



Thematic Summary of the Positions of the Members of the Non-Aligned Movement in Plenary Meeting Records of the 62nd General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency

United Nations Fora

<p>UN General Assembly</p>	<p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 12) Mr CHACÓN ESCAMILLO (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of NAM, welcomed the report set out in document GC(62)/6 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. In its conviction that an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards global nuclear disarmament, NAM reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 84) 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 resolutions of the UN General Assembly and Security Council. 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>International Atomic Energy Agency</p>	<p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 12) Mr CHACÓN ESCAMILLO (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of NAM, welcomed the report set out in document GC(62)/6 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. In its conviction that an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards global nuclear disarmament, NAM reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 13) NAM was also convinced that the effective and efficient application of Agency safeguards in the Middle East</p>

promoted greater confidence among States in the region. Achieving the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East was the first practical step towards confidence-building among the States there, and was a necessary step towards the establishment of an NWFZ in that region. NAM was pleased that its members that were Parties to the NPT had concluded CSAs with the Agency as non-nuclear-weapon States.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 14) 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 the approval by the Board of Governors of a CSA between Palestine and the Agency in connection with NPT Article III.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 15) 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.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 16) NAM also regretted that the Director General had not been able to make further progress in fulfilling his mandate under resolution GC(61)/RES/14 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, the campaign to achieve the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 17) 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 him to continue to brief Member States regularly thereon.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 20) NAM requested the Director General to continue to consult Member States on arrangements for establishing an NWFZ in the Middle East and expected all Member States of the Agency to support his efforts to implement resolution GC(61)/RES/14.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 21) NAM seconded the draft resolution submitted by Egypt on the item under discussion.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 83) 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>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 84) 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 resolutions of the UN General Assembly and Security Council. 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>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 86) 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(62)/OR.8, Para 88) 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 noted with regret that Agency documents had attested to the contrary, notably, General Conference resolutions adopted prior to 1994 condemning Israel's military and nuclear collaboration with the racist regime of apartheid South Africa.</p> <p>(GC(62)/OR.9, Para 42) Ms PEÑA (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of NAM, congratulated the President on her successful stewardship of the session and expressed appreciation to the Vice-Presidents. She commended the Chair of the Committee of the Whole for his skilled conduct of proceedings.</p>
<p>UN Security Council</p>	<p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 12) Mr CHACÓN ESCAMILLO (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of NAM, welcomed the report set out in document GC(62)/6 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. In its conviction that an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards global nuclear disarmament, NAM reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 84) 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 resolutions of the UN General Assembly and Security Council. 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(62)/OR.8, Para 87) 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(62)/OR.8, Para 12) Mr CHACÓN ESCAMILLO (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of NAM, welcomed the report set out in document GC(62)/6 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. In its conviction that an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards global nuclear disarmament, NAM reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 84) 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 resolutions of the UN General Assembly and Security Council. 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(62)/OR.8, Para 12) Mr CHACÓN ESCAMILLO (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of NAM, welcomed the report set out in document GC(62)/6 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</p>

	<p>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. In its conviction that an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards global nuclear disarmament, NAM reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p> <p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 13) NAM was also convinced that the effective and efficient application of Agency safeguards in the Middle East promoted greater confidence among States in the region. Achieving the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East was the first practical step towards confidence-building among the States there, and was a necessary step towards the establishment of an NWFZ in that region. NAM 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(62)/OR.8, Para 18) 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.</p> <p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 20) NAM requested the Director General to continue to consult Member States on arrangements for establishing an NWFZ in the Middle East and expected all Member States of the Agency to support his efforts to implement resolution GC(61)/RES/14.</p> <p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 84) 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 resolutions of the UN General Assembly and Security Council. 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>
Country Specific	
Israel	<p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 12) Mr CHACÓN ESCAMILLO (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of NAM, welcomed the report set out in document GC(62)/6 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</p>

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. In its conviction that an NWFZ in the Middle East would be a positive step towards global nuclear disarmament, NAM reiterated its support for the establishment of such a zone in accordance with the relevant UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 14) 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 the approval by the Board of Governors of a CSA between Palestine and the Agency in connection with NPT Article III.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 15) 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.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 82) 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.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 83) 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(62)/OR.8, Para 84) 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 resolutions of the UN General Assembly and Security Council. 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(62)/OR.8, Para 85) 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.

(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 87) NAM reiterated its call for the transfer to Israel of nuclear-related equipment, information, material, facilities,

	<p>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(62)/OR.8, Para 88) 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 noted with regret that Agency documents had attested to the contrary, notably, General Conference resolutions adopted prior to 1994 condemning Israel’s military and nuclear collaboration with the racist regime of apartheid South Africa.</p>
<p>South Africa</p>	<p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 88) 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 noted with regret that Agency documents had attested to the contrary, notably, General Conference resolutions adopted prior to 1994 condemning Israel’s military and nuclear collaboration with the racist regime of apartheid South Africa.</p>
<p>Non-Proliferation Treaty Related</p>	
<p>Disarmament Through the NPT</p>	<p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 18) 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.</p> <p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 19) 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(62)/OR.8, Para 18) 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.</p>
<p>Access to Technology and Technology Transfer</p>	<p>(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 87) NAM reiterated its call for the transfer to Israel of nuclear-related equipment, information, material, facilities,</p>

	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.
2000 and 2010 Action Plans	(GC(62)/OR.8, Para 18) 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.