

---

# Preparatory Committee for the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

11 May 2007

Original: English

---

## First session

Vienna, 30 April-11 May 2007

### Chairman's working paper

1. States parties<sup>1</sup> reaffirmed that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was the cornerstone of the global non-proliferation regime and the essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament. In the face of grave challenges to the non-proliferation regime, preserving and strengthening the Treaty was vital to international peace and security. States parties stressed the importance of the first session of the preparatory committee for laying a solid foundation for a successful new review cycle.

2. States parties reaffirmed that the Treaty rested on three pillars: nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The importance of balanced, full and non-selective application and implementation of the Treaty was stressed. Emphasis was placed on the mutually reinforcing nature of disarmament and non-proliferation.

3. States parties reiterated their commitment to the effective implementation of the objectives of the Treaty, the decisions and resolution of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference adopted without a vote, and the final document of the 2000 Review Conference, adopted by consensus. It was also noted that the current situation should be borne in mind.

4. States parties expressed that multilateralism and mutually agreed solutions, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, provided the only sustainable method of dealing with the multiplicity of disarmament and international security issues. States parties also expressed that multilateralism based on the concept of shared commitments and obligations provided the best way to maintain international order.

5. States parties expressed concern over the possibility that non-State actors could gain access to weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. The gravity of the dangers of weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of terrorists further reinforced the need to strengthen the Treaty and its implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Any reference to "States parties" in the present summary is not intended to imply unanimity among States parties.



6. States parties further stressed that continued support to achieve universality of the Treaty remained essential. Concern was expressed about the lack of achievement in universality. States parties called upon States outside the Treaty to accede to the Treaty as non-nuclear-weapon States, promptly and without condition. They were also called upon to bring into force the required comprehensive safeguards agreements, together with additional protocols, for ensuring nuclear non-proliferation, and to reverse clearly and urgently any policies to pursue any nuclear weapons development, testing or deployment, and to refrain from any action that could undermine regional and international peace and security and the international community's efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear weapons proliferation. States parties called upon India and Pakistan to maintain moratoriums on testing, and called upon India, Israel and Pakistan to become party to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

7. States parties continued to attach great importance to achieving compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The importance of compliance by all States parties with all the provisions of the Treaty was stressed. The view was expressed that non-compliance with the Treaty's provisions by States parties to the Treaty could undermine non-proliferation, disarmament, universality and peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

8. States parties remained committed to implementing article VI of the Treaty. The full implementation of the 13 practical steps including the unequivocal undertaking contained in the final document of the 2000 Review Conference was called for. While recent moves towards nuclear disarmament were recognized, concern continued to be expressed over the slow pace of progress made in implementing the steps.

9. States parties stated that the total elimination of nuclear weapons was the only absolute guarantee against their use or threat of use. Concern was expressed that, despite the intentions of and past achievements in bilateral and unilateral reductions, the total number of nuclear weapons deployed and stockpiled still amounted to thousands. It was stressed that the indefinite extension of the NPT did not imply the indefinite possession of nuclear arsenals.

10. The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice regarding the obligations of nuclear-weapon States was recalled and support was voiced for the development of a nuclear weapons convention. A subsidiary body dealing with nuclear disarmament at the 2010 Review Conference was sought.

11. States parties also attached significance to reducing the deployed status of nuclear weapons through de-alerting, to reducing reliance on nuclear weapons and to securing greater information from nuclear-weapon States on the active and reserve status of nuclear arsenals.

12. Concern and disappointment were voiced about plans to replace or modernize nuclear weapons and their means of delivery or platforms, the increased role of nuclear weapons in strategic and military doctrines, and the possibility of lowering the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons. In response to concerns addressed to the United States and the United Kingdom, they provided their clarifications and explanations on their efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament. Concern was also expressed about nuclear cooperation with States not party to the NPT, and calls were made for adherence to obligations under the Treaty.

13. Nuclear-weapon States reiterated their commitment to nuclear disarmament under article VI of the Treaty. A number of them delivered presentations, in particular with concrete figures, to other States parties of their respective measures taken in accordance with article VI of the Treaty, underscoring reductions of nuclear weapons arsenals, reduced reliance on nuclear weapons, reductions in their status of alert and an accelerated programme of dismantlement.

14. In that regard, the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions (the Moscow Treaty) was acknowledged as a positive trend towards nuclear disarmament. While noting those achievements and presentations, States parties called for further reductions beyond those required by the Moscow Treaty and stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status could not be a substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons. States parties noted that START I and the Moscow Treaty were due to expire in 2009 and 2012 respectively, and called for bilateral follow-up agreements. It was stressed that the principles of irreversibility, verifiability and transparency should guide all nuclear disarmament measures. The need to create an environment conducive to nuclear disarmament was noted.

