



Thematic Summary of the Positions of the Members of the Non-Aligned Movement in Plenary Meeting Records of the 60 th General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency	
United Nations Fora	
UN General Assembly	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 11) NAM, considering that an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards global nuclear disarmament, reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant UNGA and UNSC resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 58) NAM considered that the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with relevant UNGA and UNSC resolutions. It also considered that the selective approach to the issue of nuclear capabilities in the Middle East had undermined the viability of the Agency's safeguards regime and had resulted in the preservation of unsafeguarded Israeli nuclear facilities and activities, despite repeated calls on Israel to place them under comprehensive Agency safeguards.</p>
International Atomic Energy Agency	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 10) Mr CHACÓN ESCAMILLO (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of NAM, welcomed the report contained in document GOV/2016/14/Rev.1 and said that NAM was still committed to its principled position on the application of Agency safeguards in the Middle East. It strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region in which one State threatened neighbouring and other States owing to the massive continuing imbalance in military capabilities caused by its possession of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 12) NAM considered that achieving universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East was the first practical step towards confidence building among States in the region, and was a necessary step towards the establishment of an NWFZ there. It was pleased that its Members that were Parties to the NPT had concluded CSAs with the Agency as non-nuclear-weapon States.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 13) All States in the Middle East, except Israel, were Parties to the NPT and had undertaken to accept comprehensive Agency safeguards. NAM highlighted the accession of Palestine as a Party to the NPT, and welcomed its expressed wish to conclude a CSA with the Agency under NPT Article III. NAM regretted Israel's continued insistence that the issue of comprehensive Agency</p>

safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process; there was no automatic sequence making the application of comprehensive safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East dependent on a peace settlement there — in fact, the former would contribute to the latter.

(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 14) NAM also regretted that the Director General had not been able to fulfil his mandate under resolutions GC(59)/RES/15 and GC(59)/RES/16 on the application of comprehensive Agency safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East. Considering that all Member States should cooperate in rectifying an unacceptable situation, NAM called on them to participate actively in, and give priority to, achieving the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East.

(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 15) Noting that the Director General would continue consultations in accordance with his mandate on the early application of comprehensive Agency safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East, NAM welcomed the Director General's efforts to encourage relevant new ideas and approaches that might help to move his mandate forward, and requested the Director General to continue to brief Member States regularly thereon.

(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 18) NAM requested the Director General to continue to consult Member States on arrangements for establishing an NWFZ in the Middle East and hoped that all Member States of the Agency would support his efforts to implement resolutions GC(59)/RES/15 and GC(59)/RES/16.

(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 19) NAM seconded the draft resolution submitted by Egypt on the item under discussion.

(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 57) NAM was pleased that its Members that were Parties to the NPT had concluded CSAs with the Agency as non-nuclear-weapon States, under Article III.1 of the NPT. NAM noted that all States in the Middle East, except Israel, were Parties to the NPT and had undertaken to accept comprehensive Agency safeguards.

(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 58) NAM considered that the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with relevant UNGA and UNSC resolutions. It also considered that the selective approach to the issue of nuclear capabilities in the Middle East had undermined the viability of the Agency's safeguards regime and had resulted in the preservation of unsafeguarded Israeli nuclear facilities and activities, despite repeated calls on Israel to place them under comprehensive Agency safeguards.

(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 60) It called on all Member States to cooperate in rectifying that unacceptable situation and in achieving the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East by implementing resolution GC(53)/RES/17 as a first step to that end.

	<p>NAM regretted Israel’s continued insistence that the issue of Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process. There was no automatic sequence rendering the application of comprehensive safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East dependent on a peace settlement; in fact, the former would contribute to the latter.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 62) Referring to past statements by Israel to the effect that it valued the non-proliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had conducted a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear domain, NAM regretted that Agency documents dating back to 1994 attested to the contrary.</p>
<p>UN Security Council</p>	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 11) NAM, considering that an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards global nuclear disarmament, reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant UNGA and UNSC resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 58) NAM considered that the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with relevant UNGA and UNSC resolutions. It also considered that the selective approach to the issue of nuclear capabilities in the Middle East had undermined the viability of the Agency’s safeguards regime and had resulted in the preservation of unsafeguarded Israeli nuclear facilities and activities, despite repeated calls on Israel to place them under comprehensive Agency safeguards.</p>
<p>Peaceful Uses</p>	
<p>Access to Nuclear Technology</p>	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 61) NAM reiterated its call for the transfer to Israel of nuclear-related equipment, information, material, facilities, devices and other resources, and for the provision to Israel of other assistance in nuclear-related scientific or technological fields to be totally and completely prohibited.</p>
<p>NWFZs</p>	
<p>Contributions to Disarmament</p>	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 11) NAM, considering that an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards global nuclear disarmament, reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant UNGA and UNSC resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 58) NAM considered that the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and reiterated its support</p>

