



The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) Database

Summit Summary of the 16 th Heads of State Summit, Tehran, Iran (2012)	
Disarmament	
Nuclear weapon convention	<p>Para 151. The Heads of State or Government... underscored the need for the NWS to implement the unequivocal undertaking that they provided in 2000 and further reiterated in 2010 so as to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons, and emphasized, in this regard, the urgent need to commence and to bring to a conclusion negotiations on comprehensive and complete nuclear disarmament without delay.</p> <p>Para 162. The Heads of State or Government, while recalling the Statement on the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons adopted by the XVI Ministerial Conference and Commemorative Meeting of the NAM in Bali, Indonesia, from 23 to 27 May 2011, reiterated their firm commitment to work for convening a high level international conference to identify ways and means of eliminating nuclear weapons, at the earliest possible date, with the objective of an agreement on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use, and to provide for their destruction.</p> <p>Para 167. The Heads of State or Government agreed that there remains an ever growing and most pressing need for concrete actions by Nuclear-Weapon States, to take further substantive and practical measures urgently, according to their multilaterally agreed commitments, to attain the goal of complete nuclear disarmament within a specified framework of time.</p> <p>Para 181. The Heads of State or Government noted with concern the lack of agreement on a number of key priorities of NAM States Parties to the NPT, including inter alia, to begin negotiations on a Nuclear-Weapons-Convention...</p>
Verification	<p>Para 165. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the application of the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability by NWS in all measures related to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations.</p>
Nuclear weapons state, arms race and bilateral disarmament	<p>Para 152. The Heads of State or Government, while noting the recent statements by NWS of their intention to pursue actions in achieving a world free of nuclear weapons, reaffirmed the need for urgent concrete actions by the NWS to achieve this goal in accordance with their nuclear disarmament legal obligations and commitments.</p> <p>Para 166. The Heads of State or Government, while noting the conclusion and entry into force of the New START Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States, stressed that reductions in</p>

	<p>deployments and in operational status cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons. In this context they called on the United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to such cuts, to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, thus contributing to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations and facilitating the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons at the earliest date.</p>
<p>Nonproliferation and disarmament</p>	<p>Para 148. The Heads of State or Government reiterated their continued concern over the current difficult and complex situation in the field of disarmament and international security. In this regard, they called for renewed efforts to resolve the current impasse in achieving nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects.</p> <p>Para 149. Reaffirming the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, the Heads of State or Government reiterated their determination to promote multilateralism as the core principle of negotiations in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. In this regard, they welcomed the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 66/32 on Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.</p> <p>Para 151. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the Movement's principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remains its highest priority, and on the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects. They stressed the importance that efforts aiming at nuclear non-proliferation should be parallel to simultaneous efforts aiming at nuclear disarmament...</p> <p>Para 155. The Heads of State or Government emphasized that progress in nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is essential to strengthening international peace and security. They reaffirmed that efforts toward nuclear disarmament, global and regional approaches and confidence building measures complement each other and should, wherever possible, be pursued simultaneously to promote regional and international peace and security. In this context, they stressed that nuclear disarmament, as the highest priority established by SSODI and as a multilateral legal obligation, should not be made conditional on confidence building measures or other disarmament efforts.</p>
<p>International humanitarian law and ICJ</p>	<p>Para 157. The Heads of State or Government...reaffirmed the importance of the unanimous conclusion of the ICJ that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and to bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.</p>
<p>Modernization of nuclear weapons</p>	<p>Para 154. The Heads of State or Government reiterated, with concern, that improvements in existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as envisaged in the United States Nuclear Posture Review contravene the security assurances provided by the NWS. They stressed once again that these improvements as well as the</p>

