



Thematic Summary of the 17 th Heads of State Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, Margarita, Venezuela (2016)	
Disarmament	
Nuclear Weapon Convention	<p>(Final Document, Para 176) 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, inter alia, establishing an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament as soon as possible and as the highest priority. They emphasized the necessity to start negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, without further delay, on a comprehensive nuclear weapons convention that sets, inter alia, a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 179) The Heads of State or Government, while recalling General Assembly resolution 68/32, expressed satisfaction at the adoption of resolutions 69/58 and 70/34 on the “follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament” proposed by NAM, through which the Assembly:</p> <p>179.a Calls for the urgent commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for the early conclusion of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons to prohibit their possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use and to provide for their destruction;</p> <p>179.b Recalls its decision to convene no later than 2018, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to review the progress made in this regard; and</p> <p>179.c Welcomes the commemoration and promotion of the 26 September as the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons devoted to furthering this objective.</p>
Verification	<p>(Final Document, Para 171) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the statements by NWS of their intention to pursue actions in achieving a world free of nuclear weapons, reaffirmed the need for urgent concrete actions by the NWS to achieve this goal in accordance with their nuclear disarmament legal obligations and commitments. They reaffirmed the importance of the application of the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability by NWS in all measures related to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 187) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the conclusion and entry into force of the New START Treaty</p>

	<p>between the Russian Federation and the United States, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status, although they may contribute to risk reduction, cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons. In this context they called on the United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to such cuts, to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, thus contributing to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations and facilitating the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons at the earliest date.</p>
<p>Disarmament and Development</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 180) The Heads of State or Government welcomed UN meetings and activities for the commemoration of the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons on 26 September 2014. They invited Member States, the UN system and the civil society, including non-governmental organizations, academia, parliamentarians, the mass media and individuals, to commemorate and promote the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons through all means of educational and public awareness-raising activities. They also expressed their commitment to work together with the objective that the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons becomes one of the effective ways to focus international public attention on the dangers of nuclear weapons and the advantages of nuclear disarmament for development as well as for international peace and security.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 248) The Heads of State or Government welcomed the adoption without a vote of General Assembly Resolution 70/32 on the relationship between disarmament and development. They also 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 the unilateral, bilateral, regional and multilateral measures aimed at reducing military expenditures, thereby contributing to strengthening regional and international peace and security and recognized that confidence building measures assisted in this regard.</p>
<p>Nuclear-Weapon States Obligations</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 169) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the Nuclear-Weapon States (NWS) to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals in accordance with their relevant multilateral legal obligations. They 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. They called</p>

upon the NWS to fulfill their multilateral legal obligations on nuclear disarmament and to implement the unequivocal undertaking they provided in 2000 and further reiterated in 2010 so as to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons. They emphasized, in this regard, the urgent need to commence and to bring to a conclusion negotiations on comprehensive and complete nuclear disarmament without any further delay.

(Final Document, Para 171) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the statements by NWS of their intention to pursue actions in achieving a world free of nuclear weapons, reaffirmed the need for urgent concrete actions by the NWS to achieve this goal in accordance with their nuclear disarmament legal obligations and commitments. They reaffirmed the importance of the application of the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability by NWS in all measures related to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations.

(Final Document, Para 173) The Heads of State or Government reiterated, with concern, that improvements in existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as provided for in the military doctrines of some NWS, including the United States Nuclear Posture Review, violate their legal obligations on nuclear disarmament, as well as the commitments made to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in their military and security policies and contravene the negative security assurances provided by the NWS. They stressed once again that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate also the commitments undertaken at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and at the NPT Review Conferences by the NWS.

(Final Document, Para 186) The Heads of State or Government stressed the significance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, 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 realized, the continued commitment of all States signatories, especially the NWS, to nuclear disarmament would be essential. In this context, the ratification of the CTBT by Angola, Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Congo and Niue was welcomed. In this regard, they also welcomed the adoption of a “Special Declaration on the 20 Years of the opening for signature of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty” during the Summit of Heads of State and Government of CELAC, held in Quito, Ecuador, the 27th January 2016.

