



NEW ZEALAND

**PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE 2010 REVIEW CONFERENCE OF
THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF
NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

WITHDRAWAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

**STATEMENT BY H.E. JENNIFER MACMILLAN
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS IN VIENNA**

6 May 2008

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

Mr Chairman

Withdrawal constitutes one of the most fundamental challenges to the Treaty. Indeed, it is the antithesis of universalisation, one of the Treaty's central objectives. States Parties need to agree on measures to respond to any notification of withdrawal as a matter of priority.

New Zealand and Australia submitted a joint working paper to the 2005 Review Conference (NPT.CONF.2005/WP.16) which identified a series of relevant issues to be considered in the case of withdrawal. Key recommendations in this paper included:

- That any notice of withdrawal should prompt immediate verification of the State's compliance with the Treaty, if necessary mandated by the Security Council;
- That provision might be made to convene an extraordinary meeting of NPT States parties; and
- That nuclear materials, equipment, and technology acquired by a State on the basis that they would be used for peaceful purposes would remain subject to peaceful use obligations even if a State withdraws from the Treaty.

There was considerable work done on the issue of withdrawal at the 2005 Review Conference, in line with the recommendations I have just outlined, and it was one of the areas where States Parties came close to agreeing some concrete outcomes. A number of working papers addressing the issue of withdrawal have also been tabled during the first and second PrepCom of this review cycle, illustrating the increasing impetus for greater clarity on how States Parties should collectively respond to any withdrawal notification. States Parties should aim for a common approach building on the work done thus far,

so that we are in a position to put in place agreed understandings on the issue of withdrawal at the 2010 Review Conference.

Mr Chairman,

My delegation also attaches importance to the issue of institutional reform, and would like to address it briefly under this item. We acknowledge that reforms to the way in which the Treaty functions are a sensitive issue for some States, but would suggest that there are improvements that might be pursued in the short-term in accordance with the objectives of the strengthened review process.

In this respect, we would support the establishment of a cross-regional bureau to assist the Chair at each meeting of the NPT, rather than just at Review Conferences. We would also support further discussion on whether there is scope to move from a preparatory process to an annual meetings process, so that decisions of the Treaty can be taken each year, and do not have to wait for the five-yearly review conference.