	<p>development of new types of such weapons violate the commitments undertaken by the NWS at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).</p> <p>Para 209. Mindful of the threat posed to humankind by the existing weapons of mass destruction, particularly Nuclear Weapons and underlining the need for the total elimination of such weapons, the Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the need to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction and therefore supported the necessity of monitoring the situation and triggering international action as required.</p>
<p>Missiles</p>	<p>Para 168. The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defence systems and the threat of weaponization of outer space which have, inter alia, contributed to the further erosion of an international climate conducive to the promotion of disarmament and the strengthening of international security...They remained seriously concerned at the negative security consequences of the deployment of strategic missile defence systems which could trigger an arms race(s) and lead to the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>Para 171. They also emphasized the need to keep the issue of missiles in all its aspects on the agenda of the UN General Assembly and welcomed that the Panel of Governmental Experts established in accordance with Resolution 59/67 successfully concluded its work in 2008 and submitted its report to the 63rd session of the UN General Assembly. While welcoming the adoption by consensus for the first time of the UNGA decision 66/516 on "Missiles", the Heads of State or Government encouraged follow up efforts to further examine the elements contained in the conclusions of the Secretary-General's Report A/63/176. Pending the achievement of such a universal approach related to delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction, any initiative to address these concerns effectively and in a sustainable and comprehensive manner should be through an inclusive process of negotiations in a forum where all States could participate as equals. They stressed the importance of the security concerns of all States at regional and global levels in any approach to the issue of missiles in all its aspects.</p>
<p>General views on disarmament and NAM involvement</p>	<p>Para 147. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed and reiterated the long-standing principled positions of the Movement on disarmament and international security, including the decisions taken at the XII Summit in Durban in 1998, the XIII Summit in Kuala Lumpur in 2003, the XIV Summit in Havana in 2006, the XV Summit in Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt, in July 2009, the XIII Ministerial Conference in Cartagena in 2000, the XIV Ministerial Conference in Durban in 2004, the Ministerial Meeting held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, in 2006, the XV Ministerial Conference held in Teheran, Islamic Republic of Iran, in 2008 and the XVI Ministerial Conference and Commemorative Meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement held in Bali, Indonesia, in May 2011.</p> <p>Para 151. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the Movement's</p>

	<p>principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remains its highest priority, and on the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects. They stressed the importance that efforts aiming at nuclear non-proliferation should be parallel to simultaneous efforts aiming at nuclear disarmament. They stressed their concern at the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and of their possible use or threat of use. They reiterated deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the Nuclear-Weapon States (NWS) to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals in accordance with their relevant multilateral legal obligations. They underscored the need for the NWS to implement the unequivocal undertaking that they provided in 2000 and further reiterated in 2010 so as to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons, and emphasized, in this regard, the urgent need to commence and to bring to a conclusion negotiation on comprehensive and complete nuclear disarmament without delay.</p> <p>Para 155. The Heads of State or Government emphasized that progress in nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is essential to strengthening international peace and security. They reaffirmed that efforts toward nuclear disarmament, global and regional approaches and confidence building measures complement each other and should, wherever possible, be pursued simultaneously to promote regional and international peace and security.</p> <p>Para 160. The Heads of State or Government welcomed efforts of NAM Member States in advancing the goal of nuclear disarmament. In this regard, they noted the convening by the Islamic Republic of Iran of the first and second International Conferences on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, in Tehran, on 17-18 April 2010 and 12-13 June, 2011, under the theme: "Nuclear Energy for everyone, Nuclear Weapon for no one."</p>
<p>Multilateralism</p>	<p>Para 149. Reaffirming the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, the Heads of State or Government reiterated their determination to promote multilateralism as the core principle of negotiations in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. In this regard, they welcomed the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 66/32 on Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.</p> <p>Para 150. The Heads of State or Government reiterated their strong concern at the growing resort to unilateralism and in this context, underlined that multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions, in accordance with the UN Charter, provide the only sustainable method of addressing disarmament and international security issues.</p>
<p>Environmental considerations</p>	<p>Para 177. The Heads of State or Government emphasized the importance of the observance of environmental norms in the preparation and implementation of disarmament and arms limitation agreements, and in this regard, they welcomed the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 66/31 on this matter without a vote. They reaffirmed that international disarmament forums should take fully into account the relevant</p>

	<p>environmental norms in negotiating treaties and agreements on disarmament and arms limitation and that all States, through their actions, should contribute fully to ensuring compliance with the aforementioned norms in the implementation of treaties and conventions to which they are parties.</p> <p>Para 221. The Heads of State or Government underlined the importance of the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 65/55, taking into consideration the possible harmful effects to human health and the environment, caused by the use of weapons and munitions containing depleted uranium.</p>
<p>United Nations Fora</p>	
<p>UNGA and SSOD</p>	<p>Para 155. The Heads of State or Government...stressed that nuclear disarmament, as the highest priority established by SSODI and as a multilateral legal obligation, should not be made conditional on confidence building measures or other disarmament efforts.</p> <p>Para 161. The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the convening of the Fourth Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-IV) and expressed their deep concern, over the fact that the SSOD IV is yet to be convened, despite efforts for many years in this regard. In this context, they welcomed the overwhelming support received by the Non-Aligned Movement’s UNGA resolution 65/66 entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”. They urged the UN Secretary-General to make available all necessary technical, financial and human resources to implement the resolution. They stressed the importance of active participation in the open-ended working group established by the resolution to consider and reach consensus on the objectives and agenda, including the possible establishment of the preparatory committee for SSODIV.</p>
<p>UNSC</p>	<p>Para 208. While noting the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004), resolution 1673 (2006), resolution 1810 (2008) and resolution 1977 (2011) by the Security Council, the Heads of State or Government underlined the need to ensure that any action by the Security Council does not undermine the UN Charter and existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction and of international organizations established in this regard, as well as the role of the General Assembly. They further cautioned against the continuing practice of the Security Council to utilize its authority to define the legislative requirements for Member States in implementing Security Council decisions. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government stressed the importance of the issue of non-state actors acquiring weapons of mass destruction to be addressed in an inclusive manner by the General Assembly, taking into account the views of all Member States.</p>
<p>Test Ban and CTBT</p>	<p>Para 154. The Heads of State or Government...stressed once again that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate the commitments undertaken by the NWS at the time of</p>

