

# 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 of the 19th meeting

Held at the Vienna International Centre, Vienna, on Friday, 11 August 2023, at 3 p.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Viinanen . . . . . (Finland)

## Contents

Adoption of the draft final report and recommendations of the Preparatory  
Committee to the Review Conference (*continued*)

Any other matters

Closure of the session

---

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](mailto:dms@un.org)).

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

23-15716 (E)



Please recycle



*The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.*

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

(NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/CRP.2) (*continued*)

1. **The Chair** invited the Preparatory Committee to resume its consideration of the draft report on its first session (NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/CRP.2) and suggested that the Committee adopt it paragraph by paragraph.

*Paragraphs 1 to 5*

2. *Paragraphs 1 to 5 were adopted.*

*Paragraph 6*

3. **Mr. Liddle** (United Kingdom) said that a full stop should be inserted at the end of the paragraph.

4. *Paragraph 6, as orally amended, was adopted.*

*Paragraph 7*

5. **The Chair** said that paragraph 7 should be amended to reflect the fact that 112 States parties had participated in the work of the first session of the Preparatory Committee. Guatemala should be added to the list.

6. **Mr. Liddle** (United Kingdom) requested that “United Kingdom” be changed to “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland”.

7. **Mr. Bega** (Albania) requested that his country be included in the list of States parties that had participated in the work of the session, bringing the total number of participating States parties to 113.

8. **Mr. in den Bosch** (Kingdom of the Netherlands) asked that “Netherlands” be changed to “Netherlands (Kingdom of the)”.

9. *Paragraph 7, as orally amended, was adopted.*

*Paragraph 8*

10. **The Chair** said that paragraph 8 should be amended to reflect that 19 plenary meetings had been held by the Preparatory Committee.

11. *Paragraph 8, as orally amended, was adopted.*

*Paragraphs 9 to 13*

12. *Paragraphs 9 to 13 were adopted.*

*Paragraph 14*

13. **Mr. Liddle** (United Kingdom) said that, in subparagraph (a), the words “paragraph 9” should be changed to “paragraph 10”.

14. *Paragraph 14, as orally amended, was adopted.*

*Paragraphs 15 to 22*

15. *Paragraphs 15 to 22 were adopted.*

*Paragraph 23*

16. **The Chair** said that, following informal consultations held since the previous meeting, he had decided that, in order to ensure the adoption of the draft report and address the concerns raised by certain delegations, he would not submit the draft factual summary contained in document NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/CRP.3 as a working paper. The reference to the document would therefore be deleted from the draft report.

17. It was the prerogative of any Chair to submit working papers to the Committee on the substance of the Committee’s deliberations; therefore, his decision should not in any way be seen as inhibiting the authority of the Chairs of future Preparatory Committees or Review Conferences. However, the Chair was not obligated to submit working papers. It was deeply disappointing that his draft factual summary would not be issued as a working paper. Nevertheless, he had submitted two other working papers. The first was the document containing his reflections on the first session of the Committee, which had been circulated the previous day as the Chair’s recommendations. The word “recommendations” in the title would be changed to “reflections”, and the document would bear the symbol [NPT/CONF/2026/PC.I/WP.38](#). His second working paper, on further strengthening the review process of the Non-Proliferation Treaty ([NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/WP.34](#)), was being submitted in his capacity as Chair of the working group on that topic.

18. As requested by the delegation of the United Kingdom at the previous meeting, the working paper 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](#)) would be updated to include the names of the 37 States that supported the document. In addition, the two working papers submitted by France, entitled “Joint statement on addressing the North Korean nuclear challenge” and “Enhancing dialogue on national implementation reports”, would be inserted into the list of documents and

would bear the symbols [NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/WP.36](#) and [NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/WP.37](#), respectively.

19. **Mr. Laggner** (Switzerland) asked whether the Chair's draft factual summary would appear on the official website of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs.

20. **The Chair** said that the document would not be made public.

21. *Paragraph 23, as amended, was adopted.*

#### *Paragraph 24*

22. **The Chair** said that the list of participants that was referred to in paragraph 24 would be modified as necessary to reflect any late submissions or corrections.

23. *Paragraph 24 was adopted.*

#### *Annex*

24. *The annex was adopted.*

25. *The draft final report of the Preparatory Committee as a whole, as amended, was adopted.*

#### **Any other matters**

26. **Mr. Laumulin** (Kazakhstan) said that his delegation recognized the value of the Chair's reflections, which identified the pertinent items that had been raised by delegations during the session. The Chair of the second session of the Preparatory Committee would remain open to further discussion and rely on the opinions of all States parties, with the aim of holding a productive session. His delegation hoped that a balanced working approach could be identified so that key topics could be covered, including those reflected in the Chair's recommendations.

27. **Mr. Ichiro** (Japan) said that the discussions within the working group on further strengthening the review process of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons had been meaningful, as States parties had been able to engage in detailed discussions on substantial matters in an interactive manner. There had been a significant convergence of views on many issues. While it was regrettable that consensus could not be reached regarding the recommendations of the working group, his delegation highly appreciated the working paper issued by the Chair of the working group, under his own authority, which included useful recommendations proposed by States parties and would serve as an excellent basis for future discussions.