(Final Document, Para 187) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the conclusion and entry into force of the New START Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status, although they may contribute to risk reduction, cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons. In this context they called on the United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to such cuts,

	<p>to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, thus contributing to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations and facilitating the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons at the earliest date.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 202) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, and recognizing the crucial role of the NPT in nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, were of the view that the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, represent an outcome that can be built upon and further enhanced in the near future, to fully address the priorities of the Movement, in particular to realise a world free from nuclear weapons. They called upon NWS to implement fully and effectively their obligations under the Treaty, in particular in the area of nuclear disarmament, and the outcomes of its Review Conferences, in particular the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, the 2000 Review Conference and the 2010 Review Conference.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 208) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States Parties to the Treaty to the full and indiscriminate implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty. They further called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they underlined the agreement by consensus at the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, which reaffirmed the previous agreements, on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT; and on providing effective, unconditional and non-discriminatory universal legally binding security assurances to all NNWS parties to the Treaty, which would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Arms Races</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 188) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense systems and the threat of weaponization of outer space which have, inter alia, contributed to the further erosion of an international climate conducive to the promotion of disarmament and the strengthening of international security. The abrogation of the ABM Treaty brought new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained seriously concerned at the negative security consequences of the deployment of strategic missile defence systems which could trigger an arms race(s) and lead to the further</p>

	<p>development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 189) The Heads of State or Government recognized the common interest of all mankind and the inalienable, legitimate the sovereign rights of all State in the exploration and use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes, and reconfirmed their stand to oppose and reject any act denying or violating it and emphasized that prevention of an arms race in outer space, including a ban to deploy or use weapons therein, would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasized the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also reemphasized the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD, inter alia, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, taking note of the joint Russian-Chinese initiative of a draft treaty on the “Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects” (PPWT) presented in the Conference on Disarmament on 12 February 2008 and in 2014. They noted that this initiative is a constructive contribution to the work of the Conference, and is a good basis for further discussion toward adopting an international legally-binding instrument. In this context, they noted the adoption of General Assembly resolution 70/27 on no first emplacement of weapons in outer space with a view to ensuring its exclusive peaceful use.</p>
<p>Bilateral Disarmament</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 187) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the conclusion and entry into force of the New START Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status, although they may contribute to risk reduction, cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons. In this context they called on the United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to such cuts, to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, thus contributing to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations and facilitating the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons at the earliest date.</p>
<p>Disarmament and Nonproliferation</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 164) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their continued concern over the current difficult and complex situation in the field of disarmament and international security. In this regard, they called for renewed efforts to resolve the current impasse in achieving nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 166) Reaffirming the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-</p>

proliferation, the Heads of State or Government reiterated their determination to promote multilateralism as the core principle of negotiations in the area of disarmament and nonproliferation. In this regard, they welcomed the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 70/31 on Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.

(Final Document, Para 168) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the Movement's principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remains its highest priority, and on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects. They stressed the importance of ensuring that efforts aimed at nuclear non-proliferation are parallel to simultaneous efforts aimed at nuclear disarmament. They expressed concern at the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and of their possible use or threat of use.

(Final Document, Para 174) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that progress in nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is essential to strengthening international peace and security. They stressed the importance of ensuring that efforts aimed at nuclear non-proliferation are parallel to simultaneous efforts aimed at nuclear disarmament. 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. Nevertheless, they stressed that nuclear disarmament, as the highest priority established by SSOD-I and as a multilateral legal obligation, should not be made conditional on confidence building measures or other disarmament efforts.

(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia's Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.

(Final Document, Para 202) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, and recognizing the crucial role of the NPT in nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-

	<p>proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, were of the view that the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, represent an outcome that can be built upon and further enhanced in the near future, to fully address the priorities of the Movement, in particular to realise a world free from nuclear weapons. They called upon NWS to implement fully and effectively their obligations under the Treaty, in particular in the area of nuclear disarmament, and the outcomes of its Review Conferences, in particular the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, the 2000 Review Conference and the 2010 Review Conference.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 233) 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 70/36 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 non-proliferation in order to help maintain international peace and security and to contribute to global efforts against terrorism. They called upon all Member States to support international efforts to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. They also urged all Member States to take and strengthen national measures, as appropriate, to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and materials and technologies related to their manufacture.</p>
<p>Disarmament and the Environment</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 165) The Heads of State or Government expressed their deepest concern over the immediate, indiscriminate, and massive death and destruction caused by any nuclear weapon detonation and its long term catastrophic consequences on human health, environment, and other vital economic resources, thus endangering the life of present and future generations. They reiterated further their deep concern at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons, and in this context reaffirmed the need for all States at all times to comply with applicable international law, including international humanitarian law. They stressed the need to address this issue in the context of the efforts aimed at the realization of a nuclear-weapon-free world and in this regard, they noted continuing relevant international efforts, including the three International Conferences on the Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons, held respectively in Norway in 2013, in Mexico in 2014 and in Vienna in 2014, and the important role of the humanitarian initiative in promoting progress towards a comprehensive nuclear weapons convention.</p>

