



## Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) Database

### 02 June 2008 Board of Governors Meeting

2 June 2008 Meeting: GOV/OR.1209; GOV/OR.1211	
Safeguards	
General Views on Safeguards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1209 – Para 127) (Cuba)*, speaking on behalf of NAM, said that the Movement attached great importance to the SIR and reiterated its opinion that the report should cover the implementation of safeguards in Member States according to their respective agreements in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1209 – Para 128) NAM took note of the observations and conclusions drawn by the Secretariat regarding the implementation of safeguards agreements in 2007.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1209 – Para 129) NAM shared the view expressed in the report that SSACs were fundamental to the effective and efficient implementation of safeguards and noted with appreciation the actions taken during 2007 to assist Member States in establishing and strengthening their SSACs. NAM called on the Secretariat to continue its efforts in that regard.</li> </ul>
Safeguards Implementation Report (Sir)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1209 – Para 127) (Cuba)*, speaking on behalf of NAM, said that the Movement attached great importance to the SIR and reiterated its opinion that the report should cover the implementation of safeguards in Member States according to their respective agreements in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1209 – Para 129) NAM shared the view expressed in the report that SSACs were fundamental to the effective and efficient implementation of safeguards and noted with appreciation the actions taken during 2007 to assist Member States in establishing and strengthening their SSACs. NAM called on the Secretariat to continue its efforts in that regard.</li> </ul>
Technical and Procedural Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1209 – Para 130) NAM renewed its calls upon the Agency to assist interested Member States, particularly developing countries, in building up domestic capabilities for the analysis of environmental samples. That would contribute to expanding the Agency's analytical capabilities and lead to an increase in the number of qualified members of the NWAL, which would allow the Agency to proceed with the analysis of environmental samples in a more efficient manner for verification activities. NAM noted that laboratories in two developing countries had started the qualification process for bulk analysis of environmental samples.</li> </ul>
Verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 7) NAM took note of the fact that the Agency had received much information only in electronic form and had not been authorized to provide copies to Iran and that, in other cases, it was not in possession of the documents and was therefore unable to make them available to Iran. NAM was concerned that such situations could impede the verification process.</li> </ul>

Iran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 9) Given that all outstanding issues had been resolved, as reported by the Director General to the Board in March 2008, and given the rounds of intensive discussions on the alleged studies that had taken place in Iran, NAM expected that safeguards implementation in Iran should be conducted in a routine manner.</li> </ul>
<b>Disarmament</b>	
Nonproliferation and Disarmament	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1209 – Para 131) NAM emphasized its belief that the efforts of the international community aimed at nuclear disarmament should be equal and simultaneous to the efforts aimed at nuclear non-proliferation. In that regard, it requested that the Agency fulfil Objective C.2 of its Medium Term Strategy for 2006-2011<sup>7</sup> in conformity with the provisions of the Statute.</li> </ul>
<b>Nonproliferation</b>	
Nonproliferation and Disarmament	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1209 – Para 131) NAM emphasized its belief that the efforts of the international community aimed at nuclear disarmament should be equal and simultaneous to the efforts aimed at nuclear non-proliferation. In that regard, it requested that the Agency fulfil Objective C.2 of its Medium Term Strategy for 2006-2011<sup>7</sup> in conformity with the provisions of the Statute.</li> </ul>
<b>Country Specific</b>	
Iran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 2) Cuba, speaking on behalf of NAM, said that the Movement's position regarding the Iranian nuclear issue was reflected in the statement adopted at its 14th summit, held in Havana, Cuba, on 15–16 September 2006.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 3) NAM took note that the Director General had once again stated that the Agency was able to verify the non-diversion of declared nuclear material in the Islamic Republic of Iran, and that Iran had provided the Agency with access to declared nuclear material and the required nuclear material accountancy reports in connection with declared nuclear material and activities. NAM also noted that the Agency had not found indications of ongoing reprocessing activities in Iran.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 4) NAM appreciated Iran's cooperation in responding with regard to the alleged studies despite the fact that the six outstanding issues reflected in paragraphs I.2 and II of the work plan had been resolved. NAM noted with satisfaction that Iran had agreed to deal with the matter of the alleged studies, including additional questions, and to hold a series of technical meetings in Iran with the Agency's delegation headed by the Deputy Director General for Safeguards.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 5) She took note that the Director General's report once again emphasized that the Agency had not detected the actual use of nuclear material in connection with the alleged studies.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 6) NAM recalled that, regarding the alleged studies, the agreement reached in the work plan stipulated that upon receiving all related documents, Iran would review them and inform the Agency of its assessment. Also, NAM noted that, although the Agency had been unable to provide the related documents in many cases, Iran had nonetheless cooperated by providing information.</li> <li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 7) NAM took note of the fact that the Agency had received much information only in electronic form and had not been authorized to provide copies to Iran and that, in other cases, it was not in</li> </ul>

	<p>possession of the documents and was therefore unable to make them available to Iran. NAM was concerned that such situations could impede the verification process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 8) There could be concerns that issues related to the alleged studies were not a core competency of the Agency. However, NAM trusted that in clarifying the alleged studies, including issues such as high explosives testing and the missile re-entry vehicle project, the Agency would act in accordance with its Statute.</li><li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 9) Given that all outstanding issues had been resolved, as reported by the Director General to the Board in March 2008, and given the rounds of intensive discussions on the alleged studies that had taken place in Iran, NAM expected that safeguards implementation in Iran should be conducted in a routine manner.</li><li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 10) NAM reiterated its full confidence in the impartiality and professionalism of the Secretariat and the Director General and strongly opposed any undue pressure or interference in the Agency’s activities, and especially in the verification process, which would jeopardize its efficiency and credibility.</li><li>• (GOV/OR.1211 – Para 11) NAM’s principled position was that diplomacy and dialogue were the only way to achieve a long term solution of Iran’s nuclear issue and it encouraged all Member States to contribute positively to that effect. NAM also expected all concerned parties to avoid taking any measures which put at risk the constructive process between Iran and the Agency.</li></ul>
--	--