	<p>the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).</p> <p>Para 164. The Heads of State or Government stressed the significance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), including by all NWS, which, inter alia, should contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament. The Heads of State or Government reiterated that if the objectives of the Treaty were to be fully realized, the continued commitment of all States signatories, especially the NWS, to nuclear disarmament would be essential. In this context, the ratification of the CTBT by Guatemala, Guinea and Indonesia was welcomed.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">UNDC</p>	<p>Para 156. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance and the relevance of the UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) as the sole specialized, deliberative body within the UN multilateral disarmament machinery. They continued to fully support the work of the UNDC and expressed regret that UNDC was unable to reach agreement on recommendations on its three agenda items during substantive sessions of its three-year cycle ending in April 2011 due to the lack of political will and inflexible positions of certain Nuclear Weapons States... The Heads of State or Government, while recalling the proposals submitted by the Movement, during the 2012 substantive session, called upon UN Member States to display the necessary political will and flexibility in order to achieve agreement on recommendations during the substantive sessions of its three-year cycle ending in 2014.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">IAEA</p>	<p>Para 175. The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the efforts of the Arab Group in Vienna to keep the question of the Israeli nuclear capabilities under consideration of the General Conference of the IAEA.</p> <p>Para 191. The Heads of State or Government, emphasizing the importance of the positive role played by the Non-Aligned Members in the IAEA, stressed the necessity that all members of the IAEA strictly observe its Statute. They stressed that any undue pressure or interference in the Agency's activities, especially its verification process, which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the Agency, should be avoided. They recognized that the IAEA is the sole competent authority for verification of compliance with the obligations under the respective safeguard agreements of the Member States. They also reaffirmed that a clear distinction has to be made between the legal obligations of Member States under their respective safeguards agreements and their voluntary undertakings, in order to ensure that such voluntary undertakings are not turned into legal safeguards obligations. Bearing in mind the Agency's responsibility in protecting safeguards' confidential information and given the undesirable incidents of leakage of such information, the Heads of State or Government emphasized the need for strengthening the regime for the protection of safeguards confidential information.</p> <p>Para 197. The Heads of State or Government emphasized that the IAEA is the sole intergovernmental organization within the UN system with the mandate and expertise to deal with the technical subjects of nuclear safety and nuclear security.</p>

Chemical and Biological Weapons

Chemical weapons

Para 201. The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) invited all States that have not yet signed or ratified the Convention to do so as soon as possible with a view to its universality. They reaffirmed that the effective contribution of the Convention to international and regional peace and security can be enhanced through its full implementation, and in this context also encouraged all States Parties that have not yet done so to engage with the Technical Secretariat of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons on the steps that need to be undertaken for the national implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of international cooperation in the field of chemical activities for purposes not prohibited under the Chemical Weapons Convention. They reiterated their call on the developed countries to promote international cooperation for the benefit of States Parties through the transfer of technology, material and equipment for peaceful purposes in the chemical field and the removal of all and any discriminatory restrictions that are contrary to the letter and spirit of the Convention. They recalled that the full, balanced, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of all provisions of the Convention in particular economic and technical development through international cooperation, is fundamental to the achievement of its object and purpose. The Heads of State or Government expressed their serious concern on the indications by certain possessor states parties that they will not meet their obligations regarding the deadlines for the total elimination of chemical weapons and that 36.28% of chemical weapons still remained to be destroyed as of 31st January 2012. While taking note of the decision on the Final Extended Deadline of 29 April, 2012 that was adopted by the 16th Session of the Conference of States Parties, they urged all possessor State Parties to take every necessary measure with a view to ensuring their compliance with the final extended destruction deadline in order to uphold the credibility and integrity of the Convention.

Para 202. The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the CWC reaffirmed that the implementation of the Article X of the CWC on assistance and protection against chemical weapons make a significant contribution to countering the threats of use of chemical weapons. They stressed the importance of achieving and maintaining a high level of readiness of the OPCW to provide timely and needed assistance and protection against use or threat of use of chemical weapons, including assistance to the victims of chemical weapons.

