



## Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) Database

### 03 March 2008 Board of Governors Meeting

3 March 2008 Meeting: GOV/OR.1204; GOV/OR.1205;	
	Country Specific
Iran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 2) (Cuba)*, speaking on behalf of NAM, welcomed the efforts made by Iran and the Agency to implement the work plan on outstanding issues set forth in document INFCIRC/711, and the Director General’s visit to Tehran on 11–12 January 2008 during which the decision had been taken to accelerate implementation of the work plan. She noted with appreciation that, during that visit, the Iranian leadership had stated that the country’s nuclear programme had always been exclusively for peaceful purposes and that there had never been a nuclear weapons development programme.</li><li>• (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 3) NAM’s position regarding the Iranian nuclear issue was reflected in the following statement adopted at its 14th summit, held in Havana, Cuba, on 15–16 September 2006:<p>“The Heads of State or Government 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.</p><p>“The Heads of State or Government recognised the International Atomic Energy Agency (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 jeopardise the efficiency and credibility of the Agency.</p><p>“The Heads of State or Government 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 Heads of State or Government 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.</p><p>“The Heads of State or Government emphasised 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</p></li></ul>

undertakings are not legal safeguards obligations.

“The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapons-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.

“The Heads of State or Government 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 recognised the need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument, prohibiting attacks, or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

“The Heads of State or Government 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 emphasised that the Agency should continue its work to resolve the Iranian nuclear issue within its mandate under the Statute of the IAEA.

“The Heads of State or Government 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 the view to facilitating Agency’s work on resolving the outstanding issues.”

- (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 4) NAM was pleased to note that, as a result of the joint endeavours of the Agency Secretariat and Iran, significant achievements had been made in the implementation of the work plan. All six outstanding issues reflected in paragraphs I.2. and II of the work plan had been resolved. As a result of the proactive cooperation of Iran with the Agency in the implementation of the plan, the outstanding issues had been resolved earlier than expected, which was commendable. Given such substantive progress, NAM expected that safeguards implementation in Iran would henceforth be conducted in a routine manner.
- (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 5) She noted that the Agency had not detected the use of nuclear material in connection with the alleged studies, and that it did not have credible information in that regard. NAM was of the view that briefings organized by the Secretariat should serve to explain the contents of the official documents circulated beforehand. However, the technical briefing held on 25 February 2008 on the agenda item under discussion had gone beyond the Director General’s report on the matter. The work of the Board of Governors should only be based on official, credible, verifiable, factual and timely information.
- (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 6) NAM took note that the Director General had

	<p>once again stated that the Agency had been able to verify the non-diversion of declared material in Iran, and that Iran had granted the Agency access to declared nuclear material and had provided the required nuclear material accountancy reports in connection with declared nuclear material and activities. It also took note that the Agency had not found indications of ongoing reprocessing activities in Iran. Furthermore, the report stated that the Agency's knowledge of Iran's current declared programme had become clearer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 7) Maintaining the impartiality and professionalism of the Secretariat was crucial and there should be no undue pressure on or interference in the Agency's activities, especially the verification process that would jeopardize its efficiency and credibility. Diplomacy and dialogue were the only way to find a solution to the Iranian nuclear issue and all Member States should contribute positively to that end. The parties concerned should avoid taking any measures that put at risk the constructive process between Iran and the Agency.</li> </ul>
Israel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 3) NAM's position regarding the Iranian nuclear issue was reflected in the following statement adopted at its 14th summit, held in Havana, Cuba, on 15–16 September 2006:        “The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapons-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.</li> </ul>
<b>Peaceful Uses</b>	
Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 3) NAM's position regarding the Iranian nuclear issue was reflected in the following statement adopted at its 14th summit, held in Havana, Cuba, on 15–16 September 2006:</li> <li>• “The Heads of State or Government 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.</li> </ul>
Assurance of Supply/ Multilateral Approach to Nuclear Fuel Supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1205 – Para 60) (Cuba)*, speaking on behalf of NAM, said that the issue of nuclear fuel supply was a very complex and multidimensional one with technical, legal, political, commercial and economic implications. Extensive, comprehensive and transparent consultations and negotiations should be held before any decision on the matter was considered, and any decision should be based on a consensus. Any proposals on the subject should be consistent with the Agency's Statute and without prejudice to the inalienable right of Member States to research, develop and use all aspects of nuclear science and technology for peaceful purposes.</li> </ul>

