



OPCW

Review Conference

Fourth Session
21 – 30 November 2018

RC-4/NAT.52
30 November 2018
ENGLISH only

NETHERLANDS

**STATEMENT BY H.E. AMBASSADOR PAUL VAN DEN IJSSEL
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS
TO THE OPCW SUBSCRIBING TO THE EUROPEAN UNION STATEMENT
AND THE STATEMENT READ OUT BY H.E. AMBASSADOR PHILIPPE LAILLOT
OF FRANCE AT THE FOURTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE
OF THE STATES PARTIES TO REVIEW THE OPERATION
OF THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION**

We came to this Conference with the objective of having a final document with a good reflection of facts on chemical weapons use in Syria. A good reflection of the OPCW-UN Joint Investigative Mechanism (JIM) reports on chemical weapons use, issues that were at the heart of our discussions in the last years.

We expected a clear signal of this conference to the perpetrators of chemical weapons use, a clear signal that we as 193 States parties do not accept impunity for users of chemical weapons.

We also expected a clear signal of support and confidence to the Director-General and the Technical Secretariat

Unfortunately, we could not agree on these topics because some delegations preferred not to address these issues.

We tried, we came close thanks to your relentless and admirable efforts, but in the end it became clear that the gap between a group of States and the rest was too big to bridge.

That is very regrettable, but we will continue to work for and invest wherever we can, for the benefit of this Organisation and of the Chemical Weapons Convention and what they stand for. In that respect I am happy to report that I just signed a letter of intent on a twinning agreement between a Dutch and a South African laboratory with my South African colleague Ambassador Koloane.

One point on your report Chairperson, I have stressed continuously that it is your prerogative and we fully respect that. I thank you for it, but I agree with the United Kingdom that the enumeration of paragraphs where there is no agreement and a *contrario* concluding that there is agreement on the unnamed paragraphs is a very arbitrary statement because the fact is that we did not agree.



To conclude, thank you, Chairperson Augustin, for everything, it was a great pleasure to work with you.

--- 0 ---