

## **Intervention by Brazil – Agenda item 9(d)**

Mr Chair,

The proposal we are deliberating on was formally tabled yesterday, and introduced a few hours ago. Yet there seems to be very little in this text that justifies its submission with such short notice. This process cannot be labeled open and inclusive.

Brazil sincerely appreciates Syria's efforts and collaboration. We also take good note that the commitment shown on the part of our Syrian friends is gradually resulting in progress. But of course, there is still a long road ahead of us—and Brazil is ready to walk along those who want to see this file closed once and for all.

The Syria file is doubtless important. But we cannot banalize exceptionality.

The extreme short notice with which this text was submitted weakens our institutional governance, undermines the search for consensus and curtails our capacity to appropriately consult our capital on the many important questions raised by the proposal.

Chair,

With a constructive spirit, we would like to propose two adjustments to the draft that we would have submitted if we had followed an open dialogue effort.

The first operative paragraph of the draft decision stipulates that the Conference would be delegating to the Executive Council the authority to decide taking into account, and I quote, “any progress” made by Syria.

This formulation—“any progress”—is inconsistent with what we have agreed. The 2021 Conference Decision is clear on the type of progress that leads to the reinstatement of Syria's rights and privileges: it is not “any progress”, but concrete and verifiable “progress” on the specific criteria laid down by that Decision.

We take good note that the Ambassador of Qatar acknowledged in his intervention today that there is no intention to change the conditions agreed in 2021. So it is clear that the progress we need to see is full compliance with these conditions.

For these reasons, Brazil believes we should delete the expression “taking into account any progress” in OP1 of the draft.

Additionally, the competence to ascertain the fulfilment of such conditions belongs primarily to the Conference, as clearly established in OP8 of C-25/Dec.9. Once we are informed by the DG that the 2021 conditions have been fully met, the Conference can at any time decide to lift the suspensions.

Therefore, we also suggest to remove the verb “to decide” from the draft decision.

To be sure, there can be an advisory role for the Executive Council in the implementation of the 2021 decision. But this role is to consider and recommend appropriate action to the Conference. This intermediate path is a possible way forward that respects the spirit of the CWC.

Thank you.