

**Preparatory Committee for the 2005 Review
Conference of the Parties to the Treaty
on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons**

NPT/CONF.2005/PC.II/SR.19
30 June 2003

Original: ENGLISH

Second session
Geneva, 28 April-9 May 2003

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 19th MEETING*

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 9 May 2003, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. MOLNÁR (Hungary)

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (continued)

- (a) ELECTION OF OFFICERS

ORGANIZATION OF THE 2005 REVIEW CONFERENCE (continued)

- (f) FINANCING OF THE REVIEW CONFERENCE, INCLUDING ITS
PREPARATORY COMMITTEE

REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE SESSION TO THE NEXT SESSION OF THE
PREPARATORY COMMITTEE

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

* No summary records were issued for the 5th-18th meetings.

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this Committee will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.03-61599 (E) 160503 300603

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (agenda item 7)
(continued)

(a) ELECTION OF OFFICERS

1. The CHAIR said that, as consultations in the regional groups regarding the chairmanship of the third session of the Preparatory Committee were still under way, he would take it that the Committee wished to defer the election of officers to the Committee's third session.

2. It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF THE 2005 REVIEW CONFERENCE (agenda item 9) (continued)

(f) FINANCING OF THE REVIEW CONFERENCE, INCLUDING ITS
PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (NPT/CONF.2005/PC.II/1)

3. The CHAIR drew attention to paragraph 16 of the Secretariat's note summarizing the estimated costs of the 2005 Review Conference, including the sessions of its Preparatory Committee, which stated that costs associated with the preparation and holding of the 2005 Review Conference and its preparatory process would be borne by the States parties to the Treaty and that there would be no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations. He had also been informed by the Secretariat that the services required for the sessions of the Preparatory Committee and the Conference itself could only be provided by the Secretariat if the necessary funds were received in advance as reflected in that paragraph. He took it that the Committee wished to take note of that document.

4. It was so decided.

REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE SESSION TO THE NEXT SESSION OF THE
PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (agenda item 8) (NPT/CONF.2005/PC.II/CRP.1)

5. The CHAIR drew attention to the draft report on the results of the current session and noted that the report was a factual summary and procedural in nature. He suggested that the Preparatory Committee should adopt it paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1-8

6. The CHAIR said that the list of States parties participating in the work of the Preparatory Committee would be updated by the secretariat, which would also fill in the blanks in paragraph 4.

7. Paragraphs 1-8 were adopted.

Paragraph 9

8. The CHAIR proposed that, in the light of the decision that the Committee had just taken, the paragraph should be redrafted to read as follows: “At its 19th meeting, on 9 May 2003, the Committee decided to defer the election of officers to the third session of the Preparatory Committee.”

9. Paragraph 9, as orally revised, was adopted.

Paragraphs 10-23

10. The CHAIR said that the blanks in paragraphs 15 and 22 would be filled by the secretariat, which would also update the list of documents in paragraph 20, to include all documents submitted after the preparation of the draft report.

11. Paragraphs 10-23 were adopted.

12. The report of the Preparatory Committee as a whole, as amended, was adopted.

13. Mr. HU (China) commended the Chair on his skilful conduct of the current session and the Secretary and her staff on its smooth functioning. While his delegation did not agree with some opinions expressed in the Chair’s factual summary regarding the nuclear activities of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the issue of a moratorium on fissile material production, it considered that the summary was, on the whole, balanced and, as it represented the Chair’s personal views rather than a consensus document, China neither sought to amend it nor opposed its inclusion as an annex to the report. He reiterated China’s view that the nuclear weapon-free status of the Korean peninsula should be maintained and that restraint and flexibility should be exercised in dealing with the issue.

