

related issues. It was noted that broad-scope reports could be used by States parties to raise and to respond to concerns related to Treaty compliance, such as the current questions about Iran's nuclear activities. Participants noted that reporting by Iran or other States parties must not be understood to replace their obligatory reporting to the IAEA. It was also noted that the IAEA might be able to report useful information regarding the activities of states such as Iran and North Korea.

Other issues

One participant asked how the reporting process could address the issue of states that are not party to the NPT (i.e., India, Israel, and Pakistan). Such states, as non-parties, would not submit reports. States that are States parties might address the issue of non-parties through discussions on universality, however. Also, it was suggested that the UN or the IAEA might be able to report whatever information is known about the nuclear programs of the three non-parties.

The question was also raised of how to account for collective reports, such as those submitted in the name of the Non-Aligned Movement. Such reports may provide useful information. In most cases, however, they would not contain country-by-country information; thus, they could not be seen as a substitute for individual reporting by States parties.

III: How can reports best be used by States parties and NGOs?

Next, the Roundtable discussed how to increase and improve the use of reports by States parties and NGOs.

In part, this would depend on the purpose that reporting is intended to serve. Several participants commented on this topic. Reporting is not the solution to all of the NPT's problems nor is it proposed as such: it should be seen as a useful tool among others. By contributing to transparency and accountability, it, along with the other elements of the enhanced review process, could help to strengthen the Treaty and slow its erosion. Other participants commented that reporting also could contribute to implementation: the very process of reporting would force States parties to consider what they are doing or not doing to implement the treaty. It should not be seen as an alternative to disarmament action or a measure of despair, to be pursued in the absence of real progress toward disarmament. Instead, reporting should be understood as a secondary activity that reflects what is happening – a means of promoting, supporting, and keeping track of material progress. Disarmament progress might appear to be in short supply at present, but the quickest way to kill the NPT would be to give up on making progress within the Treaty.

Discussion then turned to the characteristics of reports that States Parties would find most useful. These were summarized as follows:

- Submitted as formal reports, archived, and accessible in all UN languages;
- Available early (preferably well before the PrepCom), so they can be translated, read, and commented on in a timely manner;