Para 203. The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the CWC welcomed the decision on Components of an agreed framework for the full implementation of Article XI adopted at the 16th Conference of the States Parties of the CWC and considered it as a positive step towards achieving the goal of the full, effective and nondiscriminatory

	<p>implementation of Article XI.</p> <p>Para 204. The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the CWC, while paying due respect to the chemical weapons victims and their families, declare their firm conviction that international support to provide special care and assistance to all victims suffering the effects of exposure to chemical weapons is an urgent humanitarian need and that the States Parties to the Convention as well as the OPCW should pay urgent attention to meeting these needs. In this context, they welcomed the decision adopted at the 16th Session of the Conference of States Parties to establish an International Support Network for Victims of Chemical Weapons and a voluntary Trust Fund for this purpose.</p>
<p>Biological weapons</p>	<p>Para 199. ...NAM States Parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC) reaffirmed that the possibility of any use of bacteriological (biological) agents and toxins as weapons should be completely excluded, and the conviction that such use would be repugnant to the conscience of humankind. They recognized the particular importance of strengthening the Convention through multilateral negotiations for a legally binding Protocol and universal adherence to the Convention. They reiterated their call to promote international cooperation for peaceful purposes, including scientific-technical exchange. They underlined the importance to maintain close coordination among the NAM States Parties to the Convention and highlighted that the Convention on Biological and Toxin Weapons forms a whole and that, although it is possible to consider certain aspects separately, it is critical to deal with all of the issues interrelated to this Convention in a balanced and comprehensive manner.</p> <p>Para 200. ...States Parties to the BTWC welcomed the active participation by NAM States Parties in the Seventh BTWC Review Conference held in Switzerland from 5-22 December 2011, to advance their positions on this Convention, particularly their key role in the adoption of the important decisions related to the implementation of Article X of the BTWC, especially by emphasizing the need for enhancing international cooperation, assistance and exchanges in toxins, biological agents equipment and technology for peaceful purposes, bearing in mind the Action Plan on the implementation of Article X submitted by the NAM States Parties at the Sixth Review Conference, and the additional NAM States Parties' proposal on a mechanism for the full, implementation of Article X of the Convention presented more recently. They further encouraged the BTWC States Parties to implement the Article X, as set forth in paragraphs 50-61 of the Final Document of the seventh BTWC Review Conference. They also welcomed the outcome of the Seventh Review Conference and in particular its decision to include cooperation and assistance as one of the Standing Agenda Items, with a particular focus on strengthening cooperation and assistance under Article X, as well as the Conference's decision to establish a database system to facilitate requests for and offers of exchange of assistance and cooperation among States Parties, and the establishment of a Sponsorship Programme, funded by voluntary contributions from States Parties, in order to support and increase the participation of developing</p>

	States Parties in the meetings of the intersessional programme in the framework of the BTWC.
Outer space	
General views on outer space	<p>Para 169. The Heads of State or Government recognized the common interest of all mankind and the sovereign rights of all State in the exploration and use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes, and emphasized that prevention of an arms race in outer space, including a ban to deploy or use weapons therein, would avert a grave danger for international peace and security.</p> <p>Para 171. The Heads of State or Government...emphasized the contribution of peaceful uses of space technologies, including space launch vehicle technologies, to human advancement, such as for telecommunications and data gathering on natural disasters.</p>
International treaty on outer space	<p>Para 169. The Heads of State or Government...further emphasized the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also reemphasized the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD, inter alia, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, taking note of the joint Russian-Chinese initiative of a draft treaty on the “Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects” (PPWT) presented in the Conference on Disarmament on 12 February 2008. They noted that this initiative is a constructive contribution to the work of the Conference, and is a good basis for further discussion toward adopting an international binding instrument.</p>
Information Security	<p>Para 170. While noting that considerable progress has been made in developing and applying the latest information technologies and means of telecommunication, the Heads of State or Government expressed concern that these technologies and means can potentially be used for purposes that are inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international stability and security and may adversely affect the integrity of the infrastructure of States to the detriment of their security in both civil and military fields. In this regard and while taking into account the ongoing efforts within the United Nations, the Heads of State or Government call upon Member States to further promote at multilateral levels the consideration of existing and potential threats in the field of information security, as well as possible strategies to address the threats emerging in this field. The Heads of State or Government emphasize that these technologies and means should be utilized by Member States in a manner consistent with international law and the principles and purposes of the UN Charter.</p>
Nonproliferation	

