

Preparatory Committee for the 2026 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Distr.: General
7 September 2023

Original: English

First session

Vienna, 31 July–11 August 2023

Summary record (partial)* of the 18th meeting

Held at the Vienna International Centre, Vienna, on Friday, 11 August 2023, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Viinanen (Finland)

Contents

Adoption of the draft final report and recommendations of the Preparatory
Committee for the Review Conference

* No summary record was prepared for the rest of the meeting.

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent as soon as possible to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org).

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).



The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

The discussion covered in the summary record began at 12.20 p.m.

Adoption of the draft final report and recommendations of the Preparatory Committee for the Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/CRP.2)

1. **The Chair** drew attention to the draft report of the Preparatory Committee on the work of its first session (NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/CRP.2), which was factual. He suggested that the Committee adopt it paragraph by paragraph.

2. **Mr. Robotjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) and **Mr. Kondratenkov** (Russian Federation) proposed that the Preparatory Committee begin by considering part II, section C, which dealt with the issue of documentation, before going through the rest of the draft report.

3. **The Chair** said that, since there were no objections to the proposal of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Russian Federation, the Preparatory Committee would begin its consideration of the draft report at part II, section C.

Paragraph 23

4. The Chair said that the list of documents submitted during the first session of the Preparatory Committee would be updated to include all documents submitted before the conclusion of the session, including the document circulated the previous day under the symbol [NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/6](#), containing the recommendations of the Chair on potential areas for focused discussion at the second session.

5. **Mr. Kondratenkov** (Russian Federation) said that the Chair's recommendations should not be included in the list of documents.

6. **Mr. Robotjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that there appeared to be a mistake in the list of documents, given that [NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/6](#) was listed as the symbol of the draft report on the session, not the Chair's recommendations. His delegation would like to know under which symbol the recommendations of the Chair would be issued and what status that document would have. His delegation agreed with the proposal made by the representative of the Russian Federation not to include the document in the list of documents in the report. If it were included, it should not be listed in the report as a working paper, but rather as a non-paper by the Chair. The document entitled "Draft factual summary" (NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/CRP.3) should also be deleted from the list.

7. **Mr. Barbarie** (Canada) said that the Preparatory Committee for the 2020 Review Conference had proceeded in the manner proposed by the Chair. The documents listed in the final report of the first session ([NPT/CONF.2020/1](#)) had included a draft Chair's factual summary (NPT/CONF.2020/PC.I/CRP.3) and a document containing the reflections of the Chair, entitled "Towards 2020: reflections of the Chair of the 2017 session of the Preparatory Committee", bearing the symbol [NPT/CONF.2020/PC.I/14](#). His delegation proposed that the current Preparatory Committee follow that precedent.

8. **Mr. Liddle** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation agreed with the proposal of Canada to include the recommendations of the Chair in the report as an official document of the Conference, in keeping with the practice of previous Preparatory Committees with regard to documents containing "reflections" of the Chair, which were equivalent. The draft factual summary should also be referred to as a conference room paper and as a working paper under the Chair's authority. His delegation might not agree with the full contents of those documents, but it would defend the Chair's right to submit his recommendations.

9. His delegation would submit a revised version of the document entitled "Update on the Sustained Dialogue on Peaceful Uses to Support Enhanced Cooperation as Envisioned under Article IV of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" ([NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/WP.29](#)), as more delegations had decided to sponsor the paper.

10. **Mr. Kondratenkov** (Russian Federation) said that the delegation of Canada would have to explain the equivalence it saw between the documents of the Preparatory Committee for the 2020 Review Conference that it had mentioned and the document containing the recommendations of the Chair of the current session. The earlier documents had contained expressions of general political support for the Non-Proliferation Treaty and uncontroversial proposals and recommendations. Neither document had contained the word "recommendations" in the title. In contrast, the document containing the current Chair's recommendations included specific proposals and recommendations on the review process, which had not been agreed upon by the participants at the session. It was thus a fundamentally different type of document, and the treatment of those earlier documents was irrelevant.

11. **Mr. Li Song** (China) said that his delegation shared the understanding expressed by the Russian Federation. Document [NPT/CONF.2020/PC.I/14](#) was

quite different from the document that included the recommendations of the current Chair.

