



Permanent Mission of Italy to
the Conference on Disarmament
Geneva

Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)

11th Review Conference of the Parties

New York, 27 April – 22 May 2026

Informal consultations on the strengthening of the Review Process

18 May 2026

Co-Chairs,

At the outset, I would like to thank you for guiding this open-ended consultation process and for your efforts to move us closer to consensus on a topic that represents a potentially important deliverable of this review process. Transparency is, in fact, a core principle of the NPT, and ensuring accountability for the implementation of Treaty obligations and additional commitments remains crucial to building collective confidence in both the Treaty and its implementation by all States Parties.

On p. 88, we support putting into practice strict time management and conducting proceedings on a rolling basis. We also support the need to reduce duplication and overlap, and to ensure the clear allocation of items to Main Committees and topics to Subsidiary Bodies, should they be established.

On p. 89, we welcome the early election of office-bearers of the Preparatory Committee and Review Conference, as well as regular exchanges between them across the cycle—

elements that could greatly strengthen both coordination and continuity in the review process.

On p. 92, we welcome the language on the commitment by all nuclear-weapon States to present their national reports in a standard reporting form and to organise a structured, in-person and interactive discussions and exchange of views. In our view these discussions should take place in an interactive format that allows for questions to be raised and clarifications to be sought regarding the content of national reports. We would also welcome slightly more ambitious language that encourages nuclear weapon States to provide forward-looking elements on the implementation of Article VI obligations. [Placeholder]

With regard to timelines, addressed in p. 92 bis, our preference is for those already recommended in the working paper by the Chair of the Working Group on the strengthening of the review process, namely that national reports be submitted three months before the relevant meeting and that questions to nuclear weapon States be submitted one month in advance. Successful implementation would require extensive preparation, including agreement on procedural modalities, the possible provision of enhanced resources for UNODA, and strong engagement from all nuclear weapon States.

Co-Chairs,

We cannot support the significant amendments inserted in p. 93. We believe these amendments, first and foremost, do not reflect previously agreed language . Language from Action 5 of the Action Plan, relating to commitments by nuclear weapon States, is now applied to non-nuclear weapon States. We considered your previous proposal a good starting point for this discussion, and would have suggested enhancing the voluntary nature of the reporting and the regional basis as the only applicable criterion. In that case, we would have also welcomed the proposal by Denmark, supported by others, to add a new paragraph recalling the distinction between the only two categories existing under the Treaty, nuclear weapon States and non-nuclear weapon

States, and noting that each category has its own distinct set of reporting requirements in accordance with the decisions of 1995, 2000, and 2010. We stand ready to further engage in the discussion, while rejecting any attempts to rewrite the Treaty.

Thank you, Chair.