	<b>Safeguards</b>
General Views on Safeguards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 3) NAM’s position regarding the Iranian nuclear issue was reflected in the following statement adopted at its 14th summit, held in Havana, Cuba, on 15–16 September 2006:  “The Heads of State or Government emphasised 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.  “The Heads of State or Government 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 emphasised that the Agency should continue its work to resolve the Iranian nuclear issue within its mandate under the Statute of the IAEA.</li> </ul>
Verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 3) NAM’s position regarding the Iranian nuclear issue was reflected in the following statement adopted at its 14th summit, held in Havana, Cuba, on 15–16 September 2006:  “The Heads of State or Government recognised the International Atomic Energy Agency (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 jeopardise the efficiency and credibility of the Agency.  (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 6) NAM took note that the Director General had once again stated that the Agency had been able to verify the non-diversion of declared material in Iran, and that Iran had granted the Agency access to declared nuclear material and had provided the required nuclear material accountancy reports in connection with declared nuclear material and activities. It also took note that the Agency had not found indications of ongoing reprocessing activities in Iran. Furthermore, the report stated that the Agency’s knowledge of Iran’s current declared programme had become clearer.</li> </ul>
Iran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 4) NAM was pleased to note that, as a result of the joint endeavours of the Agency Secretariat and Iran, significant achievements had been made in the implementation of the work plan. All six outstanding issues reflected in paragraphs I.2. and II of the work plan had been resolved. As a result of the proactive cooperation of Iran with the Agency in the implementation of the plan, the outstanding issues had been resolved earlier than expected, which was commendable. Given such substantive progress, NAM expected that safeguards implementation in Iran would henceforth be conducted in a routine manner.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1204 – Para 6) NAM took note that the Director General had once again stated that the Agency had been able to verify the non-diversion of declared material in Iran, and that Iran had granted the Agency access to declared nuclear material and had provided the required nuclear material accountancy reports in connection with declared nuclear material and activities. It also took note that the Agency had not found indications of ongoing reprocessing activities in Iran. Furthermore, the report stated that the Agency’s knowledge of Iran’s current declared</li> </ul>

	programme had become clearer.
Israel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(GOV/OR.1204 – Para 3) NAM’s position regarding the Iranian nuclear issue was reflected in the following statement adopted at its 14th summit, held in Havana, Cuba, on 15–16 September 2006: “The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapons-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.</li> </ul>
Technical and Procedural Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(GOV/OR.1204 – Para 5) She noted that the Agency had not detected the use of nuclear material in connection with the alleged studies, and that it did not have credible information in that regard. NAM was of the view that briefings organized by the Secretariat should serve to explain the contents of the official documents circulated beforehand. However, the technical briefing held on 25 February 2008 on the agenda item under discussion had gone beyond the Director General’s report on the matter. The work of the Board of Governors should only be based on official, credible, verifiable, factual and timely information.</li> </ul>
<b>NWFZ</b>	
Middle East NWFZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(GOV/OR.1204 – Para 3) NAM’s position regarding the Iranian nuclear issue was reflected in the following statement adopted at its 14th summit, held in Havana, Cuba, on 15–16 September 2006: “The Heads of State or Government considered the establishment of nuclear-weapons-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.</li> </ul>
<b>Security Assurances</b>	
Attack or Threat of Attack Against Peaceful Nuclear Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(GOV/OR.1204 – Para 3) NAM’s position regarding the Iranian nuclear issue was reflected in the following statement adopted at its 14th summit, held in Havana, Cuba, on 15–16 September 2006: “The Heads of State or Government 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 recognised the need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument, prohibiting attacks, or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</li> </ul>