<p>Nonproliferation and noncompliance</p>	<p>Para 198. The Heads of State or Government stressed that the issues related to proliferation, should be resolved through political and diplomatic means, and that measures and initiatives taken in this regard should be within the framework of international law, relevant conventions and the UN Charter, and should contribute to the promotion of international peace, security and stability.</p> <p>Para 206. The Heads of State or Government regretted unsubstantiated allegations of noncompliance with relevant instruments on weapons of mass destruction and called on States Parties to such instruments that make such allegations to follow procedures set out in those instruments and to provide necessary substantiation for their allegations. They called upon all States Parties to the respective international instruments to implement fully and in a transparent manner all their obligations under these instruments.</p>
<p>General views on nonproliferation</p>	<p>Para 198. The Heads of State or Government stressed that the issues related to proliferation, should be resolved through political and diplomatic means, and that measures and initiatives taken in this regard should be within the framework of international law, relevant conventions and the UN Charter, and should contribute to the promotion of international peace, security and stability.</p> <p>Para 187. The Heads of State or Government...emphasized that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and nondiscriminatory agreements. Non-proliferation control arrangements should be transparent and open to participation by all States, and should ensure that they do not impose restrictions on access to material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes required by developing countries for their continued development.</p>
<p>WMD terrorism</p>	<p>Para 208. While noting the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004), resolution 1673 (2006), resolution 1810 (2008) and resolution 1977 (2011) by the Security Council, the Heads of State or Government underlined the need to ensure that any action by the Security Council does not undermine the UN Charter and existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction and of international organizations established in this regard, as well as the role of the General Assembly. They further cautioned against the continuing practice of the Security Council to utilize its authority to define the legislative requirements for Member States in implementing Security Council decisions. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government stressed the importance of the issue of non-state actors acquiring weapons of mass destruction to be addressed in an inclusive manner by the General Assembly, taking into account the views of all Member States.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Peaceful uses</p>	
	<p>Para 187. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They</p>

<p>General peaceful uses</p>	<p>continued to note with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They again emphasized that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and nondiscriminatory agreements. Non-proliferation control arrangements should be transparent and open to participation by all States, and should ensure that they do not impose restrictions on access to material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes required by developing countries for their continued development. The Heads of State or Government expressed their full confidence in the impartiality and professionalism of the IAEA and strongly rejected any politically motivated attempts by any State to politicize the work of the IAEA, including its technical co-operation programme, in violation of its Statute, as well as any undue pressure or interference in the Agency's activities which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the IAEA and the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.</p> <p>Para 190. The Heads of State or Government took note of the adoption, through a vote, in 2010 and 2011, of three proposals of assurance of supply mechanisms in the framework of the multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle, in the IAEA Board of Governors. They highlighted that this issue should be conducted through wide, integral and transparent consultations and negotiations, focusing on its technical, legal, political and economic implications, before any further decision is taken about this complex and sensitive matter. The Heads of State or Government emphasized that decisions should be made by consensus, with the participation of all IAEA member States, and any proposal from IAEA must be consistent with its Statute, without any prejudice to the inalienable right of its member States to research, develop and use for peaceful purposes of nuclear sciences, in all its aspects, including the inalienable right of each State Party, if it so decides, to develop, for peaceful purposes, a full national nuclear fuel cycle in accordance with its rights and obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.</p> <p>Para 196. The Heads of State or Government emphasized that measures and initiatives aimed at strengthening nuclear safety and nuclear security must not be used as a pretext or leverage to violate, deny or restrict the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.</p>
<p>Access to nuclear technology</p>	<p>Para 187. The Heads of State or Government...continued to note with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They again emphasized that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and nondiscriminatory agreements. Non-proliferation control arrangements should be transparent and open to participation by all States, and should ensure that they do not impose restrictions on access to material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes required by developing</p>

	countries for their continued development.
Attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities	Para 192. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities – operational or under construction – poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the UN Charter and regulations of the IAEA. They recognized the urgent need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument prohibiting attacks or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.
Matters on UN and IAEA	Para 187. The Heads of State or Government expressed their full confidence in the impartiality and professionalism of the IAEA and strongly rejected any politically motivated attempts by any State to politicize the work of the IAEA, including its technical co-operation programme, in violation of its Statute, as well as any undue pressure or interference in the Agency's activities which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the IAEA and the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.
Inalienable right through NPT	Para 188. The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT emphasized once more that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I, II, III and IV of the Treaty. They stressed that this right constitutes one of the fundamental objectives of the Treaty. In this connection, they confirmed that each country's choices and decision in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be respected without jeopardizing its policies or international co-operation agreements and arrangements for peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its fuel-cycle policies.
NWFZs	
General view on NWFZ	Para 172. The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia's Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. Para 173. Recalling the convening and the outcome of the Second