14. In addition, China believed that only a comprehensive and balanced approach, conducive to the convergence of the positions held by different countries, could facilitate realization of all the objectives of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT); that parties should stick strictly to the final document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference and that expanded interpretation of its requirements was not acceptable. China agreed in principle to the specific proposals on negative security assurances by the New Agenda Coalition and looked forward to the conclusion at an early date of an international legal instrument on that issue. An international legal instrument was also required on the issue of fissile material production, while an undefined and unverifiable moratorium would only lead to more problems and adversely affect negotiations on a treaty. China pledged its readiness to work for implementation of the 13 practical steps and other necessary measures, in promoting the three pillars of nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

15. Mr. SEMMEL (United States of America) congratulated the Chair and his support staff on the successful accomplishment of their tasks. Turning to the factual summary, he said that, while it reflected the views of many States parties, including his own, regarding the importance of compliance with the non-proliferation obligations of the NPT, more attention should have been given, among other things, to the Islamic Republic of Iran, which, under cover of compliance with its NPT obligations, was actually developing clandestine nuclear facilities for

the development of an indigenous fuel cycle capable of supporting a nuclear weapons programme, raising serious questions about the real nature of its intentions. He stressed that the Islamic Republic of Iran should guarantee full access to all its facilities to IAEA and pledge transparency with the Agency and called for a comprehensive report on the issue from IAEA at the June 2003 meeting of its Board. It was essential for States parties to act firmly if the Islamic Republic of Iran proved not to be complying with its NPT obligations.

16. In the Middle East region, concerns were also being caused by other countries, including the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, and suppliers must scrutinize exports into the region to guard against sensitive nuclear transfers.

17. In addition, the references in the factual summary to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were, in his country's view, too weak. That country's cynical and dangerous conduct in developing a nuclear-weapons programme, seriously jeopardizing regional and international stability, merited the strongest condemnation. While the United States was prepared to work for a peaceful and multilateral solution, there was only one acceptable objective: the verifiable dismantling of the nuclear capacity of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the full denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

18. He also regretted that more attention had not been given in the factual summary to significant progress in reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons over the last 15 years and, to that end, he detailed advances by his country, including in conjunction with the Russian Federation, in implementation of the Global Partnership.

19. The United States also took exception to the affirmation in the factual summary that States parties remained committed to the 13 practical steps, since the United States did not support all 13 steps and believed that strict adherence to those steps should not be taken as the only measure of compliance with article VI. The fundamental test was whether parties were moving in the direction stipulated in that article and he gave assurances that the United States was fully meeting all its obligations in that regard.

20. Turning to the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, he stressed that his country's decisions to withdraw from that Treaty and to develop missile defence systems were entirely legal and responded to its legitimate defence needs. Those decisions had not, as alleged in the factual summary, contributed to global insecurity and instability: the cause of insecurity and instability was the heightened risk of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction posed by the actions of such countries as the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

21. While the United States did not support the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), it was not developing new nuclear weapons and maintained its moratorium on nuclear explosive testing.

22. He reiterated the challenge made by his country at the outset of the current session, that the core purpose of the NPT was to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and that excessive attention on disarmament at the expense of non-proliferation ignored the current realities in the world and was ultimately detrimental to the interests of the Treaty. Reaffirming his country's readiness to participate in a robust discussion of ways of moving towards nuclear disarmament,

he stressed that discussion was more urgently needed of ways of preventing nuclear proliferation and regretted that many of the States which had voiced their concerns about the alleged failure of nuclear-weapon States to move towards disarmament were turning a blind eye to the real risk of such proliferation by certain States parties. Compliance with articles II and III lay at the heart of the NPT and there was a critical need for a firm and effective response to the challenges posed by increasing non-compliance.

23. Mr. MOSTOVETS (Russian Federation) said that, while the factual summary was a balanced reflection of the positions taken by delegations at the session, his delegation was not entirely satisfied with all its elements and noted, in particular, that the last sentence of paragraph 26 could have been improved by reflecting that the States parties had welcomed the readiness of IAEA to resume its verification activities in Iraq and that the task of concluding that country's nuclear disarmament should be entrusted specifically to IAEA.

24. With regard to the mention in the factual summary of non-strategic weapons, he wished to place on record that the Russian Federation was fully complying with the disarmament undertakings it had given unilaterally in 1991-1992 in that area, as demonstrated by the materials that it had submitted at the current session. In addition, the Russian Federation fully supported implementation of all the 13 practical steps, which were intended to promote international stability by removing the danger of insecurity for all, and therefore opposed attempts artificially to separate non-strategic nuclear weapons from other types of weapons, through specious arguments about cold war symmetries. The Russian Federation accordingly felt that the point regarding non-strategic weapons could have been more strongly reflected in the factual summary.

