



Thematic Summary of the 14 th Heads of State Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, Havana, Cuba (2006)	
Disarmament	
Nuclear Weapon Convention	<p>(Final Document, Para 79) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, and reiterated their call on the CD to agree on a balanced and comprehensive program of work by establishing, inter alia, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament as soon as possible and as the highest priority. 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 reaffirmed the importance of the unanimous conclusion of the ICJ that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and to bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 81) The Heads of State or Government again called for an international conference to identify ways and means of eliminating nuclear dangers, 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.</p>
Disarmament and Development	<p>(Final Document, Para 115) The Heads of State or Government stressed the importance of the symbiotic relationship between disarmament and development and the important role of security in this connection, and expressed concern at the increasing global military expenditure, which could otherwise be spent on development needs. They further 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 from there to economic and social development, in particular in the fight against poverty. They expressed firm support for unilateral, bilateral, regional and multilateral measures adopted by some governments aimed at reducing military expenditures, thereby contributing to strengthening regional and international peace and security and recognised that confidence building measures assisted in this regard.</p>

Nuclear-Weapon States Obligations

(Final Document, Para 74) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the Movement's principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remains its highest priority, and on the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects and stressed the importance that efforts aiming at non-proliferation should be parallel to simultaneous efforts aiming at nuclear disarmament. They stressed their concern at the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and of their possible use or threat of use. They reiterated deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the nuclear weapons-States (NWS) to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They underscored the need for the NWS to implement the unequivocal undertaking that they provided in 2000 so as to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons and emphasised, in this regard, the urgent need to commence negotiations without delay.

(Final Document, Para 75) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned at strategic defence doctrines of NWS, including the "NATO Alliance Strategic Concept", which not only set out rationales for the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, but also maintain unjustifiable concepts on international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and nuclear deterrence policies.

(Final Document, Para 83) The Heads of State or Government stressed the significance of achieving universal adherence to the CTBT, including by all NWS, which, inter alia, should contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament. They reiterated that if the objectives of the Treaty were to be fully realised, the continued commitment of all States signatories, especially the NWS, to nuclear disarmament would be essential.

(Final Document, Para 84) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the entry into force of the 2002 Moscow Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons, and called on the United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, under the Treaty.

(Final Document, Para 92) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT, while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, expressed their disappointment at the inability of the 2005 Review Conference of the NPT to agree on substantive recommendations. They reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty to the implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total

	<p>elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five NWS to the non-NWS parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. They underlined the importance to establish subsidiary bodies to the relevant Main Committees of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; 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; and to consider security assurances. In this regard, they emphasised the need for the 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 recalled the agreement that the Review Conference will be chaired by a representative from the Movement.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Arms Races</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 85) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defence systems and the 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 ABM Treaty brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of the 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.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 86) The Heads of State or Government recognised the common interest of all mankind in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, and emphasised that prevention of an arms race in outer space would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasised the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Bilateral Disarmament</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 84) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the entry into force of the 2002 Moscow Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons, and called on the</p>

	<p>United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, under the Treaty.</p>
<p>Disarmament and Nonproliferation</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 71) The Heads of State or Government expressed deep concern over the current difficult and complex situation in the field of disarmament and international security. In this regard, they called for renewed efforts to resolve the current impasse in achieving nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 72) While reaffirming the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, the Heads of State or Government expressed their determination to promote multilateralism as the core principle of negotiations in the area of disarmament and nonproliferation, and in this regard, they welcomed the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 60/59 on Promotion on multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 74) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the Movement’s principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remains its highest priority, and on the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects and stressed the importance that efforts aiming at non-proliferation should be parallel to simultaneous efforts aiming at nuclear disarmament. They stressed their concern at the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and of their possible use or threat of use. They reiterated deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the nuclear weapons-States (NWS) to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They underscored the need for the NWS to implement the unequivocal undertaking that they provided in 2000 so as 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 77) The Heads of State or Government emphasised that progress in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects is essential to strengthening international peace and security. They reaffirmed that efforts toward nuclear disarmament, global and regional approaches and confidence building measures complement each other and should, wherever possible, be pursued simultaneously to promote regional and international peace and security.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk</p>

