



Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) Database

12 June 2006 Board of Governors Meeting

12 June 2006 Meeting: GOV/OR.1162; GOV/OR.1163; GOV/OR.1164	
	Country Specific
DPRK	<ul style="list-style-type: none">(GOV/OR.1162 – Para 158)... [NAM] said that the Foreign Ministers of the Movement had met in Putrajaya, Malaysia, for the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of NAM from 27 to 30 May 2006 with the primary objective of reviewing the preparation for the 14th Conference of Heads of State or Government of NAM to be held in Cuba from 15 to 16 September 2006. The final document of that Ministerial Meeting had stated that while acknowledging the importance of guaranteeing durable peace and security on the Korean Peninsula for the sake of the common prosperity of the Korean people, as well as the peace and security of North East Asia and the rest of the world, the Ministers had expressed their support for efforts to reunify the Korean Peninsula through the genuine aspirations and concerted efforts of the Korean people themselves, as stated in the North-South Joint Declaration issued at the historic North-South summit talks held in Pyongyang on 15 June 2000. The final document also stated that the Ministers had expressed their desire for the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and their continued support for the resumption of the six-party talks at the earliest possible date, stressing the latter's vital role in achieving a peaceful negotiated resolution to the nuclear issue. In that regard, they had further expressed their support for the joint statement of principles on the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula of 19 September 2005 and for its expeditious and faithful implementation.
Iran	<ul style="list-style-type: none">(GOV/OR.1163 – Para 2) ...[NAM] informed the Board that during the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of NAM, held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, from 27 to 30 May 2006, the NAM Ministers had adopted the following statement on the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear issue: “1. The Ministers reiterated their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation reflected in the Final Document of the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, from 27 to 30 May 2006. They considered the developments regarding the implementation of the NPT safeguards agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran. “2. The Ministers reaffirmed the basic and inalienable right of all States to develop research, production and use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, without any discrimination and in conformity with their respective legal obligations. Therefore, nothing should be interpreted in a way as inhibiting or restricting this right of States to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes. They furthermore reaffirmed that States’ choices and decisions in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear technology and its fuel cycle policies must be respected. “3. The Ministers recognized the IAEA as the sole competent authority

for verification of the respective safeguards obligations of Member States and stressed that there should be no undue pressure or interference in the Agency's activities, especially its verification process, which would jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the Agency.

"4. The Ministers welcomed the cooperation extended by the Islamic Republic of Iran to the IAEA, including those voluntary confidence building measures undertaken, with a view to resolve the remaining issues. They noted the assessment of the IAEA Director General that all nuclear material declared by Iran had been accounted for. They noted, at the same time, that the process for drawing a conclusion with regard to the absence of undeclared material and activities in Iran is an ongoing and time-consuming process. In this regard, the Ministers encouraged Iran to urgently continue to cooperate actively and fully with the IAEA within the Agency's mandate to resolve outstanding issues in order to promote confidence and a peaceful resolution of the issue.

"5. The Ministers emphasized the fundamental distinction between the legal obligations of States to their respective safeguards agreements and any confidence building measures voluntarily undertaken to resolve difficult issues, and believed that such voluntary undertakings are not legal safeguards obligations.

"6. The Ministers considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and reiterated the support for the establishment in the Middle East of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, in accordance with relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. Pending the establishment of such a zone, they demanded Israel to accede to the NPT without delay and place promptly all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards.

"7. The Ministers reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities — operational or under construction — poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and regulations of the IAEA. They recognized the need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument, prohibiting attacks, or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

"8. The Ministers strongly believed that all issues on safeguards and verification, including those of Iran, should be resolved within the IAEA framework, and be based on technical and legal grounds. They further emphasized that the Agency should continue its work to resolve the Iranian nuclear issue within its mandate under the Statute of the IAEA.

"9. The Ministers also strongly believed that diplomacy and dialogue through peaceful means must continue to find a long-term solution to the Iranian nuclear issue. They expressed their conviction that the only way to resolve the issue is to resume negotiations without any preconditions and to enhance cooperation with the involvement of all necessary parties to promote international confidence with a view to facilitating the Agency's work on resolving the outstanding issues."