	<p>(Final Document, Para 200) The Heads of State or Government emphasized the importance of the observance of environmental norms in the preparation and implementation of disarmament and arms limitation agreements, and in this regard, they welcomed the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 70/30 on this matter without a vote. 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>(Final Document, Para 247) The Heads of State or Government underlined the importance of the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 69/57, taking into consideration the possible harmful effects to human health and the environment, caused by the use of weapons and munitions containing depleted uranium.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">International Humanitarian Law and ICJ</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 165) The Heads of State or Government expressed their deepest concern over the immediate, indiscriminate, and massive death and destruction caused by any nuclear weapon detonation and its long term catastrophic consequences on human health, environment, and other vital economic resources, thus endangering the life of present and future generations. They reiterated further their deep concern at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons, and in this context reaffirmed the need for all States at all times to comply with applicable international law, including international humanitarian law. They stressed the need to address this issue in the context of the efforts aimed at the realization of a nuclear-weapon-free world and in this regard, they noted continuing relevant international efforts, including the three International Conferences on the Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons, held respectively in Norway in 2013, in Mexico in 2014 and in Vienna in 2014, and the important role of the humanitarian initiative in promoting progress towards a comprehensive nuclear weapons convention.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 169) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the Nuclear-Weapon States (NWS) to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals in accordance with their relevant multilateral legal obligations. They 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. They called upon the NWS to fulfill their multilateral legal obligations on nuclear disarmament and to implement the unequivocal undertaking they provided in 2000 and further reiterated in 2010 so as to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons. They emphasized, in this regard, the urgent need to commence and to bring to a conclusion negotiations</p>

	<p>on comprehensive and complete nuclear disarmament without any further delay.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 242) 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 terrorizing 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 style="text-align: center;">Modernization and Development of Nuclear Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 173) The Heads of State or Government reiterated, with concern, that improvements in existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as provided for in the military doctrines of some NWS, including the United States Nuclear Posture Review, violate their legal obligations on nuclear disarmament, as well as the commitments made to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in their military and security policies and contravene the negative security assurances provided by the NWS. They stressed once again that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate also the commitments undertaken at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and at the NPT Review Conferences by the NWS.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 188) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense systems and the threat of weaponization of outer space which have, inter alia, contributed to the further erosion of an international climate conducive to the promotion of disarmament and the strengthening of international security. The abrogation of the ABM Treaty brought new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained seriously concerned at the negative security consequences of the deployment of strategic missile defence systems which could trigger an arms race(s) and lead to the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 235) Mindful of the threat posed to humankind by the existing weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons and underlining the need for the total elimination of such weapons, the Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the need to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction and therefore supported the necessity of monitoring the situation and triggering international action as required. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government welcomed the adoption of the General Assembly</p>

	<p>Resolution 69/27 entitled “Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament”.</p>
<p>Missiles</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 188) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense systems and the threat of weaponization of outer space which have, inter alia, contributed to the further erosion of an international climate conducive to the promotion of disarmament and the strengthening of international security. The abrogation of the ABM Treaty brought new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained seriously concerned at the negative security consequences of the deployment of strategic missile defence systems which could trigger an arms race(s) and lead to the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 192) The Heads of State or Government remained convinced of the need for a multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive, transparent and non-discriminatory approach toward the issue of 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 emphasized the contribution of peaceful uses of space technologies, including space launch vehicle technologies, to human advancement, such as for telecommunications and data gathering on natural disasters. They also emphasized the need to keep the issue of missiles in all its aspects on the agenda of the UN General Assembly and welcomed that the Panel of Governmental Experts established in accordance with Resolution 59/67 successfully concluded its work in 2008 and submitted its report to the 63rd session of the UN General Assembly. While welcoming the consensus adoption of the UNGA decision 69/517 on “Missiles”, they encouraged follow up efforts to further examine the elements contained in the conclusions of the Secretary- General’s Report A/63/176. Pending the achievement of such a universal approach related to delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction, any initiative to address these concerns effectively and in a sustainable and comprehensive manner should be through an inclusive process of negotiations in a forum where all States could participate as equals. They stressed the importance of the security concerns of all States at regional and global levels in any approach to the issue of missiles in all its aspects.</p>
<p>NAM Involvement and Contributions</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 163) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed and reiterated the long-standing principled positions of the Movement on disarmament and international security, including the decisions taken at the XII Summit in Durban in 1998 the XIII Summit in Kuala Lumpur in 2003, the XIV Summit in Havana in 2006, the XV</p>

