



Thematic Summary of the 13 th Heads of State Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (2003)	
Disarmament	
<p>Nuclear Weapon Convention</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 74) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. They regretted that the continued inflexible postures of some of the Nuclear Weapon States continue to prevent the Conference on Disarmament from establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. They emphasised the necessity to start negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention. They reiterated their call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish as soon as possible and as the highest priority, an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. They underlined once again the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice 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. In this regard, they regretted that no progress has been made in the fulfilment of this obligation despite the lapse of six years.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 75) The Heads of State or Government again called for an international conference, at the earliest possible date, with the objective of arriving at an agreement on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time to eliminate all nuclear weapons, to prohibit their development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use, and to provide for their destruction. In this context, they reiterated the resolve at the Millennium Summit by the Heads of State or Government as contained in the United Nations Millennium Declaration to strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, and to keep all options open for achieving this aim, including the possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways and means of eliminating nuclear dangers.</p>
<p>Disarmament and Development</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 99) The Heads of State or Government stressed the importance of the reduction of military expenditures, in accordance with the principle of undiminished security at the lowest level of armaments, and urged all States to devote resources made available therefrom to economic and social development, in particular in the fight against poverty. They expressed their firm support for</p>

	<p>unilateral, bilateral and multilateral measures adopted by some governments aimed at reducing military expenditures, thereby contributing to strengthening regional and international peace and security. They recognize that confidence building measures (CBMs) assist in this regard. They took note of the measures being examined by some governments such as the Andean Community of Nations.</p>
<p>Nuclear-Weapon States Obligations</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 69) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned at strategic defence doctrines that set out rationales for the use of nuclear weapons. They remained deeply concerned over the "Alliance Strategic Concept" adopted by North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in April 1999, which not only maintain unjustifiable concepts on international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence, but also includes new elements aimed at opening even more the scope for possible use or threat of use of force by NATO.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 70) In the context of the Nuclear Posture Review that has been undertaken by the United States of America, the Heads of State or Government expressed serious concern that the development of new types of nuclear weapons are being considered and reiterated that the provision for the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against Non-Nuclear Weapon States is in contravention of the negative security assurances that have been provided by the Nuclear Weapons States. They restated that the development of new types of nuclear weapons is in contravention with the assurances provided by the Nuclear Weapons States at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty that the Treaty would prevent the improvement of existing nuclear weapons and development of new types of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 71) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation. They also reiterated deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament which remains their highest priority. They also expressed their concern about the lack of progress by the Nuclear Weapon States to accomplish the elimination of their arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. They stressed their concern at the threat to humanity derived from the continued existence of nuclear weapons and of their possible use or threat of use. The Heads of State or Government underscored the need to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons and emphasised, in this regard, the urgent need to commence negotiations without delay.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 79) The Heads of State or Government reiterated the Movement's long-standing principled position for the total elimination of all nuclear testing. They stressed the significance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), including by all the Nuclear Weapons States, which, inter alia, should contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament. They expressed their satisfaction that 166 States have</p>

	<p>signed the Treaty and 97 States have ratified it thus far. They reiterated that if the objectives of the Treaty were to be fully realised, the continued commitment of all States signatories, especially the Nuclear Weapon States, to nuclear disarmament would be essential.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 82) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT welcomed the outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. In this regard, they reiterated their call and the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the unequivocal undertaking given by the Nuclear Weapons States to the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They expected that this undertaking be demonstrated without delay through an accelerated process of negotiations and through the full implementation of the thirteen practical steps to advance systematically and progressively towards a nuclear-weapon-free world. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the 2000 Review Conference in its Final Document reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five nuclear weapons states to the non-nuclear weapon States Parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime. They took note of the First Preparatory meeting for the 2005 NPT Review Conference and emphasised the need for a substantive interaction beyond formal exchange of views between the States Parties at these meetings. The issues raised at the Preparatory meetings need to be addressed so as to continue strengthening the implementation of the Treaty and the undertakings agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, and also to lay the necessary foundation for the development of recommendations at the Third Preparatory session for the 2005 Review Conference. They recalled that specific time was made available at the 2000 Review Conference and its Third Preparatory session for the discussion on and consideration of proposals on the provisions in Article VI of the NPT and in paragraphs 3 and 4 (C) of the 1995 decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", dealing with nuclear disarmament, as well as on the Resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. In this context, they reaffirmed the importance to establish at the 2005 Review Conference a subsidiary body to Main Committee I to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons, as well as a subsidiary body to Main Committee II to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT. In this regard, they emphasised the need for Preparatory Committee meetings to continue to allocate specific time for deliberations on nuclear disarmament, implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, and security assurances. They also welcomed the accession of Cuba to the NPT.</p>
<p>Arms Races</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 77) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile defence systems and the pursuit of advanced military technologies capable of being</p>

	<p>deployed in 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. The abrogation of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missiles (ABM) brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained concerned that the implementation of a national missile defence system could trigger an arms race(s) and the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons. In accordance with United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/57, they emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work, in the Conference on Disarmament, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.</p>
<p>Bilateral Disarmament</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 72) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the signing of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reduction between the Russian Federation and the United States on 24 May 2002, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons.</p>
<p>Disarmament and Nonproliferation</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 71) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their principled positions on nuclear disarmament and the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation. They also reiterated deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament which remains their highest priority. They also expressed their concern about the lack of progress by the Nuclear Weapon States to accomplish the elimination of their arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. They stressed their concern at the threat to humanity derived from the continued existence of nuclear weapons and of their possible use or threat of use. The Heads of State or Government underscored the need to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons and emphasised, in this regard, the urgent need to commence negotiations without delay.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 100) The Heads of State or Government expressed their satisfaction with the consensus among states on measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. They welcomed the adoption by consensus of the General Assembly Resolution 57/83 entitled “Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction” and underlined the need for this threat to humanity to be addressed within the United Nations framework and through international NAM. While stressing that the most effective way of preventing terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction is through the total elimination of such weapons, they emphasized that progress was urgently needed in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation in order to help maintain international peace and security and to contribute to global efforts against terrorism. They called upon all member states to support international efforts to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of</p>

