



Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) Database

25 November 2004 Board of Governors Meeting

25 November 2004 Meeting: GOV/OR.1111; GOV/OR.1112; GOV/OR.1115	
NWFZ	
NWFZ in the Middle East	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (GOV/OR.1111 – Para 92) ...expressed support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all WMDs and reaffirmed the need for a NWFZ in that region in accordance with the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. He called on all the parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, called on Israel, as the only country in the region that had not joined the NPT or declared its intention of doing so, to renounce the possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to the NPT without delay, promptly to place all its nuclear facilities under Agency full-scope safeguards and to conduct its nuclear-related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime.
Country Specific	
Israel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (GOV/OR.1111 – Para 92) ...expressed support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all WMDs and reaffirmed the need for a NWFZ in that region in accordance with the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. He called on all the parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, called on Israel, as the only country in the region that had not joined the NPT or declared its intention of doing so, to renounce the possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to the NPT without delay, promptly to place all its nuclear facilities under Agency full-scope safeguards and to conduct its nuclear-related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime.
Safeguards	
Safeguards Agreements and Additional Protocols	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (GOV/OR.1111 – Para 93) ...took note of the decisions of the Governments of Colombia and Uganda with regard to the conclusion of a safeguards agreement and additional protocols.
United Nations Fora	
IAEA: Programme and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (GOV/OR.1111 – Para 116) ...recalled that when the Board had met in 2003 to discuss the Agency's programme and budget for 2004–2005, it had been agreed to review the modernization, flexibility and cost-effectiveness of safeguards working methods as part of a package proposal and to inform the Board of the outcome. It was essential to maintain the delicate balance between the different elements of the package. Some recommendations in the report under consideration departed from the original intention of the review exercise. Also, more time was required for further examination of the Secretariat's proposals for action to be taken in response to the

	recommendations.
	Safeguards and Verification
Republic of Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1112 – Para 75)...noted that the Republic of Korea had taken corrective action by providing ICRs on the experiments and activities it had failed to report to the Agency in accordance with its obligations under its safeguards agreement. It had also cooperated actively with the Agency, not only by providing timely information and access to personnel and locations but also by permitting environmental and other samples to be collected for Agency analysis and assessment. • (GOV/OR.1112 – Para 76) The NAM shared the Director General’s view that activities of such serious concern should have been reported in a timely manner. However, it noted that there was no indication that the undeclared experiments had continued. The Agency should therefore continue the process of verifying the correctness and completeness of the Republic of Korea’s declarations pursuant to its safeguards agreement and additional protocol. • (GOV/OR.1112 – Para 77) Such issues should be resolved principally on technical grounds and within the mandate of the Agency. The Director General should continue to report to the Board of Governors as appropriate.
	Country Specific
Iran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 22) ...NAM welcomed the progress made in resolving outstanding issues between Iran and the Agency, particularly since the Board’s September session. • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 23) Although it realized that the Agency was still examining some aspects of Iran’s past nuclear programme, NAM was pleased that all declared nuclear material in Iran had been accounted for and not diverted to prohibited activities. It hoped that Iran would continue to cooperate in the implementation of its safeguards agreement. • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 24) There remained only two issues to be resolved in order that the Agency might provide assurance that no undeclared enrichment activities had taken place in Iran, and the Agency had — with the help of third countries — been making steady progress towards resolving them. NAM was confident that they would be resolved in the near future. • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 25) NAM welcomed the fact that Iran and the E3/EU had reaffirmed the commitments made in the Tehran Agreed Statement of 21 October 2003 and had decided to proceed as outlined in the agreement of 15 November 2004. It would like to see other Member States helping to maintain the environment of cooperation that had been created. • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 26) NAM also welcomed the decision of Iran — taken voluntarily with a view to building further confidence — to continue and extend its suspension of all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities. However, all States had the inalienable right to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and NAM remained of the view that any voluntary suspension should end when appropriate requirements had been met.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 27) At the September meetings of the Board, NAM had sought to ensure that confidence-building measures were not transformed into safeguards obligations, as they were two distinct sets of issues. It was therefore pleased that the distinction had been made in the Director General’s report, and it was confident that the Director General would continue to make the distinction. • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 28) NAM considered it very important that the Board’s decisions relating to Iran be taken by consensus, in order that the question under consideration might in future be treated as a routine safeguards question. • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 29) With regard to the resolution which had just been adopted, NAM was pleased that the ‘spirit of Vienna’ had prevailed. It was also pleased that the resolution reflected NAM’s concern that a clear distinction should be made between voluntary confidence-building measures and legally binding safeguards obligations and NAM’s belief in the right of all States to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes. In NAM’s view, the question of Iran’s nuclear programme should be resolved within the framework of the Agency. • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 30) While NAM had had serious misgivings about some elements of the draft resolution, it had supported the consensus in a spirit of compromise. With regard to operative paragraph 1, NAM considered that the use of the word “essential” there showed the importance which the Board attached to the voluntary confidence-building measures taken by Iran.
Republic of Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1112 – Para 75)...noted that the Republic of Korea had taken corrective action by providing ICRs on the experiments and activities it had failed to report to the Agency in accordance with its obligations under its safeguards agreement. It had also cooperated actively with the Agency, not only by providing timely information and access to personnel and locations but also by permitting environmental and other samples to be collected for Agency analysis and assessment. • (GOV/OR.1112 – Para 76) The NAM shared the Director General’s view that activities of such serious concern should have been reported in a timely manner. However, it noted that there was no indication that the undeclared experiments had continued. The Agency should therefore continue the process of verifying the correctness and completeness of the Republic of Korea’s declarations pursuant to its safeguards agreement and additional protocol. • (GOV/OR.1112 – Para 77) Such issues should be resolved principally on technical grounds and within the mandate of the Agency. The Director General should continue to report to the Board of Governors as appropriate.
Peaceful Uses	
Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 26) However, all States had the inalienable right to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and NAM remained of the view that any voluntary suspension should end when appropriate requirements had been met. • (GOV/OR.1115 – Para 29) ...NAM’s belief in the right of all States

	<p>to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes. In NAM's view, the question of Iran's nuclear programme should be resolved within the framework of the Agency.</p>
--	---