12. **Mr. Gallhofer** (Austria) said that it was well understood that the draft factual summary, which would be issued under the authority of the Chair, did not represent consensus. His delegation supported that approach, despite its disagreement with many elements of the summary. Austria also welcomed the document containing the recommendations of the Chair. The appointment of the Chair had been accepted by all States, and he should have the right to share his reflections. Those reflections were helpful in stimulating discussion and were not binding on States. It was unfortunate that some States appeared to want to limit discussions by restricting documents.

13. **Ms. Stromšíková** (Czech Republic) said that the Preparatory Committee could not abolish the long-standing tradition in multilateral diplomacy whereby Chairs were entitled to produce documents in their own capacity. It was clear that such documents were not considered to be agreed texts. The documents drafted by the Chair of the current session did not have a different status from earlier documents issued under the authority of the Chair of the relevant session. Moreover, the views of delegations on the content of such documents had no bearing on their status. Her delegation therefore proposed that the Committee deal with the factual summary and recommendations of the Chair of the current session in accordance with the precedents set during previous review cycles.

14. **Mr. Khaddour** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the document containing the Chair's recommendations had not been the subject of discussion by States parties and did not reflect the views of all States. His delegation therefore objected to its inclusion in the list of documents.

15. **Mr. Negrete Jiménez** (Mexico) said that his delegation did not share some of the views contained in the documents included in the list and considered some of them to be unnecessary. It had expressed its views on the draft factual summary and would have many comments regarding the recommendations submitted by the Chair. However, his delegation had no issue with those documents being listed in the report, in line with established diplomatic practice. States would have an opportunity to express their views on the documents throughout the review cycle. Therefore, the Preparatory Committee should allow their inclusion in the report.

16. **Mr. Hassan** (Egypt) said that there were four categories of documentation used in the Preparatory Committee process: working papers, with "WP" in the symbol; informational documents, with "INF" in the

symbol; conference room papers, with "CRP" in the symbol; and Committee documents, with no additional elements in the symbol. As stated by the delegations of the Russian Federation and the Islamic Republic of Iran, the symbol [NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/6](#) indicated that the document containing the recommendations of the Chair was not a working paper under the authority of the Chair but rather a document approved by the Committee or a report submitted pursuant to a decision taken during the review process. His delegation therefore proposed that the document be issued as a working paper. In that regard, he recalled that the Chair had indicated that it was a working paper issued under his authority.

17. **The Chair** said that he had worked on the recommendations under the assumption that they would be issued as a working paper.

18. **The Secretary** said that previous papers containing reflections of the Chair had been issued as Committee documents, although that precedent could be adapted as necessary.

19. **Ms. Duncan** (New Zealand) said that her delegation supported the statements made by Austria and Mexico. It was important for delegations in multilateral meetings to respect the role of the Chair, as well as the Chair's ability, under his or her own authority, to issue reflections. Such documents did not bind States parties in any way.

20. **Mr. Biggs** (Australia) said that the Chair, and any delegation, had the right to present papers for consideration during the review process. The highly personal remarks that had been directed at the Chair by certain delegations at the present session were unacceptable. The draft factual summary and the recommendations of the Chair did not purport to reflect consensus, so there could be no legitimate objection to the documents being issued or listed in the report. In fact, almost none of the documents in the list reflected consensus. Moreover, the factual recording of the events of the session must not be censored. It was extremely surprising that some delegations were questioning the right of the Chair to circulate suggestions.

21. **Mr. Al-Taie** (Iraq) said that his delegation supported the proposal by the delegation of Egypt that the Chair's recommendations be issued as a working paper.

22. **Mr. Barbarie** (Canada), said that his delegation fully supported the comments made by Australia, Austria, Mexico and New Zealand, which represented good cross-regional diversity. In response to the delegation of the Russian Federation, he said that the difference between "recommendations" and "reflections" of the Chair was

semantic in nature; the reflections of the Chair of the Preparatory Committees for the 2020 Review Conference had been clearly intended to be recommendations, even though the title of the document had been slightly different. The underlying issue concerned the rights of the Chair. In that regard, there should be no abrogation or censorship of the Chair's ability to express himself in that capacity.

