

- Based on the 2006 NPTRC mandate, but interpreting this mandate broadly to address the entire Treaty.
- Listing a flexible, open format, and both around categories of information rather than a fixed format.
- Emphasizing hard information rather than advocacy and opinion.
- Forward-looking as well as backward-looking.
- Organized in such a way as to be comparable State Party-to-State Party, including NWS to NWS.
- Comparable year-to-year, and
- Not burdensome to produce.

Participants noted that the issue of early availability raised a difficult question: Since there is no permanent IWT Secretariat, to whom should States parties submit early reports? (And when could they be translated?) It was noted that the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention also lacks a permanent secretariat, but an unofficial, virtual secretariat, a website hosted by the University of Bradford (<http://www.opaw.org>), works well as a place to post reports and analyses. Participants commented that a similar site, while not receiving all questions related to early availability, might prove very useful for the NPTR review process.

Interactivity

Participants discussed the prospects for increasing the use of reports during actual PrepCom and Review Conference sessions. The prospects for interactivity are linked to the content of the report; the more relevant the content, the more likely that reports will be used. There are also practical issues of timing. When would reports become available? How quickly could delegations respond to them, both in asking questions and in providing credible responses?

A number of participants suggested that it might be possible to stagger the PrepCom/Review Conference agenda over the two weeks of the event in order to allow time for reports to be digested, questions to be asked, and approved responses to be provided. It was emphasized that delegations would need sufficient time to check with their foreign ministries if they were to provide credible responses to questions of substance. It would not be realistic to expect delegates to answer potentially loaded questions on the spot, nor would they necessarily have the detailed technical knowledge of their own country's programs that would be needed to provide useful answers. By providing time for such exchanges, however, the agenda might increase the likelihood of active use of the reports, especially with respect to the NWS and States parties facing compliance questions. It was considered unlikely, however, that the agenda of the next PrepCom could be modified in this way. Such a change probably would be made only if the Chair of the PrepCom determined it to be uncontroversial (which is not likely to be the case).

Another possible approach discussed would be to submit lists of questions for the NWS or other States parties two to three weeks in advance of the conference to allow these States time