15. Increased transparency with regard to nuclear weapons capabilities as a voluntary confidence-building measure was strongly advocated. Nuclear-weapon States were called upon to increase transparency and accountability, such as through annual briefings, with regard to their nuclear weapons arsenals, implementation of disarmament measures and security doctrines. An additional idea suggested was the compilation by the secretariat of a comparative table recording measures undertaken by nuclear-weapon States in complying with their obligations under article VI, for tabling at the 2010 Review Conference.

16. Reporting by all States parties on the implementation of article VI was encouraged. It was noted that this would promote increased confidence in the overall Treaty regime through increasing transparency, and at the same time would help address compliance concerns.

17. States parties welcomed the impetus that had developed in the Conference on Disarmament in 2006 under the six Presidents for that year and that had continued under their successors in 2007. It was emphasized that the Conference should agree on the proposal tabled on 23 March by the six Presidents for 2007.

18. Strong support was expressed for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. The importance and urgency of its early entry into force was underscored. States that had not ratified the Treaty, especially the remaining 10 States whose ratification was necessary for its entry into force, were urged to do so without delay and without conditions. It was stressed that the testing of a nuclear weapon by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea highlighted the need for an early entry into force of the Treaty. States parties reaffirmed the importance of maintaining a moratorium on nuclear-weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions. States parties noted the progress made by the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization in establishing the international monitoring system.

19. The termination of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the development of missile defence systems drew concern as adversely affecting strategic stability and having negative consequences on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

Concern was also expressed about the risk of a new arms race on Earth and in outer space.

20. States parties stressed the importance of further reductions in non-strategic nuclear weapons in a transparent, accountable, verifiable and irreversible manner, based on unilateral initiatives and as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process, for example through the Presidential Nuclear Initiatives of 1991 and 1992 by the United States and the Russian Federation. There were calls for the formalization of those initiatives. The need to deny terrorists access to non-strategic nuclear weapons was also noted.

21. The importance of the immediate commencement of negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices was stressed as a logical step in the process of nuclear disarmament. Calls were made to address the verifiability of such an instrument and the need for coverage of existing stocks. The hope was expressed that such a treaty might be concluded prior to the 2010 Review Conference. States that had not yet done so were called upon to declare moratoriums on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

22. Stress was put on the importance of arrangements by all nuclear-weapon States to place, as soon as practicable, fissile material designated by each of them as no longer required for military purposes under the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or other relevant international verification, and on arrangements for the disposition of such material for peaceful purposes. Some nuclear-weapon States reported on the actions they had taken in that regard. In that context, the Trilateral Initiative was regarded as an important measure. The ongoing efforts of nuclear-weapon States to convert excess highly enriched uranium for civilian use was commended and encouraged.

23. States parties recognized the importance of the Group of Eight Global Partnership as a positive contribution towards cooperation in reducing threats from all weapons of mass destruction through practical initiatives.

24. The importance of education on disarmament and non-proliferation to strengthen the disarmament and non-proliferation regime for future generations was stressed. In that regard, States parties were encouraged to make efforts based on the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General on disarmament and non-proliferation education (A/57/124). Steps and means as well as new initiatives to implement the recommendations were introduced at the meeting.

25. States parties noted that, pending the elimination of nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapon States should provide security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States that they would not use nuclear weapons against them. It was expressed that security assurances could play an important role in the NPT regime and serve as an incentive to forgo the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. It was also expressed that security assurances could serve as an incentive to achieve universality. It was recalled that both the 1995 Review and Extension Conference and the 2000 Review Conference had underscored the importance of security assurances. It was further recalled that the final document of the 2000 Review Conference called upon the Preparatory Committee to make recommendations to the 2005 Review Conference on security assurances. It was emphasized that the need for negative security assurances, a key basis of the 1995 extension decision, remained essential and

should be reaffirmed. Reaffirmations were expressed of commitments under Security Council resolution 984 (1995). Some States parties, including one nuclear-weapon State, emphasized the importance of a no-first-use policy.

