

## **Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative**

**Third session of NPT Preparatory Committee, New York, 29 April –  
10 May 2019**

**Joint statement for delivery by the Netherlands on behalf of 48 states:  
Albania, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile,  
Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark,  
Estonia, Finland, Germany, Guatemala, Greece, Hungary, Iceland,  
Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi,  
Mexico, the Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, North Macedonia,  
Peru, Portugal, the Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania,  
Singapore, Slovenia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey  
Uruguay, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great  
Britain and Northern Ireland**

### **Proposing a recommendation on further strengthening the NPT Review Process**

Chair,

On behalf of 48 states, I would like to propose that this session of the Preparatory Committee make a recommendation on the further strengthening of the NPT review process.

In doing so, I speak on behalf of: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Guatemala, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, North Macedonia, Peru, Portugal, the Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Singapore, Slovenia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and my own country the Netherlands.

#### *Need for further strengthening of review process*

As we continue our efforts to strengthen the NPT, States parties must also consider the means by which important substantive issues are addressed, and the working methods employed in the Review process. In general, the review process established at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference

has assisted major achievements across all three NPT pillars. There is, however, scope for improvement. Improving the effectiveness of the review process is an ongoing responsibility of States parties.

Our working methods are largely a result of our own practice and decisions. It is up to us, the NPT state parties, to decide whether existing working methods still work for us, and to identify their strengths and weaknesses, 25 years after the adoption of the 1995 decision. We should ask ourselves how the Treaty's working methods could facilitate further substantive progress. Some long-standing practices can be updated to build towards the success of each Review Conference and of the Treaty's implementation overall.

The goal of further strengthening the review process should not be dismissed as merely procedural. Reviewing our working methods could facilitate substantive, transparent and inclusive dialogue, thus contributing to efficient work and to the effective implementation of the NPT.

We therefore propose that the Preparatory Committee recommends allocating time to have such a discussion at the 2020 NPT Review Conference, building on the welcome interest in this topic at the previous sessions of the PrepCom, at regional seminars conducted by PrepCom Chairs, and at several meetings in recent years, including with experts in the field.

During these discussions, the Review Conference could adopt recommendations designed to ensure that NPT meetings truly strengthen the NPT by contributing to its credibility.

Chair,

Action to strengthen the review process is no substitute for making progress on substantive outcomes. Such progress rightly remains the first and foremost concern of the NPT review cycle. But if our procedural house is not in order we will hamper our ability to maximise opportunities for substantive progress.

We hope all NPT States parties will support the proposed recommendation and look forward to continuing to engage constructively with all States parties on this important issue.

Thank you.