	<p>mass destruction and their means of delivery. They also urged all member states to take and strengthen national measures, as appropriate, to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and materials and technologies related to their manufacture.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 101) The Heads of State or Government commended the co-ordination carried out by the NAM Working Group on Disarmament and encouraged delegations to continue their active work on issues of common concern to the Movement, particularly towards ensuring respect for the principles of multilateralism and transparency in the areas of disarmament and non-proliferation.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">International Humanitarian Law and ICJ</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 74) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. They regretted that the continued inflexible postures of some of the Nuclear Weapon States continue to prevent the Conference on Disarmament from establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. They emphasised the necessity to start negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention. They reiterated their call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish as soon as possible and as the highest priority, an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. They underlined once again the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice 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. In this regard, they regretted that no progress has been made in the fulfilment of this obligation despite the lapse of six years.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Modernization and Development of Nuclear Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 70) In the context of the Nuclear Posture Review that has been undertaken by the United States of America, the Heads of State or Government expressed serious concern that the development of new types of nuclear weapons are being considered and reiterated that the provision for the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against Non-Nuclear Weapon States is in contravention of the negative security assurances that have been provided by the Nuclear Weapons States. They restated that the development of new types of nuclear weapons is in contravention with the assurances provided by the Nuclear Weapons States at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty that the Treaty would prevent the improvement of existing nuclear weapons and development of new types of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 77) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile defence systems and the pursuit of advanced military technologies capable of being</p>

	<p>deployed in 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. The abrogation of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missiles (ABM) brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained concerned that the implementation of a national missile defence system could trigger an arms race(s) and the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons. In accordance with United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/57, they emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work, in the Conference on Disarmament, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Missiles</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 77) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile defence systems and the pursuit of advanced military technologies capable of being deployed in 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. The abrogation of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missiles (ABM) brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained concerned that the implementation of a national missile defence system could trigger an arms race(s) and the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons. In accordance with United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/57, they emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work, in the Conference on Disarmament, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 78) The Heads of State or Government welcomed the report prepared by the Panel of Governmental Experts on the Issue of Missiles in all its aspects, which marked the first time the United Nations considered this issue. They noted with satisfaction the convening of another Panel of Governmental Experts to explore further the issue of missiles in all its aspects. They remained convinced of the need for a multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory approach towards missiles in all its aspects as a contribution to international peace and security. Pending the achievement of such a universal mechanism 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 international levels in any approach to the issue of missiles in all its aspects. In this context, they emphasised the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body of the international community.</p>

NAM Involvement and Contributions

(Final Document, Para 67) 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 and the XIII Ministerial Conference in Cartagena.

(Final Document, Para 92) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned over the illicit transfer, manufacture and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation and uncontrolled spread in many regions of the world. They welcomed the adoption by consensus of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects at the United Nations Conference held from 9 - 20 July 2001 in New York which outlines a realistic, achievable and comprehensive approach, to address the problems associated with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons on the national, regional and global levels. They remained deeply concerned over the inability of the Conference to agree, due to the position of one State, on language recognising the need to establish and maintain controls over private ownership of small arms, and the need for preventing sales of such arms to non-State groups. They considered that these issues are directly related to the problems associated with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons faced by many Members of the Movement. They reiterated their call on all States to ensure that the supply of small arms and light weapons is limited only to Governments or to entities duly authorised by Governments and to implement legal restrictions on the unrestricted trade in and ownership of small arms and light weapons. They emphasized the importance of early and full implementation of the Programme of Action. They welcomed the decision to convene the First United Nations Biennial Meeting of States on the Implementation of the Programme of Action of the United Nations Conference to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in all its Aspects in New York on 7 – 11 July 2003 to consider national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action. In this regard, they encouraged the Member States to continue to play an active role in defining and elaborating the objectives of all future Conferences. They encouraged all initiatives to mobilize resources and expertise to promote implementation of the Programme of Action and to provide assistance to States in their implementation of the Programme of Action. They also welcomed the decision of convening the Review Conference in 2006 and stressed the need for a representative of the Movement to preside over the Conference.

(Final Document, Para 101) The Heads of State or Government commended the co-ordination carried out by the NAM Working Group on Disarmament and encouraged delegations to continue their active work on issues of common concern to the Movement, particularly towards ensuring respect for the principles of multilateralism and transparency in the areas of disarmament and non-proliferation.

United Nations Fora

UN General Assembly

(Final Document, Para 68) The Heads of State or Government expressed their strong concern at the growing resort to unilateralism and unilaterally imposed prescriptions and in this context strongly underlined and affirmed that multilateralism and multilaterally agreed solutions, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, provided the only sustainable method of addressing disarmament and international security issues. In this regard, they welcomed the adoption of Resolution 57/63 by the General Assembly on the “Promotion of Multilateralism in the Area of Disarmament and Non-proliferation”.

(Final Document, Para 77) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile defence systems and the pursuit of advanced military technologies capable of being deployed in 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. The abrogation of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missiles (ABM) brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained concerned that the implementation of a national missile defence system could trigger an arms race(s) and the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons. In accordance with United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/57, they emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work, in the Conference on Disarmament, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

(Final Document, Para 102) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the validity of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. They also reaffirmed the importance of international co-operation to ensure peace, security and stability in the Indian Ocean region. They noted that greater efforts and more time are required to facilitate a focused discussion on practical measures to ensure conditions of peace, security and stability in the region. They also noted that in the light of Resolution 56/16 of the United Nations General Assembly, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Indian Ocean would continue his informal consultations on the future of the Committee.

(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclearweapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region

concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.

(Final Document, Para 81) The Heads of State or Government reiterated the support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone 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 fulfilment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they 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 delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under 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 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. 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 H.E. Mr. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from 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 Nuclear Weapon State. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on the regional security as well as the reliability of the global nonproliferation regime.

(Final Document, Para 90) The Heads of State or Government welcomed the importance of Resolution 56/24 L of the United Nations General Assembly on the Prohibition of the Dumping of Radioactive Wastes and called upon States to take appropriate measures to prevent any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes that would infringe upon the sovereignty of States. They welcomed also the resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organisation of African Unity in 1991 (CM/Res.1356 {LIV}) on the Bamako Convention on the Ban on the Import of Hazardous Wastes into Africa and on the Control of Their Trans-boundary Movement within Africa. They called for effective implementation of the Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as a means of enhancing the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive wastes on their territories.

