



Thematic Summary of the Positions of the Members of the Non-Aligned Movement in Plenary Meeting Records of the 66 th General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency	
Disarmament	
NAM Involvement and Contributions	<p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 109) NAM States Parties to the NPT regretted that, despite intensive consultations, at the 2015 NPT Review Conference it had not been possible to reach agreement on the draft Final Document, a failure which could have a negative impact on the NPT regime.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 113) Lastly, noting that NAM was fully committed to cooperating with the Director General and supporting his efforts to implement resolution GC(65)/RES/14, he said that NAM expected all other Member States to do likewise.</p>
United Nations Fora	
UN General Assembly	<p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 103) He said that NAM strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region where a continuing massive imbalance in military capabilities, in particular owing to the possession of nuclear weapons, allowed one party to threaten its neighbours and others in the region. In its conviction that the establishment of 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. Moreover, NAM remained 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 building confidence and was necessary for establishing an NWFZ in that region.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 111) NAM again welcomed the convening of the 2019 and 2021 sessions of the Conference on the Establishment of a Middle East Zone Free of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction, in accordance with General Assembly decision 73/546, in addition to the conference's Political Declaration. It looked forward to the third session of the conference, under the presidency of Lebanon, and called upon all States of the region, without exception, to participate actively in the conference, negotiate in good faith and bring to a conclusion a legally binding treaty on the establishment of the zone.</p>

	<p>NAM had appreciated the participation of the Agency in the first two sessions, including through the presentation of a background paper, and requested that the Director General participate in the third session as mandated by the decision of the General Assembly.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 112) NAM stressed that the Resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference and other decisions on the subject adopted within the context of the Review Conferences would remain valid until the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other WMDs in the Middle East was achieved. Implementation of General Assembly decision 73/546 (2018) was without prejudice to the validity of the resolution and decisions and should not be construed as their replacement.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 35) In its conviction that the establishment of 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(66)/OR.8, Para 41) Referring to Israel's previous communications on the matter to the effect that it valued the non-proliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had, over the years, demonstrated a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear realm, NAM noted with regret that the official records of the Agency were testimony to the contrary. NAM recalled the various resolutions adopted by the General Conference before 1994 regarding South Africa's nuclear capabilities in which it had recalled UN General Assembly resolutions concerning relations between Israel and South Africa and military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, which had strongly condemned the extensive collaboration between Israel and the then racist regime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in defiance of UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
<p>International Atomic Energy Agency</p>	<p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 102) Mr SHAHYAROV (Azerbaijan), speaking on behalf of NAM, welcomed the report set out in document GC(66)/12 and said that NAM was committed to its principled position on the application of Agency safeguards in the Middle East.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 103) He said that NAM strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region where a continuing massive imbalance in military capabilities, in particular owing to the possession of nuclear weapons, allowed one party to threaten its neighbours and others in the region. In its conviction that the establishment of 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. Moreover, NAM remained 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</p>

Agency safeguards in the Middle East was the first practical step towards building confidence and was necessary for establishing an NWFZ in that region.

(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 104) NAM welcomed the conclusion by those of its members that were parties to the NPT of CSAs with the Agency as non-nuclear-weapon States and noted that all States of the Middle East region except Israel were parties to the NPT and had undertaken to accept comprehensive Agency safeguards. It highlighted the accession of Palestine as a State Party to the NPT in February 2015 and welcomed the signing in June 2019 of a CSA between Palestine, as a non-nuclear-weapon State, and the Agency.

(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 105) NAM regretted Israel's continued insistence that Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process. There was no automatic sequence which linked the application of comprehensive safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East with the prior conclusion of a peace settlement, and the former would, in fact, contribute to the latter.

(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 106) NAM noted with regret that the Director General had not been able to make further progress in fulfilling his mandate pursuant to resolution GC(65)/RES/14 regarding the application of comprehensive Agency safeguards covering all nuclear activities in the Middle East. All Member States should work together to reverse that unacceptable situation. NAM urged all Member States to participate actively in promoting the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East region in particular.

(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 107) NAM noted that the Director General would continue consultations in accordance with his mandate regarding the early application of comprehensive Agency safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East region. It welcomed his efforts to encourage the development and consideration of new ideas and approaches that could help in that regard, requesting that he continue to brief Member States regularly on such efforts.

(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 110) NAM requested that the Director General continue his efforts and consultations with all Member States on arrangements conducive to the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs in the Middle East.