	<p>on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>
<p>Disarmament and the Environment</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 90) The Heads of State or Government emphasised the importance of the observance of environmental norms in the preparation and implementation of disarmament and arms limitation agreements. They reaffirmed that international disarmament forums should take fully into account the relevant environmental norms in negotiating treaties and agreements on disarmament and arms limitation and that all States, through their actions, should contribute fully to ensuring compliance with the aforementioned norms in the implementation of treaties and conventions to which they are parties.</p>
<p>International Humanitarian Law and ICJ</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 79) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, and reiterated their call on the CD to agree on a balanced and comprehensive program of work by establishing, inter alia, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament as soon as possible and as the highest priority. 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 reaffirmed the importance of the unanimous conclusion of the ICJ that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and to bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.</p>
<p>Modernization and Development of Nuclear Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 76) The Heads of State or Government reiterated that the improvement in the existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as envisaged in the United States Nuclear Posture Review contravene the security</p>

	<p>assurances provided by the NWS. They further reaffirmed that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate the commitments undertaken by the NWS at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 85) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defence systems and the 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 ABM Treaty brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of the 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.</p>
<p>Missiles</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 85) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defence systems and the 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 ABM Treaty brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of the 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.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 87) The Heads of State or Government remained convinced of the need for a multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive, transparent, and non-discriminatory approach toward missiles in all its aspects as a contribution to international peace and security. They expressed their support for efforts to be continued within the UN to explore further the issue of missiles in all its aspects. In this regard, they emphasised the need to keep the issue under the agenda of the UN General Assembly and that in accordance with its Resolution 59/67 a Panel of Governmental Experts on the issue of missiles in all its aspects would be established in 2007. 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 global levels in any approach to the issue of missiles in all its aspects.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">NAM Involvement and Contributions</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 70) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed and reiterated the long-standing principled positions of the Movement on disarmament and international security, including the decisions taken at the XII Summit in Durban in 1998, the XIII Summit in Kuala Lumpur in 2003, the XIII Ministerial Conference in Cartagena in 2000, the XIV Ministerial Conference in Durban in 2004 and the Ministerial Meeting held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, in May 2006.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 110) The Heads of State or Government emphasized the importance of early and full implementation of the Programme of Action, and in this regard, stressed that international assistance and cooperation is an essential aspect in the full implementation of the Programme of Action. They expressed disappointment at the inability of the UN Conference to Review the Progress made in the Implementation of the Program of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects, held in New York, from 26 June to 7 July 2006, to agree on a final document. They reaffirmed the total validity of the Programme of Action and encouraged the NAM delegations to coordinate efforts in the UN with a view to reaching agreement on a follow-up to the Programme of Action in order to ensure its full implementation. They called for the full implementation of the international instrument to enable States to identify and trace in a timely and reliable manner the illicit small arms and light weapons, which was adopted by the General Assembly.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 116) The Heads of State or Government commended the continued work of the NAM Working Group on Disarmament, under the chairmanship of Indonesia, in coordinating issues of common concern to the Movement in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. They encouraged all NAM delegations to actively participate at the international disarmament meetings with a view to promote and achieve the objectives of the Movement.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 117) Consistent with and guided by the aforementioned principled positions and affirming the need to promote, defend and preserve these positions, the Heads of State or Government agreed to:</p> <p>117.1. Continue to pursue the positions and priorities of the Movement, as appropriate, in the relevant international fora;</p> <p>117.2. Task the NAM Coordinating Bureau to undertake efforts, as appropriate, with a view to achieving the objectives of the Movement at disarmament and international security meetings.</p>
<p>United Nations Fora</p>	
<p>UN General Assembly</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 72) While reaffirming the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-</p>

proliferation, the Heads of State or Government expressed their determination to promote multilateralism as the core principle of negotiations in the area of disarmament and nonproliferation, and in this regard, they welcomed the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 60/59 on Promotion on multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.

(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the convening of the Fourth Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-IV) and further reiterated their deep concern over the lack of consensus on the deliberations to consider the objectives and agenda of SSOD-IV. They emphasised the need to reconvene the open-ended working group on SSOD-IV, at an early date, preferably in 2007, as mandated by the General Assembly with a view to reaching agreement on the objectives and agenda of SSOD-IV, including the possibility of establishing its preparatory committee.

(Final Document, Para 87) The Heads of State or Government remained convinced of the need for a multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive, transparent, and non-discriminatory approach toward missiles in all its aspects as a contribution to international peace and security. They expressed their support for efforts to be continued within the UN to explore further the issue of missiles in all its aspects. In this regard, they emphasised the need to keep the issue under the agenda of the UN General Assembly and that in accordance with its Resolution 59/67 a Panel of Governmental Experts on the issue of missiles in all its aspects would be established in 2007. 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 global levels in any approach to the issue of missiles in all its aspects.