(Final Document, Para 98) The Heads of State or Government reiterated once again their support for the convening of the Fourth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-IV). They reiterated their deep concern over the lack of consensus on the deliberations held by the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 1999 on the agenda and objectives. They continued to call for further steps leading to the Convening of the Fourth Special Session with the participation of all Member States of the United Nations as well as the need for SSOD-IV to review and assess the implementation of SSOD-I, while reaffirming its principles and priorities. They welcomed the decision by the General Assembly to establish an open-ended working group to consider the objectives and agenda including the possibility of establishing the preparatory committee, for the Special Session. In this regard, they looked forward to the substantive discussion in the open-ended working group and its positive recommendations with a view to facilitating the convening of the Special Session.

(Final Document, Para 100) The Heads of State or Government expressed their satisfaction with the consensus among states on measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. They welcomed the adoption by consensus of the General

	<p>Assembly Resolution 57/83 entitled “Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction” and underlined the need for this threat to humanity to be addressed within the United Nations framework and through international NAM. While stressing that the most effective way of preventing terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction is through the total elimination of such weapons, they emphasized that progress was urgently needed in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation in order to help maintain international peace and security and to contribute to global efforts against terrorism. They called upon all member states to support international efforts to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. They also urged all member states to take and strengthen national measures, as appropriate, to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and materials and technologies related to their manufacture.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">SSOD</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclearweapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-</p>

	<p>operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 98) The Heads of State or Government reiterated once again their support for the convening of the Fourth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-IV). They reiterated their deep concern over the lack of consensus on the deliberations held by the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 1999 on the agenda and objectives. They continued to call for further steps leading to the Convening of the Fourth Special Session with the participation of all Member States of the United Nations as well as the need for SSOD-IV to review and assess the implementation of SSOD-I, while reaffirming its principles and priorities. They welcomed the decision by the General Assembly to establish an open-ended working group to consider the objectives and agenda including the possibility of establishing the preparatory committee, for the Special Session. In this regard, they looked forward to the substantive discussion in the open-ended working group and its positive recommendations with a view to facilitating the convening of the Special Session.</p>
<p>Test Ban and CTBT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 70) In the context of the Nuclear Posture Review that has been undertaken by the United States of America, the Heads of State or Government expressed serious concern that the development of new types of nuclear weapons are being considered and reiterated that the provision for the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against Non-Nuclear Weapon States is in contravention of the negative security assurances that have been provided by the Nuclear Weapons States. They restated that the development of new types of nuclear weapons is in contravention with the assurances provided by the Nuclear Weapons States at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty that the Treaty would prevent the improvement of existing nuclear weapons and development of new types of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 79) The Heads of State or Government reiterated the Movement’s long-standing principled position for the total elimination of all nuclear testing. They stressed the significance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), including by all the Nuclear Weapons States, which, inter alia, should contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament. They expressed their satisfaction that 166 States have signed the Treaty and 97 States have ratified it thus far. They reiterated that if the objectives of the Treaty were to be fully realised, the continued commitment of all States signatories, especially the Nuclear Weapon States, to nuclear disarmament would be essential.</p>
<p>Conference on Disarmament</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 74) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. They regretted that</p>

the continued inflexible postures of some of the Nuclear Weapon States continue to prevent the Conference on Disarmament from establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. They emphasised the necessity to start negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention. They reiterated their call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish as soon as possible and as the highest priority, an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. They underlined once again the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice 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. In this regard, they regretted that no progress has been made in the fulfilment of this obligation despite the lapse of six years.

(Final Document, Para 77) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile defence systems and the pursuit of advanced military technologies capable of being deployed in 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. The abrogation of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missiles (ABM) brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained concerned that the implementation of a national missile defence system could trigger an arms race(s) and the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons. In accordance with United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/57, they emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work, in the Conference on Disarmament, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

(Final Document, Para 78) The Heads of State or Government welcomed the report prepared by the Panel of Governmental Experts on the Issue of Missiles in all its aspects, which marked the first time the United Nations considered this issue. They noted with satisfaction the convening of another Panel of Governmental Experts to explore further the issue of missiles in all its aspects. They remained convinced of the need for a multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory approach towards missiles in all its aspects as a contribution to international peace and security. Pending the achievement of such a universal mechanism 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 international levels in any approach to the issue of missiles in all its aspects. In this context, they emphasised the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body of the international community.

<p style="text-align: center;">UN Disarmament Commission</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclearweapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 97) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) as the sole specialized, deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery that allows for in-depth deliberations on specific disarmament issues, leading to the submission of concrete recommendations on those issues, and also underlined the importance of successful conclusion during the 2003 session of the UNDC.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 98) The Heads of State or Government reiterated once again their support for the convening of the Fourth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-IV). They reiterated their deep concern over the</p>

	<p>lack of consensus on the deliberations held by the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 1999 on the agenda and objectives. They continued to call for further steps leading to the Convening of the Fourth Special Session with the participation of all Member States of the United Nations as well as the need for SSOD-IV to review and assess the implementation of SSOD-I, while reaffirming its principles and priorities. They welcomed the decision by the General Assembly to establish an open-ended working group to consider the objectives and agenda including the possibility of establishing the preparatory committee, for the Special Session. In this regard, they looked forward to the substantive discussion in the open-ended working group and its positive recommendations with a view to facilitating the convening of the Special Session.</p>
<p>UNIDIR and UNODA</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 92) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned over the illicit transfer, manufacture and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation and uncontrolled spread in many regions of the world. They welcomed the adoption by consensus of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects at the United Nations Conference held from 9 - 20 July 2001 in New York which outlines a realistic, achievable and comprehensive approach, to address the problems associated with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons on the national, regional and global levels. They remained deeply concerned over the inability of the Conference to agree, due to the position of one State, on language recognising the need to establish and maintain controls over private ownership of small arms, and the need for preventing sales of such arms to non-State groups. They considered that these issues are directly related to the problems associated with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons faced by many Members of the Movement. They reiterated their call on all States to ensure that the supply of small arms and light weapons is limited only to Governments or to entities duly authorised by Governments and to implement legal restrictions on the unrestricted trade in and ownership of small arms and light weapons. They emphasized the importance of early and full implementation of the Programme of Action. They welcomed the decision to convene the First United Nations Biennial Meeting of States on the Implementation of the Programme of Action of the United Nations Conference to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in all its Aspects in New York on 7 – 11 July 2003 to consider national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action. In this regard, they encouraged the Member States to continue to play an active role in defining and elaborating the objectives of all future Conferences. They encouraged all initiatives to mobilize resources and expertise to promote implementation of the Programme of Action and to provide assistance to States in their implementation of the Programme of Action. They also welcomed the decision of convening the Review Conference in 2006 and stressed the need for a representative of the Movement to preside over the Conference.</p>

