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NAM would like to thank you Mr. Chair for your hard work and assure you of the utmost cooperation of the Group of Non-Aligned Movement in discharge of your mandate throughout this process.

Let me, Mr. Chair, express the General Observations of the Movement on your summary report, as followings:

- NAM is of the view that the text is not adequately balanced and does not take all the views in terms of proposals as well as oral statements; including principle position of NAM on a comprehensive legally binding protocol, strengthening BTWC;

- Therefore, it should not be construed as the agreement of the States Parties of the Convention on the text, nor being binding for them;

- The text is also in some places is not the factual record of the process;

- Some of the issues are elaborately addressed in the text, while some others are just cursorily mentioned; and others are not reflected in the text.

- Under the section of “Cooperation and Assistance”, selective Articles of the Convention are lumped up, while there is synergy among all articles of the Convention, not just a few of them. Also, the main proposal of the Movement on Action Plan on Art. X, as well as its mechanism, which long have been reiterated in NAM consecutive Statements in almost all related meeting in the Intersessional period as well as in this process are completely dropped out the of text.
- In some places, throughout the text the Passive Format is used as if it is the common understanding of all, while the format of “some said so…, some others said so…” should have been strictly adhered.

- NAM has always reiterated that national implementation should not be interpreted as the sole national responsibility of States, and replace of having a multilaterally negotiated instrument on this; this point is also well ignored in the text.

- NAM also recognizes the role of ISU in supporting its Member States on national implementation of the Convention. The Group is at the same time of the belief that the CBMs should not be seen as compliance mechanism.

- NAM is of the view that issues related to 1925 Geneva Protocol, in particular the issue of “use”, also have not been well addressed in the text;

- NAM considers the issue of Inter-sessional program is a complex one, and various proposals on this theme have not been duly reflected, while just one view has been elaborated relatively in detail.

- As for ISU, NAM believes that it is not a linear matter, and the complex issues such as future mandates, scopes, plans, role of State Parties in its structure and program, as well as due regard to the equitable geographical distribution in the recruitment process, should be adequately addressed.

To conclude, Mr. Chair, NAM believes that, on the above-mentioned accounts, it should not be construed as the agreement of the States Parties of the Convention on the text, nor being binding for them, but just as an INF Paper for the consideration of delegations ahead of the Eights Review Conference.

NAM would also like to reassure you of the most constructive engagement in the successful discharge of your mandate in this process.

I thank you Mr. Chair.