28. His delegation appreciated the Chair's draft factual summary of the session of the Preparatory

Committee, which contained a balanced overview of the discussions held during the session. It was truly regrettable that the document would not be issued as a working paper, as it could have made an important contribution to the process of preparing for the 2026 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In that regard, his delegation was greatly concerned about the deviation from well-established past practice. The Chair's reflection paper was of great value, as it would strengthen continuity between the sessions of the Preparatory Committee. The idea of having a rolling text had been discussed within the working group and had garnered widespread support among States parties.

29. **Mr. Laggner** (Switzerland) said that his delegation was encouraged by the very interactive and substantive discussions in the working group on further strengthening the review process of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and appreciated that the Chair would be submitting, in his capacity as Chair of the working group, a working paper which accurately captured the main points that had been discussed.

30. It was regrettable that one delegation had exercised its veto in order to prevent the Chair's draft factual summary from being mentioned in the final report. Moreover, since the document was a conference room paper, it would not be published on the website of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs; only paper copies of the document would remain. That set a truly bad precedent. While his delegation would have hoped for the Chair's draft factual summary to be issued as a working paper, it fully understood and respected that it was the Chair's prerogative to decide which working papers to submit.

31. **Mr. Duffy** (Ireland) said that, while his delegation welcomed the submission by the Chair of a working paper that reflected many of the elements of the rich discussion held in the working group, it regretted that the Chair's draft factual summary would not be issued. His delegation would work with others to ensure that the relevant issues remained at the forefront of the Preparatory Committee's work.

32. **Mr. Siegfried** (Germany) said that while his delegation had agreed to be led by the Chair on the matter of the draft factual summary, it concurred with the views expressed in support of past practice. Under many, if not all, multilateral frameworks, Chairs had the authority to issue reflections and draft factual reports, under their own authority, as conference room papers and working papers. Fortunately, the harmful incident in

which the Chair's prerogative had effectively been called into question did not set a precedent.

33. His delegation welcomed the fact that the Chair's forward-looking reflections were referred to in the report of the Preparatory Committee on the work of its first session. Lastly, his delegation reaffirmed the need for further work to strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty and its review cycle so as to ensure continuity, efficiency, transparency and accountability. The Chair's reflections were very much in line with that endeavour.

34. **Mr. Gallhofer** (Austria) said that the useful discussions in the working group had demonstrated the enthusiasm of participants for making the Non-Proliferation Treaty more effective, bringing it into the twenty-first century and trying to break the pattern of failing to achieve results in review cycles. The current and previous meetings had, unfortunately, underlined the need for progress in that regard. The censorship of working papers was unacceptable and did not set a precedent. While his delegation had supported the Chair by following his guidance on the matter of his draft factual summary, it stressed that Chairs had the right to issue their reflections and takeaways under their own responsibility and considered that no one should be able to challenge that authority.

35. **Mr. Biggs** (Australia) said that his delegation regretted the way in which the session had ended. Multilateral practice was important for making progress on issues that mattered to the world, and it was regrettable that some colleagues had been flippant about the future of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the implementation of which was vital for the future of humanity. His delegation respected, and urged others to respect, the right of the Chair and of any organization to record its business. In the case of the Treaty review process, that included keeping an honest record of the proceedings of a common project to which all States parties were committed.

#### Closure of the session

36. **The Chair** said that the key takeaway from the current session, all States parties had demonstrated a strong commitment to the full implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It was clear that there were diverging views and priorities concerning not only the implementation of the Treaty but also how to conduct the review cycle and what issues should be addressed. Many States parties had questioned whether the failure to achieve a tangible outcome at a third consecutive review conference would affect the credibility of the Treaty among the States parties and more widely. That concern had to be taken seriously. In the interest of all

States parties, the Preparatory Committee must do its utmost to reach an agreed outcome that was substantive and capable of strengthening the Treaty and its implementation.

37. It was clear that one of the dividing lines in the Committee was the pace of nuclear disarmament. That issue needed to be addressed in a serious manner so as to achieve tangible progress. While all States parties supported disarmament, progress had been hindered by other issues. Several references had been made to the very difficult current international security environment. It was appropriate for events taking place in the world to be reflected in meetings of the Committee. However, he hoped that the work being done in the meetings would have a real impact on the world, bearing in mind that the ultimate goal of the review process was not the achievement of small diplomatic wins in negotiations but rather the achievement of a better, more peaceful world, which would lead to nuclear disarmament. All States parties could contribute to that end, including by examining their own efforts to promote cooperation at the global level. The five nuclear-weapon States, which were also permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, had a special responsibility to improve the global security environment through their own actions and by working with all States parties and States Members of the United Nations.

38. Another issue to which many delegations had referred was the further strengthening of the review process. The current session had been very interactive, with substantive issues raised. He hoped that such efforts would continue during the remainder of the review cycle and that tangible results could be achieved at the 2026 Review Conference. While it had not gone as smoothly as he had hoped, the current session had successfully laid the groundwork for the next session of the Preparatory Committee. States parties had identified their priorities and expressed their concerns and aspirations, and it had become very clear which matters would dominate the discussions and work ahead.

39. *After an exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the first session of the Preparatory Committee closed.*

*The meeting rose at 4 p.m.*