

A breakdown of how the Annex 2 states reported was not available during the Roundtable. Post-Roundtable analysis of this question produced a number of interesting results, however. Forty-one of the 44 Annex 2 states are parties to the NPT (Israel, India, and Pakistan are the non-parties). Of these 41 states, 37 (i.e., 90%) reported in one form or another in 2002 and/or 2003; twenty (49%) provided formal reports. Only North Korea (whose membership in the Treaty is currently in dispute), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Spain, and Turkey did not report in any way. By contrast, of the 147 NPT States parties that are not part of the Annex 2 list, only 31 (21%) reported in 2002 and/or 2003; eight (5%) provided formal reports. Thus, 116 (97%) of the 120 States parties that did not report in either year were states that were not on the Annex 2 list. This suggests that a perceived lack of information to report may be another major reason for the current low level of reporting participation by NPT States parties (even though a wide range of NPT-related activities and initiatives could be reported by non-Annex 2 states, as evidenced by the 31 such states that did report in one form or another).

Participants also asked how many members of the NATO alliance reported. It was suggested that Canada might be able to use its alliance ties to encourage reporting by fellow members of the alliance. Canada might also remind these countries that NATO members had affirmed their support of the 13 Steps, including the reporting requirement, as part of NATO policy in December 2000.¹² Analysis of Appendix 1 of the Roundtable background document indicated that 12 of the 19 NATO members reported in 2002 and/or 2003, and 7 provided formal reports. Non-reporting NATO members included two of the four non-reporting Annex 2 states: Spain and Turkey.

Culture of Accountability

Participants assessed that some progress had been made on promoting a “culture of accountability” at the 2003 PrepCom, despite resistance from the NWS and some other States parties. Such a culture involves more than just reporting, incorporating also NGO access to the review process and greater interactivity in discussions among States parties. It was noted that greater interactivity would help States parties to deal with questions of compliance. It had been useful, for example, to prod Iran to report at the last PrepCom.

A number of participants commented that the NWS continue to resist this culture, maintaining that they are not accountable to anyone. This, participants said, remains a fundamental problem. Nonetheless, some progress has been made with the NWS as well. The informal report submitted by the United Kingdom, for example, commented favourably on reporting and transparency, acknowledging that “States party have rightly expressed interest in reporting on disarmament measures by all states, as well as reporting on other measures linked to the Treaty.”¹³ Also, although the United States and France

¹² North Atlantic Council, *Report on Options for Confidence and Security Building Measures (CSBMs), Verification, Non-Proliferation, Arms Control and Disarmament* (public version released as *Press Communiqué M-NAC-2(2000)121*, 14 December 2000.

¹³ *Statement by Ambassador David Broucher, Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Cluster 1: Disarmament, 30 April 2003.*