(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to

establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.

(Final Document, Para 89) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their 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 NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the 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, and in this context, they took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on 29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel. In this regard, they expressed their serious concern over the continuing development whereby Israeli scientists are provided access to the nuclear facilities of one NWS. This development will have potentially serious negative

implications on security in the region as well as the reliability of the global non-proliferation regime.

(Final Document, Para 105) 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 60/78 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 UN framework and through international co-operation. 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 nonproliferation 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.

(Final Document, Para 106) While noting the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004) and resolution 1673 (2006) by the Security Council, the Heads of State or Government underlined the need to ensure that any action by the Security Council does not undermine the UN Charter and existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction and of international Organisations established in this regard, as well as the role of the General Assembly. They further cautioned against the continuing practice of the Security Council to utilize its authority to define the legislative requirements for Member States in implementing Security Council decisions. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government stressed the importance of the issue of non-state actors acquiring weapons of mass destruction to be addressed in an inclusive manner by the General Assembly, taking into account the views of all Member States.

(Final Document, Para 110) The Heads of State or Government emphasized the importance of early and full implementation of the Programme of Action, and in this regard, stressed that international assistance and cooperation is an essential aspect in the full implementation of the Programme of Action. They expressed disappointment at the inability of the UN Conference to Review the Progress made in the Implementation of the Program of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects, held in New York, from 26 June to 7 July 2006, to agree on a final document. They reaffirmed the total validity of the Programme of Action and encouraged the NAM delegations to coordinate efforts in the UN with a view to reaching agreement on a follow-up to the Programme of Action in order to ensure its full implementation. They called for the full implementation of the international instrument to

	<p>enable States to identify and trace in a timely and reliable manner the illicit small arms and light weapons, which was adopted by the General Assembly.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">SSOD</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 80) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the convening of the Fourth Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-IV) and further reiterated their deep concern over the lack of consensus on the deliberations to consider the objectives and agenda of SSOD-IV. They emphasised the need to reconvene the open-ended working group on SSOD-IV, at an early date, preferably in 2007, as mandated by the General Assembly with a view to reaching agreement on the objectives and agenda of SSOD-IV, including the possibility of establishing its preparatory committee.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Test Ban and CTBT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 76) The Heads of State or Government reiterated that the improvement in the existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as envisaged in the United States Nuclear Posture Review contravene the security assurances provided by the NWS. They further reaffirmed that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate the commitments undertaken by the NWS at the time</p>

	<p>of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 83) The Heads of State or Government stressed the significance of achieving universal adherence to the CTBT, including by all NWS, which, inter alia, should contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament. They reiterated that if the objectives of the Treaty were to be fully realised, the continued commitment of all States signatories, especially the NWS, to nuclear disarmament would be essential.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Conference on Disarmament</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 79) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the Conference on Disarmament (CD) as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, and reiterated their call on the CD to agree on a balanced and comprehensive program of work by establishing, inter alia, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament as soon as possible and as the highest priority. 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 reaffirmed the importance of the unanimous conclusion of the ICJ that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and to bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 82) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and reaffirmed further that non-NWS should be effectively assured by NWS against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they called for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to non-NWS as a matter of priority. They noted the establishment in 1998 of an Ad Hoc Committee on effective international arrangements to assure Non-nuclear-weapons States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate universal, unconditional and legally binding security assurances to all non-NWS.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 86) The Heads of State or Government recognised the common interest of all mankind in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, and emphasised that prevention of an arms race in outer space would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasised the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">UN Disarmament Commission</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 78) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance and the relevance of the UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) as the sole specialised, deliberative body within the UN multilateral disarmament machinery. They continued to fully support the work of the UNDC and called upon UN Member States to display the necessary political will and flexibility in order to achieve agreement on recommendations based on its two agenda items during the current cycle.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">UNIDIR and UNODA</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 109) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned over the illicit transfer, manufacture and circulation of small arms and light weapons (SALW) and their excessive accumulation and uncontrolled spread in many regions of the world. They recognised the need to establish and maintain controls over private ownership of small arms. They called on all States, in particular major producing 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 preventing the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons. They encouraged all initiatives by States to mobilise resources and expertise as well as to provide assistance to strengthen the full implementation of the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects.</p>