<p>UN Regional Centers for Peace and Disarmament</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 73) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that in efforts towards the objective of 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>International Atomic Energy Agency</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 81) The Heads of State or Government reiterated the support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone 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 fulfilment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they 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 delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under 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 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. 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 H.E. Mr. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from 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 Nuclear Weapon State. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on the regional security as well as the reliability of the global nonproliferation regime.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 84) 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 emphasised that proliferation</p>

	<p>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. In this regard they also expressed their strong rejection of attempts by any Member State to use the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA's Statute.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 90) The Heads of State or Government welcomed the importance of Resolution 56/24 L of the United Nations General Assembly on the Prohibition of the Dumping of Radioactive Wastes and called upon States to take appropriate measures to prevent any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes that would infringe upon the sovereignty of States. They welcomed also the resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organisation of African Unity in 1991 (CM/Res.1356 {LIV}) on the Bamako Convention on the Ban on the Import of Hazardous Wastes into Africa and on the Control of Their Trans-boundary Movement within Africa. They called for effective implementation of the Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as a means of enhancing the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive wastes on their territories.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 91) 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 United Nations Charter and regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency. They recognised the need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument, prohibiting attacks, or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</p>
<p>UN Security Council</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 81) The Heads of State or Government reiterated the support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone 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 fulfilment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they 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 delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under IAEA full-scope</p>

	<p>safeguards according to Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and to conduct its nuclear related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime. 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. 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 H.E. Mr. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from 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 Nuclear Weapon State. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on the regional security as well as the reliability of the global nonproliferation regime.</p>
--	--

<p>Chemical and Biological Weapons</p>	
---	--

<p>Chemical Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 87) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) welcomed the increasing number of ratifications of the Convention and invited all States who have still not ratified it to do so as soon as possible with the view to its universality. They also underlined the urgency of satisfactorily resolving the unresolved issues in the framework of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) with a view to paving the way for the effective, full and nondiscriminatory implementation of the Convention. In this context, they reiterated their call on the developed countries to promote international co-operation 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 also called upon States having declared possession of chemical weapons to bring about the destruction of their chemical weapons at the earliest possible date. While recognising the financial and technical challenges for some possessors, they called upon those States Parties in a position to do so, and where requested, to assist such possessor States in the achievement of the ultimate goal of the Convention – the total elimination of chemical weapons. They noted that the First Review Conference of the CWC will be convened in The Hague, from 28 April-9 May 2003 and looked forward to a</p>
--------------------------------	--

	significant outcome towards the strengthening of the implementation of the Convention.
<p align="center">Biological Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC) reaffirmed their conviction that the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction is essential for the maintenance of international and regional peace and security. They reaffirmed the Movement's continued determination, for the sake of humankind, 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 recognised the particular importance of strengthening the Convention through multilateral negotiations for a legally binding Protocol to the Convention. They believed that the effective contribution of the Convention to international and regional peace and security would be enhanced through universal adherence to the Convention. They stressed the importance for all States Parties to pursue the objectives that were set forth by the Fourth Review Conference and underlined that the only sustainable method of strengthening the Convention is through multilateral negotiations aimed at concluding a non-discriminatory legally-binding agreement. They have been deeply disappointed at the inability that has been demonstrated in the endeavours of the States Parties of the BWC to successfully undertake initiatives to strengthen the implementation of the Convention. They further regretted the limited nature of the decision that was taken during the resumed session of the Fifth Review Conference held from 11-15 November 2002 in Geneva and were disappointed that the opportunity to strengthen the Convention was foregone and that limited work, which at best only has the potential of enhancing the implementation of the Convention, is all that could be achieved despite the Movement's best endeavours. They believed that, however, the Movement has succeeded in preventing any attempt to foreclose the option of more meaningful work in the future. In this regard, the movement has succeeded in preserving multilateralism as the only vehicle for preventing reprehensible use of disease as instruments of terror and war in a sustainable way. They further noted that the 2004 meeting of States Parties to the BWC is to be chaired by a member of the Non-Aligned Movement.</p>
<p align="center">Outer Space</p>	
<p align="center">International Treaty on Outer Space</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 77) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile defence systems and the pursuit of advanced military technologies capable of being deployed in outer space which have, inter alia, contributed to the further erosion of an international climate conducive to the promotion</p>

	<p>of disarmament and the strengthening of international security. The abrogation of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missiles (ABM) brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained concerned that the implementation of a national missile defence system could trigger an arms race(s) and the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons. In accordance with United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/57, they emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work, in the Conference on Disarmament, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.</p>
<p>Missile Defense Systems</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 77) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile defence systems and the pursuit of advanced military technologies capable of being deployed in 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. The abrogation of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missiles (ABM) brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained concerned that the implementation of a national missile defence system could trigger an arms race(s) and the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons. In accordance with United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/57, they emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work, in the Conference on Disarmament, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.</p>
<p>Nonproliferation</p>	
<p>Nonproliferation and Noncompliance</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 85) 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 the procedures set out in those instruments and to provide the necessary substantiation for their allegations.</p>
<p>Nonproliferation and Peaceful Uses</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 84) 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 emphasised 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</p>

