

**JOINT STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF ANDORRA, AUSTRIA, AUSTRALIA, CANADA,
ICELAND, IRELAND, LIECHTENSTEIN, MONACO, THE NETHERLANDS, NEW
ZEALAND, NORWAY, ROMANIA, SAN MARINO, AND SWITZERLAND**

**DELIVERED BY THE PERMAMENT REPRESENTATIVE OF NEW ZEALAND
TO THE OPCW AT THE TWENTY NINTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE
STATES PARTIES**

Chair,

I am speaking on behalf of New Zealand, Canada, Australia, Norway, Austria, Monaco, Ireland, San Marino, Andorra, Liechtenstein, Romania, Iceland, Switzerland, and the Netherlands.

We are committed to the OPCW and open to all suggestions about how it can be made to work even better than it currently does. So, we welcome this discussion on voting procedures.

The current procedure is consistent with the Rules of Procedure, but we accept there may be other ways to read the Rules of Procedure and it's worth talking about the advantages and disadvantages of the various options and interpretations. We want any process that could lead to changing the voting rules to be well organised and fair. It needs to be inclusive of all member states, big and small, including those without Permanent Delegations in The Hague.

We want a chance to reflect on how this discussion could be best shaped and discuss that with our capital and our regional partners. We would like to talk about the scope and whether this narrow question before us is indeed the only voting procedure matter that needs discussion. We therefore support the Chair's suggestion for a process to agree the modalities for this discussion, but we would like to leave some room for a discussion on scope.

We read the current Chair's text to imply under the term "implementation of the rules" that this would entail a thorough and comprehensive consideration of how the voting procedures are implemented.

So let me re-state: we're open to the discussion, we want to reflect on how it can be best managed, and we support the proposal of the Chair.

Thank you, Chair.