26. States parties stressed that efforts to conclude a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States should be pursued as a matter of priority, without prejudice to legally binding security assurances already given in respect of nuclear-weapon-free zones. In that regard, references were made to pursuing a protocol to the NPT and to the prospect of substantive discussions envisaged by the current draft decision put forward by the six Presidents of the Conference on Disarmament. Pending the conclusion of any new instrument, nuclear-weapon States were called upon to honour their respective commitments under Security Council resolution 984 (1995). Concern was expressed that recent developments in respect of nuclear doctrines might undermine those commitments. The eligibility of a State party to security assurances in circumstances where such a party was not in good standing under, or had withdrawn from, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was regarded as warranting discussion. The need for a subsidiary body on security assurances at the 2010 Review Conference was urged.

27. It was stressed that the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons was a fundamental goal of the Treaty. Concern was expressed that serious proliferation events strained the NPT regime by eroding confidence in the compliance of all States parties with their obligations under the Treaty. States parties reaffirmed that IAEA was the competent authority responsible for verifying and assuring, in accordance with the statute of the Agency and the IAEA safeguards system, compliance with its safeguards agreements with States parties undertaken in fulfilment of their obligations under article III, paragraph 1 of the Treaty, with a view to preventing the diversion of nuclear energy from peaceful uses to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. States parties underlined the need for strengthening the role of IAEA and reaffirmed that nothing should be done to undermine the authority of IAEA in verifying non-diversion. States parties noted the need for effectively addressing violations of safeguards obligations in order to uphold the integrity of the Treaty.

28. States parties congratulated IAEA on its fiftieth anniversary and welcomed the efforts of the Agency in strengthening safeguards and its completion of the conceptual framework for integrated safeguards, as well as the steps taken towards their application. States parties stressed the importance of IAEA safeguards as a fundamental pillar of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and commended the important work of IAEA in implementing safeguards to verify compliance with the non-proliferation obligations of the Treaty. The IAEA safeguards thereby promoted further confidence among States, helped to strengthen their collective security and played a key role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices. States parties expressed the need to strive towards the universalization and strengthening of the IAEA safeguards system. While welcoming the recent entry into force of comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols with a number of States parties, concern was expressed that some 30 States parties had yet to bring into force safeguards agreements, as required by Article III, and that only 80 had additional protocols in force. States that had not yet concluded comprehensive safeguards agreements with IAEA were called upon to do so without further delay.

29. The importance of the model additional protocol as an essential and indispensable tool for effective functioning of the IAEA safeguards system was underlined. It was stressed that States parties must have both a comprehensive safeguards agreement and an additional protocol in place for IAEA to be able to provide credible assurance of both the non-diversion of declared material and the absence of undeclared nuclear material or activities in the States concerned.

30. States parties reaffirmed the need for the model additional protocol to be universalized, and noted that further efforts in promoting that goal were needed to increase confidence in the compliance by States parties with their non-proliferation obligations. States parties that had not yet concluded additional protocols were called upon to do so as soon as possible. It was also stated that efforts to achieve universal application of the model additional protocol should not hamper efforts towards achieving universality of comprehensive safeguards agreements. Views were expressed that the strengthened safeguards system — a comprehensive safeguards agreement coupled with the Additional Protocol — constituted the Non-Proliferation Treaty's verification standard, and that this standard could be used as a precondition for new supply arrangements. In that regard, views were also expressed that concluding an additional protocol should remain voluntary. New arrangements on the Small Quantities Protocols agreed in 2005 at IAEA were welcomed and considered an important step in the process of strengthening safeguards; all concerned States were called upon to adopt that new standard.

31. It was reiterated that export controls were a key element of the non-proliferation regime under the Treaty. States parties underlined that effective export controls, together with comprehensive safeguards, were recognized as forming an integral part of the non-proliferation regime and would facilitate peaceful nuclear cooperation. The important role played by the international export control framework for nuclear-related materials and technologies, namely the Zangger Committee and the Nuclear Suppliers Group, were noted, in particular their utility in guiding States in setting up their national export control policies.

32. Support was expressed for the concept of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among States in the regions concerned and on the basis of established United Nations guidelines. The contribution of such zones to enhancing global and regional peace and security, including the cause of global nuclear non-proliferation, was emphasized. It was noted that the number of States covered by the nuclear-weapon-free zones exceeded 105. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba was considered a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The importance of the entry into force of all those nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties was stressed. Nuclear-weapon States were called upon to provide security assurances to nuclear-weapon-free zones by signing and ratifying protocols to those treaties.

33. Continuing and increased cooperation among the parties of the zones was encouraged, as was the development of a nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere. The fortieth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Tlatelolco was recognized. States parties welcomed the conclusion of the Central Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty. The need for further consultations among concerned countries in accordance with the 1999 United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines to resolve outstanding issues was expressed. Support for nuclear-weapon-free status of

Mongolia was reiterated. States parties underlined the importance of establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones, especially in the Middle East and South Asia.