	<p>peaceful purposes required by developing countries for their continued development. In this regard they also expressed their strong rejection of attempts by any Member State to use the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA's Statute.</p>
<p>Non-State Proliferation</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 100) The Heads of State or Government expressed their satisfaction with the consensus among states on measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. They welcomed the adoption by consensus of the General Assembly Resolution 57/83 entitled “Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction” and underlined the need for this threat to humanity to be addressed within the United Nations framework and through international NAM. While stressing that the most effective way of preventing terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction is through the total elimination of such weapons, they emphasized that progress was urgently needed in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation in order to help maintain international peace and security and to contribute to global efforts against terrorism. They called upon all member states to support international efforts to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. They also urged all member states to take and strengthen national measures, as appropriate, to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and materials and technologies related to their manufacture.</p>
<p>WMD Terrorism</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 100) The Heads of State or Government expressed their satisfaction with the consensus among states on measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. They welcomed the adoption by consensus of the General Assembly Resolution 57/83 entitled “Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction” and underlined the need for this threat to humanity to be addressed within the United Nations framework and through international NAM. While stressing that the most effective way of preventing terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction is through the total elimination of such weapons, they emphasized that progress was urgently needed in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation in order to help maintain international peace and security and to contribute to global efforts against terrorism. They called upon all member states to support international efforts to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. They also urged all member states to take and strengthen national measures, as appropriate, to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and materials and technologies related to their manufacture.</p>
<p>Peaceful Uses</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;">Access to Nuclear Technology</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 84) 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 emphasised 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. In this regard they also expressed their strong rejection of attempts by any Member State to use the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA's Statute.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Attack or Threat of Attack Against Peaceful Nuclear Facilities</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 91) 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 United Nations Charter and regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency. They recognised the need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument, prohibiting attacks, or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">UN and IAEA Authority</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 84) 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 emphasised 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. In this regard they also expressed their strong rejection of attempts by any Member State to use the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA's Statute.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 91) 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 United Nations Charter and regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency.</p>

	They recognised the need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument, prohibiting attacks, or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.
--	--

NWFZs	
--------------	--

Contributions to Disarmament	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclear-weapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p>
-------------------------------------	--

Contributions to Nonproliferation	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclear-weapons-free zones in all regions of</p>
--	--

	<p>the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p>
<p>Regional Zones of Peace</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 102) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the validity of the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. They also reaffirmed the importance of international co-operation to ensure peace, security and stability in the Indian Ocean region. They noted that greater efforts and more time are required to facilitate a focused discussion on practical measures to ensure conditions of peace, security and stability in the region. They also noted that in the light of Resolution 56/16 of the United Nations General Assembly, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Indian Ocean would continue his informal consultations on the future of the Committee.</p>
<p>Treaty of Tlatelolco</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclear-weapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to</p>

	<p>achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p>
<p>Treaty of Pelindaba</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclear-weapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by</p>

	<p>making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p>
<p>Treaty of Bangkok</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclear-weapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Treaty of Rarotonga</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclear-weapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Treaty of Semipalatinsk</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclear-weapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions</p>

	<p>of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p>
<p>Mongolia as a NWFZ</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclear-weapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to</p>

	<p>sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p>
<p>Middle East WMDFZ</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 81) The Heads of State or Government reiterated the support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone 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 fulfilment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they 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 delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under 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 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. 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 H.E. Mr. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from 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 Nuclear Weapon State. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on the regional security as well as the reliability of the global nonproliferation regime.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 82) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT welcomed the outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. In this regard, they reiterated their call and the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty</p>

	<p>and called for the full implementation of the unequivocal undertaking given by the Nuclear Weapons States to the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They expected that this undertaking be demonstrated without delay through an accelerated process of negotiations and through the full implementation of the thirteen practical steps to advance systematically and progressively towards a nuclear-weapon-free world. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the 2000 Review Conference in its Final Document reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five nuclear weapons states to the non-nuclear weapon States Parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime. They took note of the First Preparatory meeting for the 2005 NPT Review Conference and emphasised the need for a substantive interaction beyond formal exchange of views between the States Parties at these meetings. The issues raised at the Preparatory meetings need to be addressed so as to continue strengthening the implementation of the Treaty and the undertakings agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, and also to lay the necessary foundation for the development of recommendations at the Third Preparatory session for the 2005 Review Conference. They recalled that specific time was made available at the 2000 Review Conference and its Third Preparatory session for the discussion on and consideration of proposals on the provisions in Article VI of the NPT and in paragraphs 3 and 4 (C) of the 1995 decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", dealing with nuclear disarmament, as well as on the Resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. In this context, they reaffirmed the importance to establish at the 2005 Review Conference a subsidiary body to Main Committee I to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons, as well as a subsidiary body to Main Committee II to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT. In this regard, they emphasised the need for Preparatory Committee meetings to continue to allocate specific time for deliberations on nuclear disarmament, implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, and security assurances. They also welcomed the accession of Cuba to the NPT.</p>
--	---

<p>Security Assurances</p>	
-----------------------------------	--

<p>Nuclear-Weapon States Role</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 70) In the context of the Nuclear Posture Review that has been undertaken by the United States of America, the Heads of State or Government expressed serious concern that the development of new types of nuclear weapons are being considered and reiterated that the provision for the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against Non-Nuclear Weapon States is in contravention of the negative security assurances that have been provided by the Nuclear Weapons States. They restated that the development of new types of nuclear weapons is in contravention with the assurances provided by</p>
--	---

	<p>the Nuclear Weapons States at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty that the Treaty would prevent the improvement of existing nuclear weapons and development of new types of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 82) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT welcomed the outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. In this regard, they reiterated their call and the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the unequivocal undertaking given by the Nuclear Weapons States to the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They expected that this undertaking be demonstrated without delay through an accelerated process of negotiations and through the full implementation of the thirteen practical steps to advance systematically and progressively towards a nuclear-weapon-free world. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the 2000 Review Conference in its Final Document reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five nuclear weapons states to the non-nuclear weapon States Parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime. They took note of the First Preparatory meeting for the 2005 NPT Review Conference and emphasised the need for a substantive interaction beyond formal exchange of views between the States Parties at these meetings. The issues raised at the Preparatory meetings need to be addressed so as to continue strengthening the implementation of the Treaty and the undertakings agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, and also to lay the necessary foundation for the development of recommendations at the Third Preparatory session for the 2005 Review Conference. They recalled that specific time was made available at the 2000 Review Conference and its Third Preparatory session for the discussion on and consideration of proposals on the provisions in Article VI of the NPT and in paragraphs 3 and 4 (C) of the 1995 decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", dealing with nuclear disarmament, as well as on the Resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. In this context, they reaffirmed the importance to establish at the 2005 Review Conference a subsidiary body to Main Committee I to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons, as well as a subsidiary body to Main Committee II to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT. In this regard, they emphasised the need for Preparatory Committee meetings to continue to allocate specific time for deliberations on nuclear disarmament, implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, and security assurances. They also welcomed the accession of Cuba to the NPT.</p>
<p>Legally-Binding International Convention or Instrument</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 76) 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. They reiterated their conviction that pending the total elimination of</p>