	<p>(Final Document, Para 110) The Heads of State or Government emphasized the importance of early and full implementation of the Programme of Action, and in this regard, stressed that international assistance and cooperation is an essential aspect in the full implementation of the Programme of Action. They expressed disappointment at the inability of the UN Conference to Review the Progress made in the Implementation of the Program of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects, held in New York, from 26 June to 7 July 2006, to agree on a final document. They reaffirmed the total validity of the Programme of Action and encouraged the NAM delegations to coordinate efforts in the UN with a view to reaching agreement on a follow-up to the Programme of Action in order to ensure its full implementation. They called for the full implementation of the international instrument to enable States to identify and trace in a timely and reliable manner the illicit small arms and light weapons, which was adopted by the General Assembly.</p>
<p>UN Regional Centers for Peace and Disarmament</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 91) The Heads of State or Government emphasised the importance of the UN activities at the regional level to increase the stability and security of its Member States, which could be promoted in a substantive manner by the maintenance and revitalization of the three regional centres for peace and disarmament.</p>
<p>International Atomic Energy Agency</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 89) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their 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 NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the 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.</p>

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, and in this context, they took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on 29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel. In this regard, they expressed their serious concern over the continuing development whereby Israeli scientists are provided access to the nuclear facilities of one NWS. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on security in the region as well as the reliability of the global non-proliferation regime.

(Final Document, Para 94) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to engage in research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They 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 non-discriminatory 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 IAEA technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA Statute.

(Final Document, Para 97) The Heads of State or Government, while emphasising the importance of the positive role played by the Non-Aligned Members in the IAEA, stressed the necessity that all members of the IAEA strictly observe its Statute. They stressed that any undue pressure or interference in the Agency's activities, especially its verification process, which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the Agency, should be avoided. They recognised that the IAEA is the sole competent authority for verification of compliance with the obligations under the respective safeguard agreements of the Member States. They also reaffirmed that a clear distinction has to be made between the legal obligations of Member States under their respective safeguards agreements and their voluntary undertakings, in order to ensure that such voluntary undertakings are not turned into legal safeguards obligations.

(Final Document, Para 98) The Heads of State or Government congratulated the IAEA and its Director General, Dr. Mohamed El Baradei, for being awarded the 2005 Nobel Peace Prize. They

	<p>expressed full confidence in the impartiality and professionalism of the Agency. They also congratulated the Agency on its Fiftieth Anniversary in 2007.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 99) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities –operational or under construction- poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the UN Charter and regulations of the IAEA. They 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>(Final Document, Para 100) The Heads of State or Government affirmed the need to strengthen the Radiological Safety and Protection Systems at facilities utilising radioactive materials as well as at radioactive waste management facilities, including the safe transportation of these materials. They reaffirmed the need to strengthen existing international regulations relating to safety and security of transportation of such materials. While reiterating the need to take appropriate measures to prevent any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes, they called for effective implementation of the Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste of the IAEA as a means of enhancing the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive wastes on their territories.</p>
<p>UN Security Council</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 89) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their 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 NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the 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.</p>

	<p>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, and in this context, they took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on 29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel. In this regard, they expressed their serious concern over the continuing development whereby Israeli scientists are provided access to the nuclear facilities of one NWS. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on security in the region as well as the reliability of the global non-proliferation regime.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 106) While noting the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004) and resolution 1673 (2006) by the Security Council, the Heads of State or Government underlined the need to ensure that any action by the Security Council does not undermine the UN Charter and existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction and of international Organisations established in this regard, as well as the role of the General Assembly. They further cautioned against the continuing practice of the Security Council to utilize its authority to define the legislative requirements for Member States in implementing Security Council decisions. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government stressed the importance of the issue of non-state actors acquiring weapons of mass destruction to be addressed in an inclusive manner by the General Assembly, taking into account the views of all Member States.</p>
--	---

Chemical and Biological Weapons

<p style="text-align: center;">Chemical Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 103) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) invited all States that have not yet signed or ratified the Convention to do so as soon as possible with a view to its universality. They reiterated their call on the developed countries to promote international cooperation through the transfer of technology, material and equipment for peaceful purposes in the chemical field and the removal of all and any discriminatory restrictions that are contrary to the letter and spirit of the Convention. They recalled that the full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of the provisions of international cooperation contribute to the universality 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 recognizing the financial and technical challenges for some possessors, they called upon those States Parties in a position</p>
--	--