34. States parties reaffirmed the importance of the resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, and recognized that the resolution remained valid until its goals and objectives were achieved. The resolution was both an essential element of the outcome of the 1995 Conference and an essential part of the basis on which the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons had been indefinitely extended without a vote in 1995. States parties reiterated their support for the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons as well as other weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. Strong concern was voiced at the lack of measurable implementation of the resolution. Renewed, action-oriented determination to implement the resolution was urged. States parties affirmed the importance of establishing practical mechanisms within the Non-Proliferation Treaty review process to promote the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, particularly through reporting to the Secretary-General on the steps that they had taken to promote the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and the realization of the goals and objectives of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East. A subsidiary body within Main Committee II of the 2010 Review Conference was sought, together with the establishment of a standing committee of the members of the bureau of that conference to report to the 2015 Review Conference. Support was also expressed for the arrangements to convene a forum requested at the forty-fourth IAEA General Conference with a view to facilitating a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, as well as the ongoing efforts under the 1995 Barcelona Declaration.

35. States parties noted that all States of the region of the Middle East, with the exception of Israel, were States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Great concern was expressed regarding the nuclear capability of Israel. States parties called upon Israel to accede to the Treaty as soon as possible as a non-nuclear-weapon State and to place its nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards.

36. The importance of the creation of an environment conducive for implementation of the resolution was underlined. The continued possession of nuclear weapons or ambitions to possess such weapons by States in the region was seen as an impediment to aspirations for the Middle East to become a nuclear-weapon-free zone. States parties welcomed the voluntary decisions by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to abandon its programmes for developing weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, as well as its ratification of the Additional Protocol. More generally, States parties also expressed full support for taking forward the Middle East peace process. It was also noted that a solution to the Iranian issue would contribute to the objective of establishing a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons as well as other weapons of mass destruction.

37. Serious concern was expressed over the nuclear programme of Iran (Islamic Republic of), which was strongly urged to comply with all the requirements in Security Council resolutions 1737 (2006) and 1747 (2007) and the relevant resolutions of the IAEA Board of Governors without further delay. It was noted that these multiple unanimous Council resolutions on that country's nuclear programme demonstrated the resolve of the international community on that issue. States parties believed that the issue should be resolved peacefully through diplomatic efforts and

negotiations. For its part, Iran (Islamic Republic of) indicated its readiness, provided the Security Council disengaged, to resolve issues in the framework of IAEA.

38. States parties expressed grave concern over the nuclear programme of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and its announcement of a nuclear test in October 2006, which represented not only a clear threat to international security but also a serious challenge to the nuclear non-proliferation regime. They urged that country to comply with Security Council resolutions 1695 (2006) and 1718 (2006) and the joint statement of September 2005, abandoning all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programmes as well as ballistic missiles programmes in a complete, verifiable and irreversible manner, returning promptly to compliance with the obligations under the NPT and the IAEA safeguards agreement. States parties stressed the importance of achieving the goal of the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula. They underlined the need for a peaceful solution of this issue and welcomed the diplomatic efforts undertaken in the framework of the six-party talks. They welcomed the agreement reached on 13 February 2007 regarding initial actions towards the implementation of the joint statement, and called on the parties to faithfully and expeditiously implement the agreement.

39. States parties reaffirmed the inalienable right under article IV of all States to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, without discrimination and in conformity with articles I, II and III of the Treaty. It was noted that, as part of the fundamental bargain, nothing in the NPT should be interpreted as affecting that right. It was stressed that participating in and facilitating the exchange of nuclear technology for peaceful uses must be consistent with the Treaty's non-proliferation obligations.

40. In view of climate change and the growing demand for nuclear energy and sustainable development, a call was also made to fully ensure the free, unimpeded and non-discriminatory transfer of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Concern was expressed about the potential effect on the right to peaceful uses of nuclear energy, particularly in the context of strengthening the non-proliferation regime. It was reiterated that additional restrictions should not be applied to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, especially in developing countries or for political purposes.

41. In that context, States parties emphasized the value and importance of the IAEA technical cooperation programme, underlining that technical cooperation played an important role in further developing the application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Appreciation was expressed for the assistance rendered, particularly for developing countries through the programme. It was stressed that States parties ensured the programme remained firm and sustainable through adequate resources. It was also stressed that full compliance with articles I, II and III of the Treaty was the basic condition for benefiting from article IV. Concern was expressed that the programme could be used as a political tool. Attention was drawn to the significance of developing proliferation-resistant nuclear technologies. States parties acknowledged the wide application of nuclear technology for areas in health, industry, agriculture and environmental protection.