	<p>nuclear weapons efforts for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to Non-Nuclear-Weapon States should be pursued as a matter of priority by the Members of the Non-Aligned Movement.</p>
<p>NWFZs and Security Assurances</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government continued to consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba as a positive step towards attaining the objective of global nuclear disarmament. The Movement welcomed the efforts aimed at establishing new nuclear-weapons-free zones in all regions of the world and calls for co-operation and broad consultation in order to achieve agreements freely arrived at between the States of the region concerned. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, it is essential that Nuclear Weapon States 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 with a view to establishing new nuclear-weapon-free zones 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 and guidelines adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its 1999 substantive session. In this context, they reiterated their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and considered that the institutionalisation of that status would be an important measure towards strengthening the non-proliferation regime in that region. They welcomed the ratification by Cuba of the Tlatelolco Treaty which, by making all the Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Treaty, brought it into full force in its area of application. They welcomed the on-going consultations between ASEAN and the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) on the Protocol of Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) Treaty and urged the NWS to become parties to the Protocol of the Treaty as soon as possible. They also welcomed the decision by all five Central Asian States to sign the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty as soon as possible. They also expressed their support to the initiative of convening an international conference of the States parties, ratifiers and signatories to the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba to discuss and implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States, at an appropriate time.</p>
<p>Security Assurances and the NPT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 82) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT welcomed the outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. In this regard, they reiterated their call and the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the unequivocal undertaking given by the Nuclear Weapons States to the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They expected that this undertaking be demonstrated without delay through an accelerated process of negotiations and</p>

	<p>through the full implementation of the thirteen practical steps to advance systematically and progressively towards a nuclear-weapon-free world. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the 2000 Review Conference in its Final Document reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five nuclear weapons states to the non-nuclear weapon States Parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime. They took note of the First Preparatory meeting for the 2005 NPT Review Conference and emphasised the need for a substantive interaction beyond formal exchange of views between the States Parties at these meetings. The issues raised at the Preparatory meetings need to be addressed so as to continue strengthening the implementation of the Treaty and the undertakings agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, and also to lay the necessary foundation for the development of recommendations at the Third Preparatory session for the 2005 Review Conference. They recalled that specific time was made available at the 2000 Review Conference and its Third Preparatory session for the discussion on and consideration of proposals on the provisions in Article VI of the NPT and in paragraphs 3 and 4 (C) of the 1995 decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", dealing with nuclear disarmament, as well as on the Resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. In this context, they reaffirmed the importance to establish at the 2005 Review Conference a subsidiary body to Main Committee I to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons, as well as a subsidiary body to Main Committee II to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT. In this regard, they emphasised the need for Preparatory Committee meetings to continue to allocate specific time for deliberations on nuclear disarmament, implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, and security assurances. They also welcomed the accession of Cuba to the NPT.</p>
--	--

<p>Country Specific</p>	
--------------------------------	--

<p>United States</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 69) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned at strategic defence doctrines that set out rationales for the use of nuclear weapons. They remained deeply concerned over the "Alliance Strategic Concept" adopted by North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in April 1999, which not only maintain unjustifiable concepts on international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and policies of nuclear deterrence, but also includes new elements aimed at opening even more the scope for possible use or threat of use of force by NATO.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 70) In the context of the Nuclear Posture Review that has been undertaken by the United States of America, the Heads of State or Government expressed serious concern that the</p>
-----------------------------	---

development of new types of nuclear weapons are being considered and reiterated that the provision for the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against Non-Nuclear Weapon States is in contravention of the negative security assurances that have been provided by the Nuclear Weapons States. They restated that the development of new types of nuclear weapons is in contravention with the assurances provided by the Nuclear Weapons States at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty that the Treaty would prevent the improvement of existing nuclear weapons and development of new types of nuclear weapons.

(Final Document, Para 72) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the signing of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reduction between the Russian Federation and the United States on 24 May 2002, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons.

(Final Document, Para 81) The Heads of State or Government reiterated the support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone 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 fulfilment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they 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 delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under 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 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. 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 H.E. Mr. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from 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

	<p>access to the nuclear facilities of one Nuclear Weapon State. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on the regional security as well as the reliability of the global nonproliferation regime.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 92) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned over the illicit transfer, manufacture and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation and uncontrolled spread in many regions of the world. They welcomed the adoption by consensus of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects at the United Nations Conference held from 9 - 20 July 2001 in New York which outlines a realistic, achievable and comprehensive approach, to address the problems associated with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons on the national, regional and global levels. They remained deeply concerned over the inability of the Conference to agree, due to the position of one State, on language recognising the need to establish and maintain controls over private ownership of small arms, and the need for preventing sales of such arms to non-State groups. They considered that these issues are directly related to the problems associated with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons faced by many Members of the Movement. They reiterated their call on all States to ensure that the supply of small arms and light weapons is limited only to Governments or to entities duly authorised by Governments and to implement legal restrictions on the unrestricted trade in and ownership of small arms and light weapons. They emphasized the importance of early and full implementation of the Programme of Action. They welcomed the decision to convene the First United Nations Biennial Meeting of States on the Implementation of the Programme of Action of the United Nations Conference to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in all its Aspects in New York on 7 – 11 July 2003 to consider national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action. In this regard, they encouraged the Member States to continue to play an active role in defining and elaborating the objectives of all future Conferences. They encouraged all initiatives to mobilize resources and expertise to promote implementation of the Programme of Action and to provide assistance to States in their implementation of the Programme of Action. They also welcomed the decision of convening the Review Conference in 2006 and stressed the need for a representative of the Movement to preside over the Conference.</p>
<p>Russia</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 72) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the signing of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reduction between the Russian Federation and the United States on 24 May 2002, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons.</p>
<p>Israel</p>	