Peaceful Uses

Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1163 – Para 2) ...[NAM] informed the Board that during the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of NAM, held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, from 27 to 30 May 2006, the NAM Ministers had adopted the following statement on the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear issue: “2. The Ministers reaffirmed the basic and inalienable right of all States to develop research, production and use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, without any discrimination and in conformity with their respective legal obligations. Therefore, nothing should be interpreted in a way as inhibiting or restricting this right of States to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes. They furthermore reaffirmed that States’ choices and decisions in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear technology and its fuel cycle policies must be respected. • (GOV/OR.1164 – Para 12)... [NAM] said that any multilateral approach to the nuclear fuel cycle would have serious consequences for Members States’ inalienable right to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Since the report of the expert group on multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle had been made available, no substantive consideration of the legal, technical and institutional aspects of the issue had taken place. • (GOV/OR.1164 – Para 13) Paragraph 9 of Chapter 1 of the group’s report stated that the group consisted of individuals, participating in their personal capacity, selected by the Director General. Furthermore, paragraph 10 stated that the report did not necessarily reflect agreement by all of the experts on the desirability or feasibility of multilateral approaches, or on all of the options, nor did it reflect a consensus assessment of their respective value but was intended only to present possible options and to reflect on the range of factors that could influence the consideration of those options. • (GOV/OR.1164 – Para 14) Any proposals presented in the Agency had to be consistent with its Statute and without prejudice to the inalienable right of Member States to research, develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. NAM felt that the issue under discussion was complex and that consideration by the Board of any proposal was premature as yet.
Safeguards	
General Views on Safeguards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1163 – Para 2) ...[NAM] informed the Board that during the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of NAM, held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, from 27 to 30 May 2006, the NAM Ministers had adopted the following statement on the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear issue: “5. The Ministers emphasized the fundamental distinction between the legal obligations of States to their respective safeguards agreements and any confidence building measures voluntarily undertaken to resolve difficult issues, and believed that such voluntary undertakings are not legal safeguards obligations. “6. The Ministers considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and reiterated the support for the establishment in the Middle East of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, in accordance with relevant General Assembly and Security Council

	<p>resolutions. Pending the establishment of such a zone, they demanded Israel to accede to the NPT without delay and place promptly all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards.</p>
Verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1163 – Para 2) ...[NAM] informed the Board that during the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of NAM, held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, from 27 to 30 May 2006, the NAM Ministers had adopted the following statement on the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear issue: • “3. The Ministers recognized the IAEA as the sole competent authority for verification of the respective safeguards obligations of Member States and stressed that there should be no undue pressure or interference in the Agency’s activities, especially its verification process, which would jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the Agency.
Small Quantities Protocol (SQP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1162 – Para 96) ...[NAM] thanked the Director General for providing document GOV/INF/2006/9 and noted with appreciation that the Secretariat, at the Board’s request, was assisting States with SQPs to establish and maintain SSACs through the development of a standard form for submitting initial reports on nuclear material and an adapted SSAC training module, and the publication of a booklet entitled Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Nuclear Security: Overview of Safeguards Requirements for States with Limited Nuclear Material and Activities. • (GOV/OR.1162 – Para 97) NAM welcomed the Secretariat’s intention to continue advising SQP States so as to ensure the smooth implementation of the Board’s decision of September 2005 and looked forward to receiving further information from the Secretariat regarding the legal implications of rescinding a nonoperational SQP for States with nuclear facilities.
NWFZ	
Middle East NWFZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1163 – Para 2) ...[NAM] informed the Board that during the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of NAM, held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, from 27 to 30 May 2006, the NAM Ministers had adopted the following statement on the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear issue: “6. The Ministers considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and reiterated the support for the establishment in the Middle East of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, in accordance with relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. Pending the establishment of such a zone, they demanded Israel to accede to the NPT without delay and place promptly all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards.
Security Assurances	
Attack or Threat of Attack Against Peaceful Nuclear Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1163 – Para 2) ...[NAM] informed the Board that during the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of NAM, held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, from 27 to 30 May 2006, the NAM Ministers had adopted the following statement on the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear issue: “7. The Ministers reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear

	<p>facilities — operational or under construction — poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and regulations of the IAEA. They recognized the need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument, prohibiting attacks, or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</p>
<p>United Nations Fora</p>	
<p>Unilateralism and Multilateralism</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (GOV/OR.1164 – Para 12)... [NAM] said that any multilateral approach to the nuclear fuel cycle would have serious consequences for Members States’ inalienable right to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Since the report of the expert group on multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle had been made available, no substantive consideration of the legal, technical and institutional aspects of the issue had taken place. • (GOV/OR.1164 – Para 13) Paragraph 9 of Chapter 1 of the group’s report stated that the group consisted of individuals, participating in their personal capacity, selected by the Director General. Furthermore, paragraph 10 stated that the report did not necessarily reflect agreement by all of the experts on the desirability or feasibility of multilateral approaches, or on all of the options, nor did it reflect a consensus assessment of their respective value but was intended only to present possible options and to reflect on the range of factors that could influence the consideration of those options.