

successfully opposed inclusion of items using the term “reporting” on the agenda of the last PrepCom, reporting did play an important *de facto* role in the proceedings.

NWS resistance was attributed in part to reluctance to admit to an obligation to report and thus to be seen to be accountable to the other States parties. Indeed, all States parties may fear to some extent being held to account as a result of reporting. States parties, and in particular the NWS, may also be afraid that such an obligation could turn into an obligation to report on specific things and in specific ways.

Progress also was reflected in the addition of comments on transparency and accountability in the Chairman’s Factual Summary produced at the end of the 2003 PrepCom.¹⁴ Participants commented that paragraphs 10 and 21, in particular, represented significant additions compared to the 2002 summary. Paragraph 21, which specifically addressed reporting, repeated in part the equivalent paragraph in the 2002 summary, but added a number of important points (new sentences are highlighted in italics):

Many States parties recalled that regular reports should be submitted by all States parties on the implementation of Article VI as outlined in paragraph 15, subparagraph 12, of the 2000 Final Document. It was stressed that such reporting would promote increased confidence in the overall Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty regime through transparency. *It was also expressed that such transparency provided valuable means to address and respond to compliance concerns. States parties recognized the value of reports and used them in substantive deliberation, in line with their wish for enhanced interaction.*

II: What reporting content would be most useful?

The Canadian Government’s initial approach has been that it doesn’t care how States parties report as long as they do it. This has led to somewhat greater support and participation and has allowed other States parties to experiment with scope, format, and content, minimizing any sense that this is just a Canadian initiative. Over the long run, however, participants felt that a greater standardization of scope, format, and content is desirable to maximize the usefulness and viability of reporting.

Participants suggested that it is still too early to expect to achieve completely standardized reporting. But it would only be sensible to seek fairly standardized kinds of information content. The immediate priority should continue to be to encourage more widespread participation in reporting. It would be important not to discourage participation by seeking an excessively demanding standard of reporting. Nonetheless, it is also important that reporting elicit useful information. When States undertook to report, it reflected a certain seriousness of purpose, and the result tended to be a little less rhetorical. This should be encouraged. Production of concrete, detailed reports would not only enhance the usefulness of reporting in monitoring Treaty implementation. It would also contribute to the further development of a culture of reporting and accountability among NPT States parties.

¹⁴ NPT/CONF.2005/PC.II/50, Annex II: Chairman’s factual summary, 13 May 2003.