

**Statement by Ambassador ICHIKAWA Tomiko,
Permanent Representative of Japan to the Conference on Disarmament**

**Third Session of the Preparatory Committee
for the 2026 NPT Review Conference
- Cluster 3 Specific issue –
7 May 2025, New York**

Mr. Chair,

I would like to start by highlighting the importance of deciding on concrete measures to strengthen the review process at the next Review Conference, building upon the discussions during this review cycle. In this context, my delegation highly appreciates your leadership in emphasizing this issue, including the Draft Decision on Strengthening the Review Process.

(General)

Mr. Chair,


Japan has been proposing the following procedural measures to strengthen the review process to be decided on at the next Review Conference, all of which are already reflected in the Draft Decision:

- (a) The third Preparatory Committee should adopt a draft decision on the topics of the main committees and the subsidiary bodies for the Review Conference.*
- (b) The chairs of the main committees and the subsidiary bodies should be nominated at the third session of the Preparatory Committee.*
- (c) Subsidiary bodies should focus on specific issues that require in-depth discussion to avoid overlap with the work of main committees.*
- (d) The President of the Review Conference should circulate a draft final outcome document at the end of the second week of the Review Conference.*
- (e) The President-designate of the Review Conference should commence their work upon the conclusion of the third Preparatory Committee, with the chairs of the Preparatory Committee sessions, as a “President’s bureau”.*

(Specifics)

Mr. Chair,

In the context of strengthening the review process, Japan attaches great importance to enhancing transparency and accountability. To improve transparency and accountability, the NPDI, of which Japan is a member, submitted



a working paper on transparency and accountability, including proposals of concrete measures to be decided on at the next Review Conference. I would like to highlight its main points.

The first point concerns the reporting process. The NPDI proposes that the Conference decide to implement the following measures:

- (a) Each nuclear-weapon State presents reports twice in every review cycle, both to the second Preparatory Committee and to the Review Conference;*
- (b) The second Preparatory Committee allocates time under cluster 1 and the Review Conference allocates time in Main Committee I, to hold interactive discussions on the reports by all nuclear-weapon States.*


In this context, Japan welcomes the submission of draft national reports by France and the United Kingdom this year and the interactive discussions held at the side events on these reports in the margins of this meeting.

The second point relates to the content of the reports. The NPDI proposes that *the Conference should call upon the nuclear-weapon States to include comparable and numerical information in their reports, without prejudice to national security. Such information should include, among others: the number, types and status of nuclear warheads; the number and types of delivery vehicles; the number and types of dismantled and reduced weapons and delivery systems; the amount of fissile material produced for military purposes; as well as the measures taken to diminish the role and significance of nuclear weapons in military and security concepts, doctrines and policies.*

Mr. Chair,

Japan appreciates the elements related to the discussion on the national reports of the nuclear-weapon States, which are included in the Draft Decision prepared by the Chair. Japan is of the view that we should advance our discussion on this issue by focusing on the national reports of the nuclear-weapon States, and not on those of non-nuclear-weapon States. We believe that it is important to continue this discussion from this perspective with a view to adopting a decision in the Review Conference next year.

In this regard, I would also like to refer to the point made by Australia. I would also like to echo the comments by several delegations on the importance of civil society.



DELEGATION OF JAPAN
TO THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

Japan hopes that the above-mentioned comments will be taken into account in the further revision of the Draft Decision on Strengthening Review Process.

Mr. Chair,

Finally, allow me to address the issue of withdrawal. Article X of the NPT provides States Parties with the right to withdraw from the Treaty. However, if a State Party withdraws from the Treaty after acquiring nuclear weapons or nuclear capabilities when it is under an obligation not to do so, it would have an enormous impact on the credibility and integrity of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime based on the NPT. Japan emphasizes that notice of withdrawal should not and cannot acquit any State Party of any illicit acquisition of its nuclear capabilities.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

(END)