(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 111) NAM again welcomed the convening of the 2019 and 2021 sessions of the Conference on the Establishment of a Middle East Zone Free of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction, in accordance with General Assembly decision 73/546, in addition to the conference's Political Declaration. It looked forward to the third session of the conference, under the presidency of Lebanon, and called upon all States of the region, without exception, to participate actively in the conference, negotiate in good faith and bring to a conclusion a legally binding treaty on the establishment of the zone. NAM had appreciated the participation of the Agency in the first two sessions, including through the presentation of a background paper, and

	<p>requested that the Director General participate in the third session as mandated by the decision of the General Assembly.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 113) Lastly, noting that NAM was fully committed to cooperating with the Director General and supporting his efforts to implement resolution GC(65)/RES/14, he said that NAM expected all other Member States to do likewise.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 34) NAM welcomed the fact that its member States that were parties to the NPT had concluded CSAs with the Agency as non-nuclear-weapon States and noted that all States of the Middle East region except for Israel were parties to the NPT and had undertaken to accept comprehensive Agency safeguards.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 36) NAM noted with concern 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 continued and dangerous presence of Israeli nuclear facilities and activities that were not subject to comprehensive Agency safeguards, despite repeated calls on Israel to sign a CSA.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 38) All Member States should cooperate to rectify that unacceptable situation and achieve the universality of comprehensive Agency safeguards in the Middle East, first of all by implementing resolution GC(53/RES/17).</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 39) NAM regretted Israel’s continued insistence that Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process. The Group emphasized that there was no automatic sequence linking the application of comprehensive safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East to the prior conclusion of a peace settlement. The former would, in fact, contribute to the latter.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 41) Referring to Israel’s previous communications on the matter to the effect that it valued the non-proliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had, over the years, demonstrated a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear realm, NAM noted with regret that the official records of the Agency were testimony to the contrary. NAM recalled the various resolutions adopted by the General Conference before 1994 regarding South Africa’s nuclear capabilities in which it had recalled UN General Assembly resolutions concerning relations between Israel and South Africa and military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, which had strongly condemned the extensive collaboration between Israel and the then racist regime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in defiance of UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
<p>UN Security Council</p>	<p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 103) He said that NAM strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region where a continuing massive imbalance in military capabilities, in particular owing to the possession</p>

	<p>of nuclear weapons, allowed one party to threaten its neighbours and others in the region. In its conviction that the establishment of 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. Moreover, NAM remained 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 building confidence and was necessary for establishing an NWFZ in that region.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 35) In its conviction that the establishment of 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(66)/OR.8, Para 41) Referring to Israel’s previous communications on the matter to the effect that it valued the non-proliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had, over the years, demonstrated a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear realm, NAM noted with regret that the official records of the Agency were testimony to the contrary. NAM recalled the various resolutions adopted by the General Conference before 1994 regarding South Africa’s nuclear capabilities in which it had recalled UN General Assembly resolutions concerning relations between Israel and South Africa and military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, which had strongly condemned the extensive collaboration between Israel and the then racist regime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in defiance of UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
Peaceful Uses	
Access to Nuclear Technology	<p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 40) NAM reiterated its call for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear-related scientific or technological fields to Israel.</p>
NWFZs	
Contributions to Disarmament	<p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 103) He said that NAM strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region where a continuing massive imbalance in military capabilities, in particular owing to the possession of nuclear weapons, allowed one party to threaten its neighbours and</p>

	<p>others in the region. In its conviction that the establishment of 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. Moreover, NAM remained 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 building confidence and was necessary for establishing an NWFZ in that region.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 35) In its conviction that the establishment of 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>Middle East WMDFZ</p>	<p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 103) He said that NAM strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region where a continuing massive imbalance in military capabilities, in particular owing to the possession of nuclear weapons, allowed one party to threaten its neighbours and others in the region. In its conviction that the establishment of 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. Moreover, NAM remained 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 building confidence and was necessary for establishing an NWFZ in that region.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 108) Recalling the decision reached by consensus in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference on the convening, in 2012, of a conference on the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, NAM State Parties to the NPT reiterated their profound disappointment that the 2010 Action Plan had not been implemented, as that ran counter to the letter and spirit of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East, which constituted the original terms of reference for establishing the zone, and violated the collective agreement reached at the 2010 NPT Review Conference.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 110) NAM requested that the Director General continue his efforts and consultations with all Member States on arrangements conducive to the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs in the Middle East.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 111) NAM again welcomed the convening of the 2019 and 2021 sessions of the Conference on the Establishment of a</p>

	<p>Middle East Zone Free of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction, in accordance with General Assembly decision 73/546, in addition to the conference’s Political Declaration. It looked forward to the third session of the conference, under the presidency of Lebanon, and called upon all States of the region, without exception, to participate actively in the conference, negotiate in good faith and bring to a conclusion a legally binding treaty on the establishment of the zone. NAM had appreciated the participation of the Agency in the first two sessions, including through the presentation of a background paper, and requested that the Director General participate in the third session as mandated by the decision of the General Assembly.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 112) NAM stressed that the Resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference and other decisions on the subject adopted within the context of the Review Conferences would remain valid until the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other WMDs in the Middle East was achieved. Implementation of General Assembly decision 73/546 (2018) was without prejudice to the validity of the resolution and decisions and should not be construed as their replacement.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 35) In its conviction that the establishment of 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>
--	---

Country Specific	
-------------------------	--

Israel	<p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 103) He said that NAM strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region where a continuing massive imbalance in military capabilities, in particular owing to the possession of nuclear weapons, allowed one party to threaten its neighbours and others in the region. In its conviction that the establishment of 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. Moreover, NAM remained 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 building confidence and was necessary for establishing an NWFZ in that region.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 104) NAM welcomed the conclusion by those of its members that were parties to the NPT of CSAs with the Agency as non-nuclear-weapon States and noted that all States of the Middle East region except Israel were parties to the NPT and had undertaken to accept comprehensive Agency safeguards. It highlighted the accession</p>
---------------	---

of Palestine as a State Party to the NPT in February 2015 and welcomed the signing in June 2019 of a CSA between Palestine, as a non-nuclear-weapon State, and the Agency.