	<p>Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Established Nuclear Weapon Free Zones and Mongolia held in New York, on 30 April 2010, the Heads of State or Government called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States. They expressed their support for Mongolia’s policy aimed at institutionalizing its nuclear-weapons-free status and for the measures taken by Mongolia to consolidate and strengthen this status. In this regard they welcomed the start of the talks by Mongolia with the Nuclear Weapon States to conclude an international instrument institutionalizing the status.</p>
<p>Mongolia as a NWFZ</p>	<p>Para 173. Recalling the convening and the outcome of the Second Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Established Nuclear Weapon Free Zones and Mongolia held in New York, on 30 April 2010, the Heads of State or Government...expressed their support for Mongolia’s policy aimed at institutionalizing its nuclear-weapons-free status and for the measures taken by Mongolia to consolidate and strengthen this status. In this regard they welcomed the start of the talks by Mongolia with the Nuclear Weapon States to conclude an international instrument institutionalizing the status.</p>
<p>Middle East NWFZ</p>	<p>Para 174. The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. As a priority step to this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the fulfillment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment...They further welcomed the initiative by the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, and in this context, they took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on 29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone.</p> <p>Para 182. ...The Heads of State or Government of States Parties to the NPT welcomed the adoption by consensus of a detailed plan of action on “the Middle East, particularly implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East” in the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The Heads of State or Government urged the UN Secretary General and the co-sponsors of the 1995 Resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, to exert utmost efforts in ensuring the success of the Conference to be convened in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. They stressed the importance of the full implementation of all aspects of the agreed plan of action and the active</p>

and constructive engagement of all parties concerned to allow for the success of the conference in launching a regional negotiation process aimed at fully realizing the objectives of the 1995 resolution and the establishment of the zone.

Para 183. The Heads of State or Government of States Parties to the NPT expressed deep concern over the delay in the implementation of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East. They strongly urged the United Nations Secretary-General and the three cosponsors of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East to fully implement, without any further delay, in close consultation and coordination with the States of the Middle East, the measures contained in the Action Plan on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They welcomed the appointment of a facilitator, and the designation of a host government for a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. They noted the report of the facilitator to the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference and called on him to accelerate consultations with all capitals in the region. The Heads of State or Government requested the Secretary-General, in implementation of his mandate to convene the Conference, to exert maximum efforts with a view to convening the Conference at the earliest possible date in 2012, while noting the need to avoid any further delay. The Heads of State or Government further stressed the importance of availing all financial means necessary for the activities of the facilitator and convening of the Conference, as soon as possible, including from the regular budget of the United Nations.

Security assurances

Nuclear weapons states role

Para 153. The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned at strategic defence doctrines of NWS, including the “NATO Alliance Strategic Concept”, which not only set out rationales for the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, but also maintain unjustifiable concepts on international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and nuclear deterrence policies.

Para 163. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and reaffirmed further that Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (NNWS) should be effectively assured by NWS against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they reaffirmed the need for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to all NNWS as a matter of high priority.

Para 31.5 ...Oppose and condemn the categorization of countries as good or evil based on unilateral and unjustified criteria, and the adoption of the doctrine of pre-emptive attack, including attack by nuclear weapons by

<p>General view on security assurances</p>	<p>certain States, which is inconsistent with international law, in particular the international legally-binding instruments concerning nuclear disarmament; and further oppose and condemn all military actions, or use of force or threat of use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Non-Aligned Countries which constitute acts of aggression and blatant violations of the principles of the UN Charter, including non-interference in the internal affairs of States;</p> <p>Para 163. The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and reaffirmed further that Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (NNWS) should be effectively assured by NWS against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they reaffirmed the need for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to all NNWS as a matter of high priority.</p>
<p>International convention or instrument</p>	<p>Para 163. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they reaffirmed the need for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to all NNWS as a matter of high priority. They noted the lack of progress since the establishment in 1998 of an Ad Hoc Committee in the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate universal, unconditional and legally binding security assurances to all NNWS. They expressed concern that despite long standing requests by NNWS to receive such legally binding assurances, no tangible progress has been achieved in this regard. The Heads of State or Government further stressed the significance and positive security implications of the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on NSAs.</p>
<p>NWFZ and security assurances</p>	<p>Para 172. The Heads of State or Government...reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission.</p>
<p>Security assurances and the NPT</p>	<p>Para 181. The Heads of State or noted with concern the lack of agreement on a number of key priorities of NAM States Parties to the NPT, including inter alia, to begin negotiations on a Nuclear-Weapons-Convention and to commence negotiations on a legally binding instrument on unconditional Negative Security Assurances to Non-Nuclear-Weapon States.</p> <p>Para 185. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT reiterated that legally binding, security assurances by the five NWS to the non-NWS parties to the Treaty would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. They underlined the agreement by consensus at the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; the implementation of</p>