25. Mr. KRIEKOUKIS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the European Union, and also of the countries acceding to and associated with the Union, expressed thanks and commendation to the Chair and the secretariat on the successful outcome of the session. He reaffirmed the Union's belief that the NPT was the most valuable instrument in the campaign to achieve general and comprehensive disarmament under effective and verifiable international control and restated its commitment to the goals of the NPT.

26. Mr. de LA FORTELLE (France), associating himself with the statement by Greece on behalf of the European Union, likewise commended the Chair and his team on their sterling performance. He said that, on the whole, the factual summary was a balanced reflection of the many points of consensus among all parties to the NPT but regretted that it had not accorded due importance to the issue of general and complete disarmament, an integral element of article VI. Among its other shortcomings, he also noted the omission of any reference to the principles of international stability and security, which had been strongly reaffirmed by several States, or to the reaffirmations by certain nuclear-weapon States, including his own, of the negative security assurances which they had given in 1995 to all NPT States parties. In France's view, additional weight should have been given to IAEA in the summary and to the issue of the peaceful uses of nuclear technology. Finally, the French delegation regretted that they had had to work almost exclusively on English documents throughout the session.

27. Mr. BROUCHER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that his country had been content for the factual summary to be annexed to the report but regretted that it failed to mention the maintenance of moratoriums by four nuclear-weapon States on the

production of fissile materials for nuclear weapon purposes and other safeguards measures and had glossed over the important reaffirmations by several nuclear-weapon States of their negative security assurances. Paragraph 10 of the summary, on accountability of nuclear disarmament measures, largely repeated the wording of the corresponding passage of the factual summary of the 2002 session, and his country repeated its view that the observation was unbalanced: implementation of non-proliferation commitments was also a key criterion for the operation of the NPT.

28. Particularly serious challenges were posed by non-compliance with the NPT and the proliferation of nuclear weapons and his delegation regretted that the summary had not given more prominence to that issue. In particular, the paragraph on the Islamic Republic of Iran did not adequately reflect discussion in the Committee, in which more than 40 States parties had expressed serious concerns about that country's actions and urged it to cooperate closely with IAEA. In conclusion, he stressed that the issues of proliferation and non-compliance with the NPT remained of critical importance.

29. Mr. CAUGHLEY (New Zealand), speaking on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition, comprising Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden, recognized that the factual summary did not represent a consensus, or even a majority of the views expressed, and noted that the process required at the Committee's next session would need to be substantially different, as the Committee moved closer towards the consensus decisions required at the review conference. It might therefore be necessary to revise the programme of work accordingly.

30. In conclusion, he pledged New Zealand's determination to work for implementation of article IV and the 13 practical steps and, in particular, for an unequivocal undertaking by nuclear-weapon States to work towards nuclear disarmament.

31. Ms. WHELAN (Ireland), conceding that the factual statement was of necessity a subjective document, regretted nonetheless that it had not always appropriately reflected the interest shown in certain issues and, in particular, the five ambassadors initiative put forward in the Conference on Disarmament, which, in her delegation's opinion, represented a way forward for the implementation of practical steps 3 and 4.

32. Mr. SARRA (Syrian Arab Republic), joining previous speakers in thanking the Chair and the secretariat on their hard work, said, with reference to paragraph 25 of the factual summary on the so-called "roadmap" for resolution of the Israel-Palestine issue, that compliance with the NPT should not be conditional on any other measures and, in particular, that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones should not be tied to other issues. Accordingly, it was essential for Israel to adhere to the NPT. In addition, the roadmap - albeit very important - was merely one in a series of measures to be implemented in the Middle East, which included Security Council resolutions 224 (1967) and 338 (1973), the outcome of the Madrid Conference and the "land for peace" principle. Finally, he stressed the need for commitment under the NPT to be implemented in a non-discriminatory manner.

33. Ms. GABR (Egypt), associating her delegation with the statement by New Zealand on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition, expressed thanks to the Chair for his hard work and to IAEA and the secretariat. With regard to the Middle East question, she reaffirmed Egypt's

commitment to full implementation of the decision of the 1995 Review Conference on the Middle East and the recommendation of the 2000 Review Conference on that issue, in particular, for Israel to accede to the NPT and to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. Noting the importance of the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones free of weapons of mass destruction to attainment of the goals of the NPT, she strongly urged that the creation of such zones should not be linked to political developments in the regions concerned.

