

States parties would find it useful if one or several States parties were to provide some guidance about the kinds of reporting that would be helpful. This need not be a final, fixed position, but it should at least describe how Canada sees reporting working in general. Preferably, this should be produced quite early, so it could be used to support work at the margins of the First Committee and at regional fora, well before the PrepCom.

It was suggested that there are three routes that Canada could take with respect to recommending approaches to content and format. Canada could say

- we think the following is the best approach, for these reasons, and we recommend that all States parties adopt it;
- we intend to do this, for these reasons, but other ways are possible, and here are some of the arguments for and against these other approaches; or
- we intend to do this, but other States parties may have other preferred approaches.

Many States parties (e.g., the non-Annex 2 states) might think that they have relatively little to report. In many cases, these States parties might also be among those with small delegations and relatively under-resourced foreign ministries. It was suggested that it might be worth producing a sample, "boilerplate" model report that might do most of the work for such States parties, should they choose to use it, leaving them little to do but fill in the blanks and add any special items or comments. This might encourage more NNWS to participate, and it might also have the effect of helping to standardize reporting, not necessarily on a "final format", but at least encouraging movement toward certain desirable general characteristics with respect to scope, choice of categories, and level of detail. Another participant argued that States parties can and should talk about whatever subjects they want, and in particular about what they have done, as long as the information is relevant to assessing progress in implementation of the Treaty. It would not be wise, therefore, to try to impose a limited and inflexible format. Other participants argued, however, that producing a model report that addressed a broad range of Treaty elements while encouraging additional reporting on whatever else the State party considered relevant was worth considering. The Conventional Arms Register received reports from 126 states in 2001, so it is not unprecedented to achieve widespread participation in reporting regimes. Another participant commented that any such model should be applicable to both the NWS and the NNWS. It would have to be both simple enough for microstate reporting and comprehensive enough for NWS reporting.

Several participants suggested that it would be useful for States parties to perceive that other people (NGOs, the media, other States parties) were watching their performance. It would be helpful to highlight those States parties that didn't report and praise those that did. In this respect it is useful to have documents like the Shadow Report and the Roundtable background document, which show which States parties are not yet reporting. Other participants commented, however, that attempts at shaming would likely be counterproductive. In any case, at this point, they argued, there were too many non-reporters. Highlighting them would only