	<p>(Final Document, Para 81) The Heads of State or Government reiterated the support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone 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 fulfilment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they 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 delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under 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 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. 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 H.E. Mr. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from 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 Nuclear Weapon State. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on the regional security as well as the reliability of the global nonproliferation regime.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">North Korea</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 83) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT noted the withdrawal of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) from the NPT. They expressed the view that the Parties directly concerned resolve, through dialogue and negotiations, all issues related to the withdrawal of the DPRK from the NPT as an expression of their goodwill.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Iran</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 81) The Heads of State or Government reiterated the support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they reaffirmed</p>

	<p>the need for the speedy establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone 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 fulfilment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone and, pending its establishment, they 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 delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under 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 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. 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 H.E. Mr. Mohammed Hosni Mubarak, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, on the establishment of a zone free from 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 Nuclear Weapon State. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on the regional security as well as the reliability of the global nonproliferation regime.</p>
--	--

<p>Non-Proliferation Treaty Related</p>	
--	--

<p>Disarmament Through the NPT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 82) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT welcomed the outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. In this regard, they reiterated their call and the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the unequivocal undertaking given by the Nuclear Weapons States to the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They expected that this undertaking be demonstrated without delay through an accelerated process of negotiations and through the full implementation of the thirteen practical steps to advance systematically and progressively towards a nuclear-weapon-free world. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also</p>
---	---

	<p>recalled that the 2000 Review Conference in its Final Document reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five nuclear weapons states to the non-nuclear weapon States Parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime. They took note of the First Preparatory meeting for the 2005 NPT Review Conference and emphasised the need for a substantive interaction beyond formal exchange of views between the States Parties at these meetings. The issues raised at the Preparatory meetings need to be addressed so as to continue strengthening the implementation of the Treaty and the undertakings agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, and also to lay the necessary foundation for the development of recommendations at the Third Preparatory session for the 2005 Review Conference. They recalled that specific time was made available at the 2000 Review Conference and its Third Preparatory session for the discussion on and consideration of proposals on the provisions in Article VI of the NPT and in paragraphs 3 and 4 (C) of the 1995 decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", dealing with nuclear disarmament, as well as on the Resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. In this context, they reaffirmed the importance to establish at the 2005 Review Conference a subsidiary body to Main Committee I to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons, as well as a subsidiary body to Main Committee II to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT. In this regard, they emphasised the need for Preparatory Committee meetings to continue to allocate specific time for deliberations on nuclear disarmament, implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, and security assurances. They also welcomed the accession of Cuba to the NPT.</p>
<p>1995 Review and Extension of the NPT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 82) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT welcomed the outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. In this regard, they reiterated their call and the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the unequivocal undertaking given by the Nuclear Weapons States to the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They expected that this undertaking be demonstrated without delay through an accelerated process of negotiations and through the full implementation of the thirteen practical steps to advance systematically and progressively towards a nuclear-weapon-free world. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the 2000 Review Conference in its Final Document reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five nuclear weapons states to the non-nuclear weapon States Parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime. They took note of the First Preparatory meeting for the 2005 NPT Review Conference and emphasised the need for a substantive interaction beyond formal exchange of views between the States Parties at these meetings. The issues raised at the Preparatory meetings need to be addressed so as to continue strengthening the implementation of the Treaty and the</p>

	<p>undertakings agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, and also to lay the necessary foundation for the development of recommendations at the Third Preparatory session for the 2005 Review Conference. They recalled that specific time was made available at the 2000 Review Conference and its Third Preparatory session for the discussion on and consideration of proposals on the provisions in Article VI of the NPT and in paragraphs 3 and 4 (C) of the 1995 decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", dealing with nuclear disarmament, as well as on the Resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. In this context, they reaffirmed the importance to establish at the 2005 Review Conference a subsidiary body to Main Committee I to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons, as well as a subsidiary body to Main Committee II to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT. In this regard, they emphasised the need for Preparatory Committee meetings to continue to allocate specific time for deliberations on nuclear disarmament, implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, and security assurances. They also welcomed the accession of Cuba to the NPT.</p>
<p>Access to Technology and Technology Transfer</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 84) 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 emphasised 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. In this regard they also expressed their strong rejection of attempts by any Member State to use the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA's Statute.</p>
<p>2000 and 2010 Action Plans</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 82) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT welcomed the outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. In this regard, they reiterated their call and the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the unequivocal undertaking given by the Nuclear Weapons States to the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They expected that this undertaking be demonstrated without delay through an accelerated process of negotiations and through the full implementation of the thirteen practical steps to advance systematically and progressively towards a nuclear-weapon-free world. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the 2000 Review Conference in its Final Document</p>

	<p>reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five nuclear weapons states to the non-nuclear weapon States Parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime. They took note of the First Preparatory meeting for the 2005 NPT Review Conference and emphasised the need for a substantive interaction beyond formal exchange of views between the States Parties at these meetings. The issues raised at the Preparatory meetings need to be addressed so as to continue strengthening the implementation of the Treaty and the undertakings agreed upon at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, and also to lay the necessary foundation for the development of recommendations at the Third Preparatory session for the 2005 Review Conference. They recalled that specific time was made available at the 2000 Review Conference and its Third Preparatory session for the discussion on and consideration of proposals on the provisions in Article VI of the NPT and in paragraphs 3 and 4 (C) of the 1995 decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", dealing with nuclear disarmament, as well as on the Resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. In this context, they reaffirmed the importance to establish at the 2005 Review Conference a subsidiary body to Main Committee I to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons, as well as a subsidiary body to Main Committee II to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT. In this regard, they emphasised the need for Preparatory Committee meetings to continue to allocate specific time for deliberations on nuclear disarmament, implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, and security assurances. They also welcomed the accession of Cuba to the NPT.</p>
--	--

<p>Nuclear Safety and Security</p>	
---	--

<p>IAEA and Safety and Security</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 89) 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 encouraged the design of an appropriate international regime for physical protection of radioactive materials during their transportation. They reaffirmed the need to continue working at the multilateral level, with the purpose of strengthening existing international regulations relating to safety and security of transportation of such materials, and provisions for liability in the case of accidents or damage, resulting in contamination of the sea and seabed. They emphasised the need for the provision of information to concerned States regarding shipment routes, the mandatory requirements for contingency plans in case of leakage, accidents or incidents, the commitment to recover the waste material in such cases, and a comprehensive regulatory framework for obtaining</p>
--	--