34. Mr. HEINSBERG (Germany) associated himself with the comments made by the representative of Greece on behalf of the European Union. Describing the factual summary as a comprehensive summary of the debates, he said that it was now necessary to look forward to the Conference itself. He reiterated his call for a more focused approach, concentrating on compliance and ways of securing greater momentum for the disarmament process, and his readiness to cooperate to ensure that the Conference produced meaningful results.

35. Mr. DUARTE (Brazil) endorsed the comments made by the representative of New Zealand on behalf of the Coalition for a New Agenda. While he would have wished for greater emphasis on the problems of nuclear disarmament and the threats to the NPT, both internal and external, the Chair's summary was a balanced record of the successful discussions, which would contribute to strengthening the review process. He paid tribute to the Chair for his dedication, fairness and hard work, as well as to the secretariat.

36. Ms. HUSSAIN (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the members of the Non-Aligned Movement who were States parties to the NPT, expressed appreciation to the Chair and the secretariat for their efforts and welcomed the accession of Timor Leste to the Treaty. She noted that it had been agreed in the Final Document of the 2002 Conference that at its third session - to be chaired by a representative of the non-aligned countries - the Preparatory Committee would work hard to produce recommendations for presentation to the 2005 Conference. She was encouraged by the progress made during the second session, and welcomed the increased number of reports that had been submitted, especially on the implementation of article VI and the 13 practical steps.

37. Ms. INOGUCHI (Japan) expressed appreciation to the Chair and the secretariat for the smooth organization of the session. It was clear that the NPT maintained its integrity as a vital instrument, despite the major challenges it currently faced, and that all were agreed on the goal of the full implementation of the Treaty and addressed that goal in good faith. She welcomed the contributions made by non-governmental organizations, the paper on the role of civil society presented by Canada as well as other proposals and ideas put forward in order to facilitate the preparatory process for the Conference.

38. Mr. SMITH (Australia) congratulated the Chair on guiding the Committee to a successful conclusion, on the basis of thorough preparation in advance of the session, for which thanks also went to the Secretary. The Chair's summary was a substantive document which fairly reported the discussions. He singled out the clear message it contained regarding non-compliance by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and the urgent need to address that issue, as well as the wide support expressed in the Committee for strengthened IAEA safeguards and for the CTBT and a fissile material cut-off treaty. The NPT was an important treaty, and he urged all States parties to prepare carefully for the third session of the Committee in the interests of strengthening it.

39. Mr. ZAMANINIA (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, while little headway had been made towards the objective of nuclear disarmament, the NPT had achieved considerable success in the area of non-proliferation. A strong NPT and safeguards regime, which would be of benefit to all, required full compliance by all States.

40. A number of delegations had raised questions during the session concerning his country's nuclear programme. The appropriate venue for discussing such issues was IAEA, with which the Islamic Republic of Iran was committed to cooperate because it had nothing to hide. However, the country's historical experience over the past 20 years had led to a mentality of mistrust and caution, while the United States had shown itself to be unable or unwilling to view the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear programme objectively, that is, independently of the issue of bilateral relations.

41. The United States had devoted much effort during the session to challenging that programme, clearly illustrating the double standard it applied as between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Israel, a proven and substantiated proliferator. The United States' attitude was unfair as it prejudged issues which were still under study by IAEA and was couched in tendentious terms. That could only hamper the process of verification and inspection.

42. The Chair's summary inevitably reflected the climate which had been created in the Committee by the United States and others, and it should be viewed in that light. His position regarding paragraph 34 of the summary was well known, but since the summary was the personal responsibility of the Chair and not a negotiated text, and in a spirit of responsibility, confidence-building and transparency, he had decided not to challenge it.

43. In the same spirit his country had taken note of the questions raised concerning its nuclear programme, which would be studied by Iranian specialists and answered in due course. He pointed out that there were other questions raised by his delegation and many others concerning the implementation of article VI and the 13 practical steps which still awaited responses.