	<p>for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with relevant UNGA and UNSC resolutions. It also considered that the selective approach to the issue of nuclear capabilities in the Middle East had undermined the viability of the Agency’s safeguards regime and had resulted in the preservation of unsafeguarded Israeli nuclear facilities and activities, despite repeated calls on Israel to place them under comprehensive Agency safeguards.</p>
<p>Middle East WMDFZ</p>	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 11) NAM, considering that an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards global nuclear disarmament, reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant UNGA and UNSC resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 12) NAM considered that achieving universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East was the first practical step towards confidence building among States in the region, and was a necessary step towards the establishment of an NWFZ there. It was pleased that its Members that were Parties to the NPT had concluded CSAs with the Agency as non-nuclear-weapon States.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 16) NAM Members that were Parties to the NPT, mindful of the consensus decision to convene, in 2012, a conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, had been profoundly disappointed that the conference had still not been convened, contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East and the collective agreement of the Parties to the NPT enshrined in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They had strongly rejected the conveners’ allegations of impediments to the convening of the conference on schedule. They urged the UN Secretary-General, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation to convene the conference without any further delay in order to avoid any negative repercussions on the relevance and credibility of the NPT, on the preparations for the NPT Review Conference, on the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime as a whole and on the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 18) NAM requested the Director General to continue to consult Member States on arrangements for establishing an NWFZ in the Middle East and hoped that all Member States of the Agency would support his efforts to implement resolutions GC(59)/RES/15 and GC(59)/RES/16.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 58) NAM considered that the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with relevant UNGA and UNSC resolutions. It also considered that the selective approach to the issue of nuclear capabilities in the Middle East had undermined the viability of the Agency’s safeguards regime and had resulted in the preservation of unsafeguarded Israeli nuclear facilities and activities,</p>

	despite repeated calls on Israel to place them under comprehensive Agency safeguards.
Country Specific	
United States	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 16) NAM Members that were Parties to the NPT, mindful of the consensus decision to convene, in 2012, a conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, had been profoundly disappointed that the conference had still not been convened, contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East and the collective agreement of the Parties to the NPT enshrined in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They had strongly rejected the conveners' allegations of impediments to the convening of the conference on schedule. They urged the UN Secretary-General, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation to convene the conference without any further delay in order to avoid any negative repercussions on the relevance and credibility of the NPT, on the preparations for the NPT Review Conference, on the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime as a whole and on the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East.</p>
Russia	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 16) NAM Members that were Parties to the NPT, mindful of the consensus decision to convene, in 2012, a conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, had been profoundly disappointed that the conference had still not been convened, contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East and the collective agreement of the Parties to the NPT enshrined in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They had strongly rejected the conveners' allegations of impediments to the convening of the conference on schedule. They urged the UN Secretary-General, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation to convene the conference without any further delay in order to avoid any negative repercussions on the relevance and credibility of the NPT, on the preparations for the NPT Review Conference, on the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime as a whole and on the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East.</p>
United Kingdom	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 16) NAM Members that were Parties to the NPT, mindful of the consensus decision to convene, in 2012, a conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, had been profoundly disappointed that the conference had still not been convened, contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East and the collective agreement of the Parties to the NPT enshrined in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They had strongly rejected the conveners' allegations of impediments to the convening of the conference on</p>

