuclear weapons, which could impact, in a positive way, the prospects for peace and stability in other regions of the world, such as the Middle East, the Korean Peninsula and South Asia.”

“We have renounced the possession of nuclear weapons by a legally binding international instrument. Therefore, we hope to begin negotiations on a global
would not need universal world. Such an instrument of a nuclear-weapon-free weapons and the maintenance of nuclear weapons would have a legal as well as legal impact on the disarmament debate and it would provide much-needed direction for further initiatives aiming at the elimination of nuclear weapons and the maintenance of a nuclear-weapon-free world. Such an instrument would not need universal adherence to be negotiated nor to enter into force.”

“We propose that the open-ended working group, in its report, includes the following recommendations to the General Assembly: (a) convene a conference in 2017, open to all states, international organizations and civil society, to negotiate a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons; (b) report to the United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to be convened no later than 2018, pursuant to resolution 68/32, on the progress made on the negotiation of such an instrument.”

**WORKING PAPER 35**
**SUBMITTED BY IRELAND**

“The Humanitarian Pledge call for states to ‘identify and pursue effective measures to fill the legal gap for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons’ refers primarily to the fact that, although treaties to prohibit and eliminate chemical and biological weapons are in force, no such global regime has yet been negotiated for nuclear weapons.”

**WORKING PAPER 36**
**SUBMITTED BY ENDORSERS OF THE HUMANITARIAN PLEDGE (126 STATES)**

“The ‘building blocks’ approach by definition recognizes that multiple measures are needed and essentially refers to a combination and sequence of different legal and non-legal measures. Conceptually, these different measures would include a legally binding instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons in some form.”

“A prohibition/ban-treaty would likely entail the prohibition of the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of nuclear weapons, without necessarily addressing all effective legal measures covered by a comprehensive nuclear weapons convention.”

“The countries supporting the Humanitarian Pledge consider it indispensable to reflect the following elements in the recommendations of the open-ended working group: … to pursue an additional legal instrument or instruments with urgency and to support international efforts to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons.”

**WORKING PAPER 37**
**SUBMITTED BY BRAZIL**

“The technical intricacies of a nuclear weapons convention would probably need the robust involvement of at least several states possessing nuclear weapons, whereas a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons could be negotiated even without them, if necessary.”

“The most viable option for immediate action seems to be the negotiation of a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons, establishing general interdictions and obligations, and an unambiguous political commitment to completely eliminate nuclear weapons.”

“Such a treaty should benefit from further developments. It could be complemented by protocols on national declarations, national implementation, verification and phases of destruction, assistance and technical cooperation, and the non-discriminatory verification regime to be implemented after the dismantlement of all nuclear weapons.”

“A prohibition on nuclear weapons followed by the negotiation of protocols on elimination and other relevant issues would be the best possible option available, and could be immediately pursued.”

“Brazil would like that the final report of the open-ended working group to the General Assembly of the UN at its 71st session recommends the immediate commencement of negotiations on a treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons, which would establish the main prohibitions and obligations associated with that goal, as well as the general provisions regarding future steps aimed at the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.”
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