	<p>the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT; and on a legally binding international instrument on unconditional security assurances to Non-Nuclear Weapon States.</p> <p>Para 186. The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT called upon the NWS to fully comply with their commitments not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-NWS parties to the Treaty or NWFZs at any time or under any circumstances, pending the conclusion of a legally binding instrument on security assurances.</p>
--	--

Country specific	
-------------------------	--

Israel	<p>Para 174. The Heads of State or Government...demanded on Israel, the only country in the region that has not joined the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) nor declared its intention to do so, to renounce possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to the NPT without precondition and further delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) full-scope safeguards according to Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and to conduct its nuclear related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime. They called for the earliest implementation of relevant IAEA resolutions on “Application of IAEA Safeguards in the Middle East”. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States, and condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. In this context they also condemned the statement made by the then Prime Minister of Israel on 11 December 2006, related to the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel. They urged the continued consideration of the issue of Israeli nuclear capabilities in the context of the IAEA, including at the General Conference. They were of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons, which allow one party to threaten its neighbours, and the region. They further welcomed the initiative by the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, and in this context, they took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on 29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called 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. In this regard, they expressed their serious concern over the continuing development whereby Israeli scientists are provided access to the nuclear facilities of one NWS. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on security in the</p>
---------------	---

	<p>region as well as the reliability of the global non-proliferation regime.</p> <p>Para 175. The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the efforts of the Arab Group in Vienna to keep the question of the Israeli nuclear capabilities under consideration of the General Conference of the IAEA.</p> <p>Para 184. The Heads of State or Government of State Parties to the NPT reaffirmed the urgency and importance of Israel’s accession to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the placement of all its nuclear facilities under IAEA comprehensive safeguards according to the relevant international instruments and decisions, including operative paragraph 5 of Security Council resolution 487 (1981). They called on Israel, as the only non-NPT party in the Middle East, to accede, without further delay, to the Treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon State.</p> <p>Para 205. The Heads of State or Government once again condemned the Israeli military aggression against the Gaza Strip in 2009 and the occupying power’s indiscriminate shelling and bombing of Palestinian civilian areas, and expressed their grave concern over the reported use in civilian areas of harmful and potentially fatal incendiary weapons, such as white phosphorous. In this regard, they reiterated their call for a thorough investigation of this serious matter by relevant bodies under the appropriate international conventions and agreements.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Syria</p>	<p>Para 176. The Heads of State or Government underscored the Movement’s principled position concerning non-use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity of any State. In this regard, they condemned the Israeli attack against a Syrian facility on September 6, 2007, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the UN Charter and welcomed Syria’s cooperation with the IAEA in this regard.</p>
<p>Nonproliferation Treaty related</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">General views on NPT</p>	<p>Para 179. The Heads of State or Government of States Parties to the Treaty on the NonProliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, and recognizing the crucial role of the NPT in nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, were of the view that the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, represent an outcome that can be built upon and further enhanced in the near future, to fully address the priorities of the Movement, in particular to realise a world free from nuclear weapons. They called uponNWS to implement fully and effectively their obligations under the Treaty, in particular in the area of nuclear disarmament, and the outcomes of its Review Conferences, in particular the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, the 2000 Review Conference and the 2010 Review Conference.</p>

	<p>Para 181. The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT commended the Presidency of H.E. Libran N. Cabactulan of the Philippines, of the 2010 NPT Review Conference and the active engagement of NAM States Parties to the Treaty in its deliberations. They reiterated the importance of implementing the action plans adopted by the conference on nuclear disarmament, on nuclear non-proliferation, on peaceful uses of nuclear energy and on the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East. The Heads of State or with concern the lack of agreement on a number of key priorities of NAM States Parties to the NPT, including inter alia, to begin negotiations on a Nuclear-Weapons-Convention and to commence negotiations on a legally binding instrument on unconditional Negative Security Assurances to Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. The Heads of State or Government of these States Parties to the NPT agreed to continue their collective efforts in pursuing the realization of the aforementioned NAM priorities in the 2015 NPT review process. While welcoming the success of the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference, the NAM States Parties to the Treaty call for the full implementation of the action plans adopted in 2010 on nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle-East.</p> <p>Para 183. The Heads of State or Government of States Parties to the NPT expressed deep concern over the delay in the implementation of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East. They strongly urged the United Nations Secretary-General and the three cosponsors of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East to fully implement, without any further delay, in close consultation and coordination with the States of the Middle East, the measures contained in the Action Plan on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference...They noted the report of the facilitator to the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference and called on him to accelerate consultations with all capitals in the region.</p>
<p>NWS obligations on disarmament</p>	<p>Para 185. The Heads of State or Government of States Parties to the NPT reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States Parties to the Treaty to the full and indiscriminate implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty. They further called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT reiterated that legally binding, security assurances by the five NWS to the non-NWS parties to the Treaty would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.</p>
<p>Review and extension of the NPT</p>	<p>Para 180. The Heads of State or Government of States Parties to the NPT stressed the importance of the review of the operation of the Treaty in the framework of the NPT Review Conferences and in this context emphasized that the inclusion of the Review Part of the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference as an opinion of the President and</p>