	to do so, and where requested, to assist such possessor States in the achievement of the total elimination of chemical weapons.
Biological Weapons	(Final Document, Para 102) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC) reaffirmed that the possibility of any use of bacteriological (biological) agents and toxins as weapons should be completely excluded, and the conviction that such use would be repugnant to the conscience of humankind. They recognised the particular importance of strengthening the Convention through multilateral negotiations for a legally binding Protocol and universal adherence to the Convention. They reiterated their call to promote international cooperation for peaceful purposes, including scientific-technical exchange. They underlined the need to coordinate among the NAM States Parties to the Convention and expressed their commitment to work towards a successful outcome of the forthcoming Sixth Review Conference, to be held in Geneva, from 20 November to 8 December 2006.
Outer Space	
International Cooperation on Outer Space	(Final Document, Para 86) The Heads of State or Government recognised the common interest of all mankind in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, and emphasised that prevention of an arms race in outer space would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasised the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.
International Treaty on Outer Space	(Final Document, Para 86) The Heads of State or Government recognised the common interest of all mankind in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, and emphasised that prevention of an arms race in outer space would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasised the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also emphasised the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.
Missile Defense Systems	(Final Document, Para 85) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defence

	<p>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 ABM Treaty brings new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of the 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.</p>
--	--

<p>Nonproliferation</p>	
--------------------------------	--

<p>Nonproliferation and Noncompliance</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 101) The Heads of State or Government stressed that the issue of proliferation should be resolved through political and diplomatic means, and that measures and initiatives taken in this regard should be within the framework of international law; relevant conventions; the UN Charter, and should contribute to the promotion of international peace, security and stability.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 104) The Heads of State or Government regretted unsubstantiated allegations of non-compliance with relevant instruments on weapons of mass destruction and called on States Parties to such instruments that make such allegations to follow procedures set out in those instruments and to provide necessary substantiation for their allegations. They called upon all States parties to the respective international instruments to implement fully and in a transparent manner all their obligations under these instruments.</p>
--	--

<p>Nonproliferation and Peaceful Uses</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 94) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to engage in research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They 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 non-discriminatory 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 IAEA technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA Statute.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 95) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT emphasised once more that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the</p>
--	---

	<p>parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I, II, and III of the Treaty. They stressed that this right constitutes one of the fundamental objectives of the Treaty. In this connection, they confirmed that each country’s choices and decision in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be respected without jeopardizing its policies or international co-operation agreements and arrangements for peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its fuel-cycle policies.</p>
<p>Non-State Proliferation</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 105) 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 60/78 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 UN framework and through international co-operation. 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 nonproliferation 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>(Final Document, Para 106) While noting the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004) and resolution 1673 (2006) by the Security Council, the Heads of State or Government underlined the need to ensure that any action by the Security Council does not undermine the UN Charter and existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction and of international Organisations established in this regard, as well as the role of the General Assembly. They further cautioned against the continuing practice of the Security Council to utilize its authority to define the legislative requirements for Member States in implementing Security Council decisions. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government stressed the importance of the issue of non-state actors acquiring weapons of mass destruction to be addressed in an inclusive manner by the General Assembly, taking into account the views of all Member States.</p>
<p>WMD Terrorism</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 105) 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>

	<p>Assembly Resolution 60/78 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 UN framework and through international co-operation. 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 nonproliferation 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>(Final Document, Para 106) While noting the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004) and resolution 1673 (2006) by the Security Council, the Heads of State or Government underlined the need to ensure that any action by the Security Council does not undermine the UN Charter and existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction and of international Organisations established in this regard, as well as the role of the General Assembly. They further cautioned against the continuing practice of the Security Council to utilize its authority to define the legislative requirements for Member States in implementing Security Council decisions. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government stressed the importance of the issue of non-state actors acquiring weapons of mass destruction to be addressed in an inclusive manner by the General Assembly, taking into account the views of all Member States.</p>
--	---

Peaceful Uses

<p>Access to Nuclear Technology</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 94) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to engage in research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They 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 non-discriminatory 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 IAEA technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA Statute.</p>
--	--

	<p>(Final Document, Para 95) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT emphasised once more that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I, II, and III of the Treaty. They stressed that this right constitutes one of the fundamental objectives of the Treaty. In this connection, they confirmed that each country’s choices and decision in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be respected without jeopardizing its policies or international co-operation agreements and arrangements for peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its fuel-cycle policies.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 96) The Heads of State or Government stressed particularly the responsibility of developed countries to promote the legitimate need of nuclear energy of the developing countries, by allowing them to participate to the fullest possible to transfer of nuclear equipment, materials, scientific and technological information for peaceful purposes with a view to achieving the largest benefits and applying pertinent elements of sustainable development in their activities.</p>
<p>Attack or Threat of Attack Against Peaceful Nuclear Facilities</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 99) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities –operational or under construction- poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the UN Charter and regulations of the IAEA. They 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 and IAEA Authority</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 94) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to engage in research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They 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 non-discriminatory 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 IAEA technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA Statute.</p>