(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 105) NAM regretted Israel's continued insistence that Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process. There was no automatic sequence which linked the application of comprehensive safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East with the prior conclusion of a peace settlement, and the former would, in fact, contribute to the latter.

(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 33) Mr AKHUNDOV (Azerbaijan), speaking on behalf of NAM, said that the Group strongly believed that stability could not be achieved in a region where a continuing massive imbalance in military capabilities, in particular owing to the possession of nuclear weapons, allowed one party to threaten its neighbours and others in the region.

(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 34) NAM welcomed the fact that its member States that were parties to the NPT had concluded CSAs with the Agency as non-nuclear-weapon States and noted that all States of the Middle East region except for Israel were parties to the NPT and had undertaken to accept comprehensive Agency safeguards.

(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 36) NAM noted with concern 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 continued and dangerous presence of Israeli nuclear facilities and activities that were not subject to comprehensive Agency safeguards, despite repeated calls on Israel to sign a CSA.

(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 37) NAM expressed great concern regarding the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel, which posed a serious and continuing threat to the security of its neighbouring and other States, and regarding the continuing provision of access for Israeli scientists to the nuclear facilities of one nuclear-weapon State.

(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 39) NAM regretted Israel's continued insistence that Agency safeguards could not be addressed in isolation from the regional peace process. The Group emphasized that there was no automatic sequence linking the application of comprehensive safeguards to all nuclear activities in the Middle East to the prior conclusion of a peace settlement. The former would, in fact, contribute to the latter.

(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 40) NAM reiterated its call for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear-related scientific or technological fields to Israel.

(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 41) Referring to Israel's previous communications on the matter to the effect that it valued the non-

	<p>proliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had, over the years, demonstrated a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear realm, NAM noted with regret that the official records of the Agency were testimony to the contrary. NAM recalled the various resolutions adopted by the General Conference before 1994 regarding South Africa's nuclear capabilities in which it had recalled UN General Assembly resolutions concerning relations between Israel and South Africa and military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, which had strongly condemned the extensive collaboration between Israel and the then racist regime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in defiance of UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">South Africa</p>	<p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 41) Referring to Israel's previous communications on the matter to the effect that it valued the non-proliferation regime, acknowledged its importance and had, over the years, demonstrated a responsible policy of restraint in the nuclear realm, NAM noted with regret that the official records of the Agency were testimony to the contrary. NAM recalled the various resolutions adopted by the General Conference before 1994 regarding South Africa's nuclear capabilities in which it had recalled UN General Assembly resolutions concerning relations between Israel and South Africa and military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, which had strongly condemned the extensive collaboration between Israel and the then racist regime of South Africa, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in defiance of UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.</p>
<p>Non-Proliferation Treaty Related</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Disarmament Through the NPT</p>	<p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 108) Recalling the decision reached by consensus in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference on the convening, in 2012, of a conference on the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, NAM State Parties to the NPT reiterated their profound disappointment that the 2010 Action Plan had not been implemented, as that ran counter to the letter and spirit of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East, which constituted the original terms of reference for establishing the zone, and violated the collective agreement reached at the 2010 NPT Review Conference.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 109) NAM States Parties to the NPT regretted that, despite intensive consultations, at the 2015 NPT Review Conference it had not been possible to reach agreement on the draft Final Document, a failure which could have a negative impact on the NPT regime.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">1995 Review and Extension of the NPT</p>	

	<p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 108) Recalling the decision reached by consensus in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference on the convening, in 2012, of a conference on the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, NAM State Parties to the NPT reiterated their profound disappointment that the 2010 Action Plan had not been implemented, as that ran counter to the letter and spirit of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East, which constituted the original terms of reference for establishing the zone, and violated the collective agreement reached at the 2010 NPT Review Conference.</p> <p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 112) NAM stressed that the Resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference and other decisions on the subject adopted within the context of the Review Conferences would remain valid until the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other WMDs in the Middle East was achieved. Implementation of General Assembly decision 73/546 (2018) was without prejudice to the validity of the resolution and decisions and should not be construed as their replacement.</p>
<p>Access to Technology and Technology Transfer</p>	<p>(GC(66)/OR.8, Para 40) NAM reiterated its call for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear-related scientific or technological fields to Israel.</p>
<p>2000 and 2010 Action Plans</p>	<p>(GC(66)/OR.7, Para 108) Recalling the decision reached by consensus in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference on the convening, in 2012, of a conference on the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMDs, NAM State Parties to the NPT reiterated their profound disappointment that the 2010 Action Plan had not been implemented, as that ran counter to the letter and spirit of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East, which constituted the original terms of reference for establishing the zone, and violated the collective agreement reached at the 2010 NPT Review Conference.</p>