23. **Mr. Hassan** (Egypt) said that his delegation hoped that the procedural matter being discussed would not become a polarizing issue. It should be simple to resolve, since the Secretary had confirmed that a precedent could be adapted and the Chair had stated that the document containing his recommendations was intended to be a working paper. His delegation trusted the Chair's judgment in that regard and stressed that its proposal that the document be treated as a working paper was in no way intended to undermine the authority of the Chair.

24. **Mr. Duffy** (Ireland) said that his delegation acknowledged and supported the prerogative of the Chair to issue documents in his own capacity. Those documents were helpful to the review process, as shown in previous Preparatory Committees, and drew on the expertise and central vantage point of the Chair.

25. **Mr. Ichiro** (Japan) said that his delegation supported the statement made by Austria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Mexico, New Zealand and the United Kingdom. His delegation could not see any reason for deviating from the established practice of issuing the recommendations of the Chair as a document of the Preparatory Committee.

26. **Mr. Robatjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation could not agree to the recommendations of the Chair being listed as a working paper in the report, to the issuance of the draft factual summary as a working paper or to the inclusion of the summary in the list of documents. With regard to precedents and established practice, the current context was different from that of previous Preparatory Committees. At the current session, a State party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty was being directly targeted and named in the Chair's non-factual summary of the discussions. His delegation would therefore not agree to such a non-factual and discriminatory document being referenced in the report.

27. His delegation had been surprised by the Chair's actions in the working group on further strengthening the review process of the Treaty. In his draft decision and recommendation, the Chair had made no reference to the lengthy and substantive discussions on the importance of transparency and accountability that had taken place within the working group, but only

presented a draft decision that was devoid of substance. In his draft summary of the session of the Committee, the Chair had now targeted a State party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty that was compliant with its Treaty obligations and safeguards agreements. The Chair was reflecting in a one-sided manner the views of Western countries regarding the implementation by the Islamic Republic of Iran of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which had actually been hollowed out by the actions of the United States. It was also worth noting that the United States had single-handedly prevented the adoption of a substantive final document by the 2005 and 2015 Review Conferences by insisting on the inclusion of the term "consensus".

28. The concerns of his delegation should not be disregarded, even though the Chair had chosen to do so. The issue being discussed was not personal; it was an important issue for a State party and should therefore be taken into account and reflected in the report.

29. **Ms. Petit** (France) said that her delegation would like to request the addition of two working papers to the list: [NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/WP.36](#), which contained a joint statement on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and [NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/WP.37](#), on enhancing dialogue on national implementation reports, which had originally been submitted to the working group on further strengthening the review process of the Treaty.

30. **The Chair** said that, with regard to the status of the documents under discussion, both the draft factual summary and the recommendations of the Chair would be issued as working papers. During the first and second sessions of the Preparatory Committee for the 2020 Review Conference, at which the Committee had not been able to adopt factual summaries, the respective Chairs had drawn up factual summaries that had then been issued as working papers ([NPT/CONF.2020/PC.I/WP.40](#) and [NPT/CONF.2020/PC.II/WP.41](#)). Similarly, at the third session, in the absence of a consensus report containing recommendations for the 2020 Review Conference, the Chair had produced a working paper containing recommendations ([NPT/CONF.2020/PC.III/WP.49](#)). That established practice should be followed in the current case. The Chairs of the three sessions had submitted their reflections as official documents of the Committee. The document containing the recommendations of the Chair of the current session had been submitted without prejudice to the plans and preparations of the Chair of the second session. It was not intended to be a guide or a template; it simply contained the Chair's views and was intended to facilitate the work of the Committee. The Chair had indicated clearly that he was submitting both his recommendations and the draft factual summary in his personal capacity, without prejudice to

the position of any delegation, and that they in no way represented the views of the Preparatory Committee.

31. The Committee's report on its first session was intended to be a comprehensive procedural summary. It was a longstanding multilateral tradition that the list of documents included in such reports should be complete, so that it could serve as a reference for readers. The inclusion of documents in such lists did not imply their acceptance by the States participating in the meetings. The inclusion of a document merely reflected its existence.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.