	<p>(Final Document, Para 97) The Heads of State or Government, while emphasising the importance of the positive role played by the Non-Aligned Members in the IAEA, stressed the necessity that all members of the IAEA strictly observe its Statute. They stressed that any undue pressure or interference in the Agency’s activities, especially its verification process, which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the Agency, should be avoided. They recognised that the IAEA is the sole competent authority for verification of compliance with the obligations under the respective safeguard agreements of the Member States. They also reaffirmed that a clear distinction has to be made between the legal obligations of Member States under their respective safeguards agreements and their voluntary undertakings, in order to ensure that such voluntary undertakings are not turned into legal safeguards obligations.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 99) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities –operational or under construction- poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the UN Charter and regulations of the IAEA. They 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;">Inalienable Right Through NPT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 94) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to engage in research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They 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 non-discriminatory 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 IAEA technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA Statute.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 95) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT emphasised once more that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I, II, and III of the Treaty. They stressed that this right constitutes one of the fundamental objectives of the Treaty. In this connection, they confirmed that each country’s choices and decision in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be respected without jeopardizing its policies or international co-operation agreements and</p>

	arrangements for peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its fuel-cycle policies.
--	---

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

Contributions to Disarmament	<p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>
-------------------------------------	---

Contributions to Nonproliferation	<p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to</p>
--	--

	<p>establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>
<p>Treaty of Tlatelolco</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>
<p>Treaty of Pelindaba</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective</p>

	<p>contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>
<p>Treaty of Bangkok</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>
<p>Treaty of Rarotonga</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive</p>

	<p>steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>
<p>Treaty of Semipalatinsk</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>

<p>Mongolia as a NWFZ</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p>
<p>Middle East WMDfZ</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 89) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their 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 NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the 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</p>

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, and in this context, they took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on 29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel. In this regard, they expressed their serious concern over the continuing development whereby Israeli scientists are provided access to the nuclear facilities of one NWS. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on security in the region as well as the reliability of the global non-proliferation regime.

(Final Document, Para 92) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT, while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, expressed their disappointment at the inability of the 2005 Review Conference of the NPT to agree on substantive recommendations. They reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty to the implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five NWS to the non-NWS parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. They underlined the importance to establish subsidiary bodies to the relevant Main Committees of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; 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; and to consider security assurances. In this regard, they emphasised the need for the 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 recalled the agreement that the Review Conference will be chaired by a representative from the Movement.

Security Assurances

<p style="text-align: center;">Nuclear-Weapon States Role</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 76) The Heads of State or Government reiterated that the improvement in the existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as envisaged in the United States Nuclear Posture Review contravene the security assurances provided by the NWS. They further reaffirmed that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate the commitments undertaken by the NWS at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 82) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and reaffirmed further that non-NWS should be effectively assured by NWS against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they called for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to non-NWS as a matter of priority. They noted the establishment in 1998 of an Ad Hoc Committee on effective international arrangements to assure Non-nuclear-weapons States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate universal, unconditional and legally binding security assurances to all non-NWS.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 93) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT called upon the NWS to implement their commitments not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-NWS parties to the Treaty or NWFZs at any time or under any circumstances, pending the conclusion of a legally binding instrument on security assurances.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Legally-Binding International Convention or Instrument</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 82) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and reaffirmed further that non-NWS should be effectively assured by NWS against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they called for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to non-NWS as a matter of priority. They noted the establishment in 1998 of an Ad Hoc Committee on effective international arrangements to assure Non-nuclear-weapons States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate universal, unconditional and legally binding security assurances to all non-NWS.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 93) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT called upon the NWS to implement their commitments not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-NWS parties to the Treaty or NWFZs at any time or under any</p>

	<p>circumstances, pending the conclusion of a legally binding instrument on security assurances.</p>
<p>NWFZs and Security Assurances</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 88) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba and Mongolia’s nuclear-weapon-free-status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. They welcomed the signing of the Treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia in Semipalatinsk on 8 September 2006 by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, and considered the establishment of that zone as an effective contribution to strengthening regional and global peace and security. They reiterated that in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the principles adopted by the 1999 UN Disarmament Commission. They noted with satisfaction the convening of the First Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, held in Tlatelolco, Mexico, from 26 to 28 April 2005, and in this context, called on the States parties and signatories to the Treaties of NWFZs to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 93) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT called upon the NWS to implement their commitments not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-NWS parties to the Treaty or NWFZs at any time or under any circumstances, pending the conclusion of a legally binding instrument on security assurances.</p>
<p>Security Assurances and the NPT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 92) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT, while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, expressed their disappointment at the inability of the 2005 Review Conference of the NPT to agree on substantive recommendations. They reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty to the implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament.</p>