44. Concerning paragraph 25 of the Chair's summary, he emphasized that no efforts should be spared to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, which would undoubtedly promote peace and security in the region. Israel was the only non-party to the NPT in the area, and its unsafeguarded nuclear facilities constituted the main obstacle to attainment of the goals of the NPT.

45. Concerning paragraph 35, he placed on record his reservations concerning export control regimes, which he said were incompatible with the NPT.

46. Ms. RODRIGUEZ CAMEJO (Cuba) congratulated the Chair on the hard work which had produced an even-handed summary of the discussions, reflecting consensus in the Committee in many respects. She would have preferred to see firmer and more consistent treatment of the statements made concerning the need for full compliance with article VI, especially by the nuclear-weapon States. Cuba also considered implementation of the 13 practical steps to be mandatory for all States parties, and especially the nuclear-weapon States.

47. She pointed out that the drafting of paragraph 35 of the summary did not accurately reflect the discussion that had taken place. Export controls were an important element of the non-proliferation regime, but restrictions imposed for political reasons were incompatible with obligations under the NPT.
48. Mr. CHUNG (Republic of Korea) expressed appreciation to the Chairman and the secretariat for their role in ensuring the success of the session. The integrity, diplomatic skill and fairness of the Chair had enabled him to produce an excellent summary. Noting the passages relating to non-compliance by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, he expressed confidence that the highlighting of the problem would provide favourable grounds for a peaceful and successful resolution of the situation, the dismantling of that country's nuclear programme and its full compliance with its NPT obligations.
49. Mr. RAUF (International Atomic Energy Agency) pointed out that, while the Agency was not a party to the NPT, and hence could not comment on issues relating to the review or interpretation of the Treaty, it was a party to safeguards agreements, by virtue of which its Board of Governors was called upon to reach conclusions as to their implementation. Requests made to the Board at its March 2003 meeting to study and report on nuclear activities in one member State had not been acted on, but at the next meeting, in June, the Director-General would be reporting to the Board on various issues, including that of the implementation of safeguards agreements.
50. Mr. BROUCHER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking on behalf of the group of Western European and other countries, expressed appreciation to the Chair and the secretariat for their role in ensuring the success of the session.
51. Mr. OBIDOV (Uzbekistan), noting the reference in the Chair's summary to the efforts of five Central Asian countries to set up a nuclear-weapon-free zone, emphasized that the agreement they had concluded had been welcomed by many participants during the general debate, as well as by the General Assembly in resolution 57/69.
52. The CHAIR thanked preceding speakers for their kind words addressed to the Chair and their valuable comments aimed at further advancing the work of the Review Conference.
53. The Committee's session had demonstrated the enormous support the NPT enjoyed in the international community as the legal basis for global cooperation in nuclear-non-proliferation, disarmament and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Progress in those areas, as well as in addressing new challenges, would be bolstered by the ongoing review process.
54. He expressed satisfaction at the smooth progress of the discussions and the genuine if limited dialogue that had taken place - hallmarks of a productive review process. Progress had been made in addressing the remaining issues that continued to divide the States parties. The session had generated a rich body of statements, reports and working papers which would assist its successors.
55. Impressive agreement had been reached on many specific issues: solid support for multilateralism; general appreciation of the contributions of international law and organizations, especially IAEA, in supporting NPT goals; widespread recognition of the interdependence and

complementarity of the goals of non-proliferation and disarmament; substantial support for the maintenance, strengthening and enforcement of fully universal norms; the vital importance of compliance with every NPT commitment; the indispensable role of verification in building confidence; growing appreciation of the need for greater transparency; strong support for enhanced physical security measures to reduce the risk of nuclear terrorism; a firm collective will not to grant any special status to non-parties that had acquired sensitive nuclear capabilities; recognition of the need for key treaty commitments to be irreversible; the need to address both strategic and non-strategic nuclear weapons; the value of disarmament and non-proliferation education, and recognition of the important role of civil society; strong support for the 1995 Middle East resolution and efforts to implement it as soon as possible; and strong support for nuclear-weapon-free zones.

56. He concluded by thanking the participants for their support, the secretariat and other supporting staff, the Chair of the Committee at its first session, IAEA and all the non-governmental organizations which had contributed to the success of the session.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.