	<p>compensation in case of nuclear damage. They welcomed the convening of a conference on these issues to be held in 2003.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 90) The Heads of State or Government welcomed the importance of Resolution 56/24 L of the United Nations General Assembly on the Prohibition of the Dumping of Radioactive Wastes and called upon States to take appropriate measures to prevent any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes that would infringe upon the sovereignty of States. They welcomed also the resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organisation of African Unity in 1991 (CM/Res.1356 {LIV}) on the Bamako Convention on the Ban on the Import of Hazardous Wastes into Africa and on the Control of Their Trans-boundary Movement within Africa. They called for effective implementation of the Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as a means of enhancing the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive wastes on their territories.</p>
<p>Individual State Responsibilities</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 90) The Heads of State or Government welcomed the importance of Resolution 56/24 L of the United Nations General Assembly on the Prohibition of the Dumping of Radioactive Wastes and called upon States to take appropriate measures to prevent any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes that would infringe upon the sovereignty of States. They welcomed also the resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organisation of African Unity in 1991 (CM/Res.1356 {LIV}) on the Bamako Convention on the Ban on the Import of Hazardous Wastes into Africa and on the Control of Their Trans-boundary Movement within Africa. They called for effective implementation of the Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as a means of enhancing the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive wastes on their territories.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Conventional Weapons</p>	
<p>Licit Access to Conventional Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 92) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned over the illicit transfer, manufacture and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation and uncontrolled spread in many regions of the world. They welcomed the adoption by consensus of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects at the United Nations Conference held from 9 - 20 July 2001 in New York which outlines a realistic, achievable and comprehensive approach, to address the problems associated with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons on the national, regional and global levels. They remained deeply concerned over the inability of the Conference to agree, due to the position of one State, on language recognising the need to establish and maintain controls over private ownership of small arms, and the need for</p>

	<p>preventing sales of such arms to non-State groups. They considered that these issues are directly related to the problems associated with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons faced by many Members of the Movement. They reiterated their call on all States to ensure that the supply of small arms and light weapons is limited only to Governments or to entities duly authorised by Governments and to implement legal restrictions on the unrestricted trade in and ownership of small arms and light weapons. They emphasized the importance of early and full implementation of the Programme of Action. They welcomed the decision to convene the First United Nations Biennial Meeting of States on the Implementation of the Programme of Action of the United Nations Conference to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in all its Aspects in New York on 7 – 11 July 2003 to consider national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action. In this regard, they encouraged the Member States to continue to play an active role in defining and elaborating the objectives of all future Conferences. They encouraged all initiatives to mobilize resources and expertise to promote implementation of the Programme of Action and to provide assistance to States in their implementation of the Programme of Action. They also welcomed the decision of convening the Review Conference in 2006 and stressed the need for a representative of the Movement to preside over the Conference.</p>
<p>Anti-Personnel Mines</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 93) The Heads of State or Government continued to deplore the use, in contravention of international humanitarian law, of anti-personnel mines in conflict situations aimed at maiming, killing and terrorising innocent civilians, denying them access to farmland, causing famine and forcing them to flee their homes eventually leading to de-population and preventing the return of civilians to their place of original residence. They again called upon the international community to provide the necessary assistance to landmine clearance operations as well as the rehabilitation of victims and their social and economic reintegration in the landmine affected countries. They further called for international assistance to ensure full access of affected countries to material equipment, technology and financial resources for mine clearance. They also called for increased humanitarian assistance for victims of landmine.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 94) The Heads of State or Government of States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction invited those States that have not yet done so to consider becoming parties to the Convention. They took note of the convening of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention held from 16 - 20 September 2002 in Geneva. They also welcomed the decision to hold the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention from 15 - 19 September 2003 in Bangkok, Thailand.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 95) The Heads of State or Government expressed concern about the residue of the Second World War, particularly in the form of landmines which have caused human and</p>

	<p>material damage and obstructed development plans in some Non-Aligned countries. They called on the States primarily responsible for laying the mines outside their territories to co-operate with the affected countries, provide the necessary information, and maps indicating the locations of such mines, technical assistance for their clearance and contribute towards defrayal of the costs of clearance and provide compensation for any ensuing losses.</p>
<p>Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 96) The Heads of State or Government of States Parties to the Convention on Prohibition or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW) and its Protocols encouraged States to become parties to it. They took note of the outcome of the Second Review Conference of the CCW. They also took note of the outcome of the Third Meeting of States Parties to the CCW held from 12 - 13 December 2002 in Geneva.</p>
<p>Small Arms and Light Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 92) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned over the illicit transfer, manufacture and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation and uncontrolled spread in many regions of the world. They welcomed the adoption by consensus of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects at the United Nations Conference held from 9 - 20 July 2001 in New York which outlines a realistic, achievable and comprehensive approach, to address the problems associated with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons on the national, regional and global levels. They remained deeply concerned over the inability of the Conference to agree, due to the position of one State, on language recognising the need to establish and maintain controls over private ownership of small arms, and the need for preventing sales of such arms to non-State groups. They considered that these issues are directly related to the problems associated with the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons faced by many Members of the Movement. They reiterated their call on all States to ensure that the supply of small arms and light weapons is limited only to Governments or to entities duly authorised by Governments and to implement legal restrictions on the unrestricted trade in and ownership of small arms and light weapons. They emphasized the importance of early and full implementation of the Programme of Action. They welcomed the decision to convene the First United Nations Biennial Meeting of States on the Implementation of the Programme of Action of the United Nations Conference to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in all its Aspects in New York on 7 – 11 July 2003 to consider national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action. In this regard, they encouraged the Member States to continue to play an active role in defining and elaborating the objectives of all future Conferences. They encouraged all initiatives to mobilize resources and expertise to promote implementation of the Programme of Action and to provide</p>

	<p>assistance to States in their implementation of the Programme of Action. They also welcomed the decision of convening the Review Conference in 2006 and stressed the need for a representative of the Movement to preside over the Conference.</p>
--	---