	<p>Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five NWS to the non-NWS parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. They underlined the importance to establish subsidiary bodies to the relevant Main Committees of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; 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; and to consider security assurances. In this regard, they emphasised the need for the 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 recalled the agreement that the Review Conference will be chaired by a representative from the Movement.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 93) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT called upon the NWS to implement their commitments not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-NWS parties to the Treaty or NWFZs at any time or under any circumstances, pending the conclusion of a legally binding instrument on security assurances.</p>
--	--

Country Specific

<p>United States</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 75) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned at strategic defence doctrines of NWS, including the “NATO Alliance Strategic Concept”, which not only set out rationales for the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, but also maintain unjustifiable concepts on international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and nuclear deterrence policies.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 76) The Heads of State or Government reiterated that the improvement in the existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as envisaged in the United States Nuclear Posture Review contravene the security assurances provided by the NWS. They further reaffirmed that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate the commitments undertaken by the NWS at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 84) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the entry into force of the 2002 Moscow Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons, and called on the</p>
-----------------------------	--

	<p>United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, under the Treaty.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 89) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their 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 NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the 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, and in this context, they took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on 29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel. In this regard, they expressed their serious concern over the continuing development whereby Israeli scientists are provided access to the nuclear facilities of one NWS. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on security in the region as well as the reliability of the global non-proliferation regime.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Russia</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 84) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the entry into force of the 2002 Moscow Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons, and called on the</p>

	<p>United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, under the Treaty.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Israel</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 89) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their 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 NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the 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, and in this context, they took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on 29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel. In this regard, they expressed their serious concern over the continuing development whereby Israeli scientists are provided access to the nuclear facilities of one NWS. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on security in the region as well as the reliability of the global non-proliferation regime.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Iran</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 89) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, they</p>

	<p>reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the 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, and in this context, they took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on 29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel. In this regard, they expressed their serious concern over the continuing development whereby Israeli scientists are provided access to the nuclear facilities of one NWS. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on security in the region as well as the reliability of the global non-proliferation regime.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Syria</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 89) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their 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 NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the 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)</p>

	<p>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, and in this context, they took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on 29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of this zone. They also called for the total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance in the nuclear related scientific or technological fields to Israel. In this regard, they expressed their serious concern over the continuing development whereby Israeli scientists are provided access to the nuclear facilities of one NWS. This development will have potentially serious negative implications on security in the region as well as the reliability of the global non-proliferation regime.</p>
--	--

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

<p>Disarmament Through the NPT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 92) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT, while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, expressed their disappointment at the inability of the 2005 Review Conference of the NPT to agree on substantive recommendations. They reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty to the implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five NWS to the non-NWS parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. They underlined the importance to establish</p>
---	---

	<p>subsidiary bodies to the relevant Main Committees of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; 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; and to consider security assurances. In this regard, they emphasised the need for the 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 recalled the agreement that the Review Conference will be chaired by a representative from the Movement.</p>
<p>1995 Review and Extension of the NPT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 92) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT, while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, expressed their disappointment at the inability of the 2005 Review Conference of the NPT to agree on substantive recommendations. They reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty to the implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five NWS to the non-NWS parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. They underlined the importance to establish subsidiary bodies to the relevant Main Committees of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; 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; and to consider security assurances. In this regard, they emphasised the need for the 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 recalled the agreement that the Review Conference will be chaired by a representative from the Movement.</p>
<p>Access to Technology and Technology Transfer</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 94) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to engage in research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They 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</p>

