Thank you Mr Chairman. I am pleased to take the floor on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition to present our views on the operation and implementation of the Treaty as well as on implementation of the 2010 Action Plan and other NPT Review Conference outcomes as they relate to the issues under discussion here.

As you know, the NAC’s uppermost focus this year is on the elaboration of the legal approaches capable of implementing the “effective measures” called for in Article VI of the NPT. That this core provision has yet to be fully implemented is acknowledged by all States – both non-nuclear weapon and nuclear weapon States – with the vast majority also recognising that uneven implementation of the Treaty, and of the grand bargain contained therein, directly undermines the Treaty’s credibility.

It is the view of the NAC, and of very many other States Parties to the NPT, that this Review Conference must set in motion the process for rectifying this imbalance – namely, the process for elaborating the legally “effective measures” needed to achieve and maintain a world free of nuclear weapons.

In prioritising this outcome, something which will be the subject of focused discussions here in Subsidiary Body 1 tomorrow, we do not at all devalue the importance of implementation of the 2010 Action Plan or of the outcomes of other NPT Review Conferences. And we accept that a frank assessment of the extent of implementation of all these outcomes will also have a direct bearing on our confidence that further commitments made at this Review Conference will indeed be implemented.

Mr Chairman, it is clear that implementation of the 2010 Action Plan – let alone earlier commitments – is, at best, underwhelming. That said, the NAC is, however, able to applaud one of the most significant and positive developments to occur during this review cycle. We refer to the fact that the overwhelming majority of States have considered and endorsed statements, and participated in Conferences, reflecting on the risks and catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any nuclear weapon detonation. 159 States have affirmed that it is in the interest of the very
survival of humanity that nuclear weapons are never used again, under any circumstances and reaffirmed that the only way to guarantee that nuclear weapons will never be used again is through their total elimination. They have also emphasised that the humanitarian imperative must underpin all approaches to nuclear disarmament, particularly at this Review Conference. For these States – which include all members of the New Agenda Coalition – our support for the humanitarian initiative is certainly one of the policies we have pursued, and will continue to pursue, in fulfilment of Action 1.

We note the positive steps that have been taken by the nuclear weapon States. These include the participation of the US and the UK in the Third Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons in Vienna in December 2014, the ongoing implementation by Russia and the US of the New Start Treaty, and the ratification by four of the nuclear weapon States of the Protocol to the Central Asian Nuclear Weapon Free Zone - with the United States having submitted it to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratify. We also note the launch by the US of the International Partnership for Nuclear Disarmament Verification.

Overall, however, there is little to celebrate, most conspicuously with respect to Action 5 of the 2010 Action Plan. To highlight just a few concerns:

- There has been no adequate movement towards an overall reduction in the global stockpile of all types of nuclear weapons – rather reductions are slowing while at the same time the nuclear weapon States are spending billions of dollars to modernize their stockpiles of nuclear weapons.

- There is no evidence that the role and significance of nuclear weapons in all military and security concepts, doctrines and policies has diminished. To the contrary, efforts appear focused, instead, on developments that entrench nuclear weapons in the doctrines and military budgets of all nuclear weapon States and their alliance partners for the indefinite future.
• There is no evidence that the nuclear weapon States are considering the legitimate interest of non-nuclear-weapon States in reducing the operational status of nuclear weapons systems.

• The reports submitted by the nuclear weapon States to the Preparatory Committee in 2014, while apparently based on a “common framework”, did not reference or reflect a “standard reporting form” as required by Action 21 and fell short of the expectations of non-nuclear-weapon States with respect to the information contained therein.

Mr Chairman, the NAC is firmly of the view that this Review Conference represents a turning point. We are faced with a fairly anaemic record of implementation of Article VI, of the 2010 Action Plan and of other undertakings made at earlier Review Conferences. We also have the continued doctrinal and budgetary commitment of the nuclear weapon States and their alliance partners to nuclear deterrence, even in the face of the growing international awareness and concern, as we mentioned at the outset, about the risks and catastrophic consequences of a nuclear weapon detonation.

But we also have the opportunity – and the legal obligation – to put in place the effective measures required by Article VI of the Treaty. At this Review Conference we must move forward, setting in motion a process for elaborating the measures which, under international law, establish the rules and prohibitions necessary for the achievement of verifiable and irreversible nuclear disarmament and of a nuclear-weapon free world. This is the outcome to which we all aspire and to the realisation of which we are all legally bound.

The NAC asks how we can realise this outcome if we do not conclude the elaboration of legally “effective measures”? And how can we conclude, if we do not start?

Thank you Mr Chairman.