42. The importance of strengthening nuclear safety, radiation protection, the safety of radioactive-waste management and the safe transport of nuclear and radioactive-materials, including maritime transport, was stressed. The need for maintaining the highest standards of safety at civilian nuclear installations through national



measures and international cooperation was also emphasized. The role of IAEA in the promotion of safety in all its aspects was underlined and it was noted that further efforts were needed in that regard. States parties that had not yet done so were called on to accede to all relevant conventions on nuclear safety, safe waste management and physical protection of nuclear material and the IAEA Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources. States parties supported efforts to enhance the security of existing stockpiles of highly enriched uranium, while minimizing its use in the civilian nuclear sector. The importance of maintaining dialogue on facilitating safe maritime transport of radioactive material was stressed.

43. States parties noted the importance of combating nuclear terrorism and strongly supported existing IAEA initiatives in that regard. The IAEA action plan on protection against nuclear terrorism was widely noted and supported. States parties called for full implementation of Security Council resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006) and noted the adoption of the convention against nuclear terrorism as well as other initiatives, including the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. The Agency's work in support of States' efforts to prevent the illicit trafficking of nuclear and other radioactive material was also commended. In that context, States noted the new proliferation threat posed by clandestine networks for the supply of nuclear goods and technologies. It was emphasized that only through proactive and full cooperation and assistance to IAEA could those threats be curbed. States parties stressed the importance of contributions to the Nuclear Security Fund of IAEA. States expressed support for measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and related material and welcomed the principles of the Group of Eight in that regard.

44. States parties urged the strengthening of the physical protection of nuclear material and facilities as an element of the non-proliferation regime that should be emphasized, particularly in the light of the heightened risk of nuclear terrorism. They welcomed the amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and urged States that had not yet done so to accede to the amended convention. All States were urged to implement the IAEA Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources.

45. States parties emphasized the need to increase international cooperation in respect of the promotion of multilateralism in the nuclear fuel cycle and the supply of nuclear fuel. The ongoing and forthcoming discussions at IAEA on fuel supply assurance mechanisms were noted, and some States parties made reference to the various proposals submitted on that subject, expressing their willingness to participate in and contribute to such discussions. It was stressed that such proposals should be addressed in a multilaterally negotiated, comprehensive and non-discriminatory manner under the auspices of IAEA, without restrictions on access to nuclear material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes. The need to ensure participation by States in full compliance with their safeguards obligations was also stressed. Some States expressed the hope that the NPT review process would encourage further progress. It was noted that a balanced multilateral mechanism could significantly contribute to confidence-building in the field of non-proliferation and to peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Some States noted that multilateralization of the fuel cycle should not deny States parties' choices regarding the development of national fuel cycles.

46. States parties were reminded about discussions held at the 2005 Review Conference on the need for disincentives on and response to withdrawal from the Treaty. While reaffirming the sovereign right of each State party to withdraw from the NPT as provided for in article X (1), it was noted that article X envisaged that withdrawal would be exercised only in the face of extraordinary events. Importance was attached to the need for any withdrawal to be made in a manner consistent with the purposes and objectives of the Treaty and that its consequences would be subject to international scrutiny.

47. Views were expressed that a State that withdraws from the NPT should not be able to benefit from nuclear materials, equipment and technology acquired while party to the Treaty. It was emphasized that, under international law, a withdrawing party was liable for breaches of the Treaty that occurred prior to withdrawal. It was also stressed that nuclear material, equipment and technology acquired by States for peaceful purposes prior to withdrawal must remain subject to peaceful uses under IAEA safeguards.

48. The need was noted for States parties to undertake consultations and conduct every diplomatic effort, including on a regional basis, to encourage a party to reconsider its sovereign position to withdraw. Given the particular circumstances envisaged in article X for the exercise of the right to withdraw, the role of the Security Council as provided for in that article was also underlined.

49. The need to strengthen the Treaty and its review process was expressed. Institutional improvements suggested included annual or extraordinary meetings of States parties, a small standing bureau or standing committee, and an enhanced secretariat.

50. There was an exchange of views on rotation among regional groupings of the chairpersonship of the preparatory committees and the review conferences for future cycles.

51. States parties emphasized the value of the involvement and contribution of civil society in the process of Treaty review. Substantive proposals were made for the enhanced participation of non-governmental organizations.

---