	<p>schedule. They urged the UN Secretary-General, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation to convene the conference without any further delay in order to avoid any negative repercussions on the relevance and credibility of the NPT, on the preparations for the NPT Review Conference, on the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime as a whole and on the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Israel</p>	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 10) Mr CHACÓN ESCAMILLO (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of NAM, welcomed the report contained in document GOV/2016/14/Rev.1 and said that NAM was still committed to its principled position on the application of Agency safeguards in the Middle East. It strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region in which one State threatened neighbouring and other States owing to the massive continuing imbalance in military capabilities caused by its possession of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 13) All States in the Middle East, except Israel, were Parties to the NPT and had undertaken to accept comprehensive Agency safeguards. NAM highlighted the accession of Palestine as a Party to the NPT, and welcomed its expressed wish to conclude a CSA with the Agency under NPT Article III. NAM regretted Israel's continued insistence that the issue of comprehensive Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process; there was no automatic sequence making the application of comprehensive safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East dependent on a peace settlement there — in fact, the former would contribute to the latter.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 56) Mr CHACÓN ESCAMILLO (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of NAM, said that NAM strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region in which one State threatened neighbouring and other regional States, owing to a massive continuing imbalance in military capabilities, due to its possession of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 57) NAM was pleased that its Members that were Parties to the NPT had concluded CSAs with the Agency as non-nuclear-weapon States, under Article III.1 of the NPT. NAM noted that all States in the Middle East, except Israel, were Parties to the NPT and had undertaken to accept comprehensive Agency safeguards.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 58) NAM considered that the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament and reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with relevant UNGA and UNSC resolutions. It also considered that the selective approach to the issue of nuclear capabilities in the Middle East had undermined the viability of the Agency's safeguards regime and had resulted in the preservation of unsafeguarded Israeli nuclear facilities and activities,</p>

	<p>despite repeated calls on Israel to place them under comprehensive Agency safeguards.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 59) NAM was gravely concerned about the dire consequences for international security of Israel’s nuclear capabilities, which posed a serious threat to neighbouring and other States, and about the continuing provision to Israeli scientists of access to the nuclear facilities of one nuclear-weapon-State.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 60) It called on all Member States to cooperate in rectifying that unacceptable situation and in achieving the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East by implementing resolution GC(53)/RES/17 as a first step to that end. NAM regretted Israel’s continued insistence that the issue of Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process. There was no automatic sequence rendering the application of comprehensive safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East dependent on a peace settlement; in fact, the former would contribute to the latter.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 61) NAM reiterated its call for the transfer to Israel of nuclear-related equipment, information, material, facilities, devices and other resources, and for the provision to Israel of other assistance in nuclear-related scientific or technological fields to be totally and completely prohibited.</p> <p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 62) Referring to past statements by Israel to the effect that it valued the non-proliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had conducted a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear domain, NAM regretted that Agency documents dating back to 1994 attested to the contrary.</p>
--	--

Non-Proliferation Treaty Related	
---	--

Disarmament Through the NPT	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 16) NAM Members that were Parties to the NPT, mindful of the consensus decision to convene, in 2012, a conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, had been profoundly disappointed that the conference had still not been convened, contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East and the collective agreement of the Parties to the NPT enshrined in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They had strongly rejected the conveners’ allegations of impediments to the convening of the conference on schedule. They urged the UN Secretary-General, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation to convene the conference without any further delay in order to avoid any negative repercussions on the relevance and credibility of the NPT, on the preparations for the NPT Review Conference, on the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime as a whole and on the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East.</p>
------------------------------------	---

	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 17) NAM Members that were Parties to the NPT feared that the failure of the 2015 NPT Review Conference to agree on the draft final document would have a negative impact on the NPT regime.</p>
<p>1995 Review and Extension of the NPT</p>	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 16) NAM Members that were Parties to the NPT, mindful of the consensus decision to convene, in 2012, a conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, had been profoundly disappointed that the conference had still not been convened, contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East and the collective agreement of the Parties to the NPT enshrined in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They had strongly rejected the conveners' allegations of impediments to the convening of the conference on schedule. They urged the UN Secretary-General, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation to convene the conference without any further delay in order to avoid any negative repercussions on the relevance and credibility of the NPT, on the preparations for the NPT Review Conference, on the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime as a whole and on the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East.</p>
<p>Access to Technology and Technology Transfer</p>	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 61) NAM reiterated its call for the transfer to Israel of nuclear-related equipment, information, material, facilities, devices and other resources, and for the provision to Israel of other assistance in nuclear-related scientific or technological fields to be totally and completely prohibited.</p>
<p>2000 and 2010 Action Plans</p>	<p>(GC(60)/OR.8, Para 16) NAM Members that were Parties to the NPT, mindful of the consensus decision to convene, in 2012, a conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, had been profoundly disappointed that the conference had still not been convened, contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East and the collective agreement of the Parties to the NPT enshrined in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They had strongly rejected the conveners' allegations of impediments to the convening of the conference on schedule. They urged the UN Secretary-General, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation to convene the conference without any further delay in order to avoid any negative repercussions on the relevance and credibility of the NPT, on the preparations for the NPT Review Conference, on the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime as a whole and on the establishment of an NWFZ in the Middle East.</p>