



## Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) Database

### 11 September 2006 Board of Governors Meeting

11 September 2006 Meeting: GOV/OR.1170; GOV/OR.1171;	
	Country Specific
DPRK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 46) ...[NAM] emphasized that the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula was essential to maintaining peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and that dialogue among all parties was important for the peaceful resolution of the nuclear issue.</li><li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 47) NAM reaffirmed its support for the principles of the joint statement on the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula reached on 19 September 2005 at the six-party talks in Beijing and stressed the importance of its observance and implementation. NAM called upon all the parties concerned to resume the six-party talks as a means to move forward in achieving a peaceful resolution of the issue.</li></ul>
Iran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 100) ...[NAM] expressed appreciation to the Director General and the Secretariat for the report contained in document GOV/2006/53.</li><li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 101) At the Ministerial Meeting of its Coordinating Bureau in May 2006, NAM had adopted a statement on the Iranian nuclear issue. In that statement, the Ministers had 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 and that, therefore, nothing should be interpreted in any way to inhibit or restrict the right of States to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes. They had furthermore reaffirmed that States' choices and decisions in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear technology and fuel cycle policies must be respected. The Ministers had recognized the Agency as the sole competent authority for verification of the respective safeguards obligations of Member States and had 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. The Ministers had 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 had stated their belief that such voluntary undertakings were not legal safeguards obligations.</li><li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 102) In addition, the final document adopted by the same Meeting had stated that the Ministers had reaffirmed the Movement's principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remained its highest priority, and on the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects and had stressed the importance that efforts aiming at non-proliferation should be parallel to simultaneous efforts aiming at nuclear disarmament. They had stressed their concern at the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of their use. They had reiterated deep</li></ul>

	<p>concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They had underscored the need for the nuclear-weapon States to implement the unequivocal undertaking that they had provided in 2000 aimed at the total elimination of nuclear weapons and, in that regard, had emphasized the urgent need to commence negotiations without delay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 103) NAM was pleased to note that Iran had been providing the Agency with access to nuclear material and facilities and had provided the required reports. NAM took note that the Agency would continue its work with regard to the remaining outstanding issues related to Iran’s nuclear activities. In that regard, NAM encouraged Iran to continue to cooperate actively and fully with the Agency to resolve outstanding issues in order to promote confidence and a peaceful resolution to the issue.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 104) [NAM] recalled that the Director General’s report contained in document GOV/2006/15 dated February 2006 stated that all the declared nuclear material in Iran had been accounted for and that the Agency had not seen any diversion of such material to prohibited activities. NAM reiterated that all safeguards and verification issues, including those concerning Iran, should be resolved within the framework of the Agency on technical and legal bases. All involved parties and international bodies should avoid any action that might exacerbate the situation.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 105) NAM took note of the six-country package proposal that had been presented to Iran and welcomed the fact that Iran had responded on the agreed date. In that regard, NAM called upon the concerned parties to avoid any hasty decisions and to give serious consideration to all proposals, including Iran’s response. In that way, common ground could be found through negotiation, without any precondition, with a view to achieving a peaceful and mutually acceptable solution. Diplomacy and dialogue must continue for a long-term solution to the Iranian nuclear issue to be found through peaceful means.</li> </ul>
Israel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1171 – Para 70) ...[NAM] recalled that the statement on the Iranian nuclear issue adopted at the Ministerial Meeting of the NAM Coordinating Bureau held in Malaysia in May 2006 had pointed to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and had expressed support for the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East, in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. Pending the establishment of such a zone, the statement had called upon Israel to accede to the NPT without delay and promptly place all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive safeguards.</li> </ul>
	<b>NWFZ</b>
Middle East NWFZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1171 – Para 70) ...[NAM] recalled that the statement on the Iranian nuclear issue adopted at the Ministerial Meeting of the NAM Coordinating Bureau held in Malaysia in May 2006 had pointed to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and had expressed support for the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East, in</li> </ul>

	<p>accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. Pending the establishment of such a zone, the statement had called upon Israel to accede to the NPT without delay and promptly place all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive safeguards.</p>
	<b>Peaceful Uses</b>
Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 101) At the Ministerial Meeting of its Coordinating Bureau in May 2006, NAM had adopted a statement on the Iranian nuclear issue. In that statement, the Ministers had 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 and that, therefore, nothing should be interpreted in any way to inhibit or restrict the right of States to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes. They had furthermore reaffirmed that States’ choices and decisions in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear technology and fuel cycle policies must be respected. The Ministers had recognized the Agency as the sole competent authority for verification of the respective safeguards obligations of Member States and had 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. The Ministers had 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 had stated their belief that such voluntary undertakings were not legal safeguards obligations.</li> </ul>
	<b>Safeguards</b>
General Views on Safeguards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 101) At the Ministerial Meeting of its Coordinating Bureau in May 2006, NAM had adopted a statement on the Iranian nuclear issue. In that statement, the Ministers had 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 and that, therefore, nothing should be interpreted in any way to inhibit or restrict the right of States to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes. They had furthermore reaffirmed that States’ choices and decisions in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear technology and fuel cycle policies must be respected. The Ministers had recognized the Agency as the sole competent authority for verification of the respective safeguards obligations of Member States and had 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. The Ministers had 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 had stated their belief that such voluntary undertakings were not legal safeguards obligations.</li> </ul>
Verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 104) [NAM] recalled that the Director General’s report contained in document GOV/2006/15 dated February 2006 stated that all the declared nuclear material in Iran had been accounted for and that the Agency had not seen any diversion of such material to prohibited</li> </ul>

	<p>activities. NAM reiterated that all safeguards and verification issues, including those concerning Iran, should be resolved within the framework of the Agency on technical and legal bases. All involved parties and international bodies should avoid any action that might exacerbate the situation.</p>
	<b>Disarmament</b>
Nonproliferation and Disarmament	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 102) In addition, the final document adopted by the same Meeting had stated that the Ministers had reaffirmed the Movement’s principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remained its highest priority, and on the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects and had stressed the importance that efforts aiming at non-proliferation should be parallel to simultaneous efforts aiming at nuclear disarmament. They had stressed their concern at the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of their use. They had reiterated deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They had underscored the need for the nuclear-weapon States to implement the unequivocal undertaking that they had provided in 2000 aimed at the total elimination of nuclear weapons and, in that regard, had emphasized the urgent need to commence negotiations without delay.</li> </ul>
	<b>Nonproliferation</b>
Nonproliferation and Disarmament	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1170 – Para 102) In addition, the final document adopted by the same Meeting had stated that the Ministers had reaffirmed the Movement’s principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remained its highest priority, and on the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects and had stressed the importance that efforts aiming at non-proliferation should be parallel to simultaneous efforts aiming at nuclear disarmament. They had stressed their concern at the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of their use. They had reiterated deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They had underscored the need for the nuclear-weapon States to implement the unequivocal undertaking that they had provided in 2000 aimed at the total elimination of nuclear weapons and, in that regard, had emphasized the urgent need to commence negotiations without delay.</li> </ul>