	<p>negotiated, universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory 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 IAEA technical co-operation programme as a tool for political purposes in violation of the IAEA Statute.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 95) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT emphasised once more that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I, II, and III of the Treaty. They stressed that this right constitutes one of the fundamental objectives of the Treaty. In this connection, they confirmed that each country's choices and decision in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be respected without jeopardizing its policies or international co-operation agreements and arrangements for peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its fuel-cycle policies.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 96) The Heads of State or Government stressed particularly the responsibility of developed countries to promote the legitimate need of nuclear energy of the developing countries, by allowing them to participate to the fullest possible to transfer of nuclear equipment, materials, scientific and technological information for peaceful purposes with a view to achieving the largest benefits and applying pertinent elements of sustainable development in their activities.</p>
<p>2000 and 2010 Action Plans</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 74) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the Movement's principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remains its highest priority, and on the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects and stressed the importance that efforts aiming at non-proliferation should be parallel to simultaneous efforts aiming at nuclear disarmament. They stressed their concern at the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and of their possible use or threat of use. They reiterated deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the nuclear weapons-States (NWS) to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. They underscored the need for the NWS to implement the unequivocal undertaking that they provided in 2000 so as 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 92) The Heads of State or Government of the States Parties to the NPT, while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, expressed their</p>

	<p>disappointment at the inability of the 2005 Review Conference of the NPT to agree on substantive recommendations. They reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States parties to the Treaty to the implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty and called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they also recalled that the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT reiterated that legally binding security assurances by the five NWS to the non-NWS parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. They underlined the importance to establish subsidiary bodies to the relevant Main Committees of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT to deliberate on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; 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; and to consider security assurances. In this regard, they emphasised the need for the 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 recalled the agreement that the Review Conference will be chaired by a representative from the Movement.</p>
<p>Nuclear Safety and Security</p>	
<p>IAEA and Safety and Security</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 100) The Heads of State or Government affirmed the need to strengthen the Radiological Safety and Protection Systems at facilities utilising radioactive materials as well as at radioactive waste management facilities, including the safe transportation of these materials. They reaffirmed the need to strengthen existing international regulations relating to safety and security of transportation of such materials. While reiterating the need to take appropriate measures to prevent any dumping of nuclear or radioactive wastes, they called for effective implementation of the Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste of the IAEA as a means of enhancing the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive wastes on their territories.</p>
<p>Conventional Weapons</p>	
<p>Licit Access to Conventional Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 107) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the sovereign right of States to acquire, manufacture, export, import and retain conventional arms for their self-defence and security needs. They expressed their concern about unilateral coercive measures</p>

	<p>and emphasised that no undue restriction should be placed on the transfer of such arms.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 108) The Heads of State or Government recognised the significant imbalance in the production, possession and trade in conventional weapons between the industrialized and the Non-Aligned Countries, and called for a significant reduction in the production, possession and trade of conventional weapons by the industrialized states with a view to enhancing international and regional peace and security.</p>
<p>Cluster Munitions</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 114) 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 the Convention and its additional Protocol on Explosive Remnants of War.</p>
<p>Anti-Personnel Mines</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 111) 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 called upon all States in the position to do so, to provide the necessary financial, technical and humanitarian assistance to landmine clearance operations, the social and economic rehabilitation of victims as well as to ensure full access of affected countries to material equipment, technology and financial resources for mine clearance.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 112) The Heads of State or Government of the 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.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 113) The Heads of State or Government expressed concern about the explosive remnants of the Second World War, particularly in the form of landmines which continue to cause human and material damage and obstruct development plans in some Non-Aligned Countries. They called on the States primarily responsible for laying these mines and living explosives outside their territories during Second World War to cooperate with the affected countries and provide mine action support to affected countries, including information exchange, maps indicating the locations of mines and explosives, technical assistance for mine clearance, defrayal of the costs of clearance and compensation for any losses caused by mines-laid.</p>

<p>Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 114) 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 the Convention and its additional Protocol on Explosive Remnants of War.</p>
<p>Small Arms and Light Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 109) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned over the illicit transfer, manufacture and circulation of small arms and light weapons (SALW) and their excessive accumulation and uncontrolled spread in many regions of the world. They recognised the need to establish and maintain controls over private ownership of small arms. They called on all States, in particular major producing 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 preventing the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons. They encouraged all initiatives by States to mobilise resources and expertise as well as to provide assistance to strengthen the full implementation of the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 110) The Heads of State or Government emphasized the importance of early and full implementation of the Programme of Action, and in this regard, stressed that international assistance and cooperation is an essential aspect in the full implementation of the Programme of Action. They expressed disappointment at the inability of the UN Conference to Review the Progress made in the Implementation of the Program of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects, held in New York, from 26 June to 7 July 2006, to agree on a final document. They reaffirmed the total validity of the Programme of Action and encouraged the NAM delegations to coordinate efforts in the UN with a view to reaching agreement on a follow-up to the Programme of Action in order to ensure its full implementation. They called for the full implementation of the international instrument to enable States to identify and trace in a timely and reliable manner the illicit small arms and light weapons, which was adopted by the General Assembly.</p>