	<p>not as a consensus language should not be considered as a precedent to be followed in the future without prejudice to the prerogatives of the Review Conference.</p>
<p>Access to technology and technology transfer</p>	<p>Para 187. The Heads of State or Government...continued to note with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They again emphasized that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and nondiscriminatory agreements. Non-proliferation control arrangements should be transparent and open to participation by all States, and should ensure that they do not impose restrictions on access to material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes required by developing countries for their continued development.</p> <p>Para 189. The Heads of State or Government stressed particularly the responsibility of developed countries to promote the legitimate need of nuclear energy of the developing countries, by allowing them to participate to the fullest extent possible in the transfer of nuclear equipment, materials, scientific and technological information for peaceful purposes with a view to achieving the largest benefits and applying pertinent elements of sustainable development in their activities.</p>
<p>Specific modalities for specific deliberations</p>	<p>Para 182. ...the Heads of State or Government of States Parties to the NPT welcomed the adoption by consensus of a detailed plan of action on “the Middle East, particularly implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East” in the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The Heads of State or Government urged the UN Secretary General and the co-sponsors of the 1995 Resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, to exert utmost efforts in ensuring the success of the Conference to be convened in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. They stressed the importance of the full implementation of all aspects of the agreed plan of action and the active and constructive engagement of all parties concerned to allow for the success of the conference in launching a regional negotiation process aimed at fully realizing the objectives of the 1995 resolution and the establishment of the zone.</p>
<p>2010 Action Plan</p>	<p>Para 181. The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT commended the Presidency of H.E. Libran N. Cabactulan of the Philippines, of the 2010 NPT Review Conference and the active engagement of NAM States Parties to the Treaty in its deliberations. They reiterated the importance of implementing the action plans adopted by the conference on nuclear disarmament, on nuclear non-proliferation, on peaceful uses of nuclear energy and on the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East...While welcoming the success of the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference, the NAM States Parties to the Treaty call for the full implementation of the action plans adopted in 2010 on nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle-East.</p>

Nuclear safety and security

<p style="text-align: center;">IAEA and safety and security</p>	<p>Para 193. The Heads of State or Government affirmed the need to strengthen the Radiological Safety and Protection Systems at facilities utilising radioactive materials as well as at radioactive waste management facilities, including the safe transportation of these materials. They reaffirmed the need to strengthen existing international regulations relating to safety and security of transportation of such materials. The Heads of State or Government noted efforts of the IAEA in this regard including convening an “International Conference on the safe and secure transport of radioactive material: The next fifty years- creating a safe, secure and sustainable framework” in Vienna from the 17th to the 21st of October 2011. While reiterating the need to take appropriate measures to prevent any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes, they called for effective implementation of the Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste of the IAEA as a means of enhancing the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive waste on their territories.</p> <p>Para 197. The Heads of State or Government emphasized that the IAEA is the sole intergovernmental organization within the UN system with the mandate and expertise to deal with the technical subjects of nuclear safety and nuclear security.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">General nuclear safety and security</p>	<p>Para 194. The Heads of State or Government recognized that the primary responsibility for nuclear safety and nuclear security rests with the individual States. In that sense, the Heads of State or Government underlined that States with nuclear power programs have a central role in their own countries in ensuring the application of the highest standards of nuclear safety and the responsibility for providing a timely, transparent and adequate response to nuclear accidents in order to minimize their consequences. The Heads of State or Government stressed the need for a rapid, timely, continuous, reliable and transparent dissemination of information on nuclear accidents with significant trans-boundary radiological effects in accordance with relevant international conventions.</p> <p>Para 196. The Heads of State or Government emphasized that measures and initiatives aimed at strengthening nuclear safety and nuclear security must not be used as a pretext or leverage to violate, deny or restrict the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Emergency preparedness</p>	<p>Para 195. The Heads of State or Government emphasized the need to improve national, regional and international preparedness and response to nuclear accidents and calls for a strengthened role of the IAEA in emergency preparedness and response, including through assisting Member States, upon their request, on emergency preparedness and response to nuclear accidents, promoting capacity building, including education and training in the field of crisis management.</p>