

NPT PrepCom Report # 4
Debbie Grisdale, Executive Director
Physicians for Global Survival (Canada)

May 3-5, 2004

On Tuesday afternoon, after countries had an opportunity to finish the last of the “special time” sessions which was on “Safety and Security of Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Programs”, the Chair announced the program for the remainder of the week. The product of the Prepcom will be a Report of the meeting (on procedural issues, provisional agenda for the 2005 Review Conference, Draft Rules of Procedure, etc) and an annex to it that contains the Chair’s Factual Summary. After discussing the procedural issues in plenary on Wednesday morning, countries would have a chance on Wednesday afternoon to meet with the Chair and Vice-Chairs individually to “provide their views” on what should be in the Factual Summary. The draft Report with the procedural aspects would be available on Thursday morning and the draft of the Factual Summary on Friday morning. This was announced by the Chair, but no written overview of this timetable was provided and many countries remained confused about the plan. Even one of the Vice Chairs admitted after in a smaller meeting that she was not exactly sure what was in the Chair’s mind.

On Wednesday morning, discussion on the provisional agenda for the 2005 Review Conference (which is essentially the 2000 Review Conference’s agenda) hit a snag when Canada proposed that the review should take into account not only the decision taken at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference but also “the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference”. Sounds reasonable - the 13 Steps, a very important achievement, came out of the 2000 RevCon. Canada proposed it simply as a technical adjustment; an update to the agenda, not a substantive change. There followed a lengthy discussion in the plenary, with many countries supporting Canada but the U.S. in particular unable to see any value in adding 2000, another hour in a smaller group, a third session in the afternoon and still there is no agreement. Discussions on this “technical” and definitely “not political” point begin again today. These smaller group sessions are chaired by Canada’s Ambassador Paul Meyer, doing an admirable job. Most of the countries support Canada’s suggestion except the U.S., Russia and the U.K.. The UK suggested adding the phrase “where appropriate”, until it was pointed out that this was “cherry-picking”. Discussion continues this morning.

The NGOs have daily briefings at 9 a.m. by various delegations and delegates. Yesterday I met with NGOs to talk about being “An NGO on the Canadian Delegation”. A number of NGOs are interested in knowing the background on the Canadian situation.