Summit in Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt, in July 2009, the XVI Summit in Tehran in 2012, the XIII Ministerial Conference in Cartagena in 2000, the XIV Ministerial Conference in Durban in 2004, the Ministerial Meeting held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, in 2006, the XV Ministerial Conference held in Teheran, Islamic Republic of Iran, in 2008, and the XVI Ministerial Conference and Commemorative Meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement held in Bali, Indonesia, in May 2011, and the XVII Ministerial Conference held in Algiers, Algeria in 2014.

(Final Document, Para 170) The Heads of State or Government acknowledged the significant contribution towards realizing the objective of nuclear disarmament made by NAM Member and Observer States, including through the voluntary renunciation of the possession of nuclear weapons by Belarus, Kazakhstan, South Africa and Ukraine.

(Final Document, Para 175) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance and the relevance of the UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) as the sole specialized, deliberative body within the UN multilateral disarmament machinery and reiterated their full support for its work. They expressed regret that UNDC was unable to reach agreement on any recommendation since 2000 due to the lack of political will and inflexible positions of some Nuclear-Weapons States, despite NAM's constructive role and concrete proposals throughout the deliberations, especially in the Working Group on "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons". They called upon UN Member States to display the necessary political will and flexibility in order to enable the Commission to agree on substantive outcomes in its current cycle.

(Final Document, Para 177) The Heads of State or Government expressed their appreciation for the efforts undertaken, in particular by those representatives of Member States of the Non-Aligned Movement who served as the Presidents of the CD for the commencement of its substantive work, including negotiations. They noted the various proposals on the program of Work of the CD as contained in the documents CD/1864, a decision adopted by CD on 29 May 2009 but not implemented, CD/1933/Rev.1, CD/1952, and CD/1955 which were presented successively by Algeria, Egypt, Iran and Iraq between 2009 to 2013 sessions. They called on the CD to agree by consensus on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work without any further delay taking into account the security interests of all States. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the principle contained in the final document of the SSOD-I that "The adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to security and to ensure that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage". They agreed to continue coordination of efforts at the NAM Chapter in Geneva.

(Final Document, Para 178) The Heads of State or Government commended the efforts of NAM Member States in advancing the goal

of nuclear disarmament. In this regard, they welcomed the convening, at the initiative of NAM, of the first-ever high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament on 26 September 2013, and underlined the strong support expressed at that meeting for taking urgent and effective measures to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

(Final Document, Para 179) The Heads of State or Government, while recalling General Assembly resolution 68/32, expressed satisfaction at the adoption of resolutions 69/58 and 70/34 on the “follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament” proposed by NAM, through which the Assembly:

179.a Calls for the urgent commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for the early conclusion of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons to prohibit their possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use and to provide for their destruction;

179.b Recalls its decision to convene no later than 2018, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to review the progress made in this regard; and

179.c Welcomes the commemoration and promotion of the 26 September as the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons devoted to furthering this objective.

(Final Document, Para 181) Moreover, the Heads of State or Government underlined the importance of UNGA resolutions 68/32, 69/58 and 70/34 as a roadmap on nuclear disarmament and accordingly stressed the need for an active participation of NAM Member States in all activities related to their implementation, including enhancing public awareness and education on this issue. They commended all efforts aiming at promoting the implementation of these resolutions, including those undertaken by the Group of 21 in the Conference on Disarmament.

(Final Document, Para 186) The Heads of State or Government stressed the significance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, 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 realized, the continued commitment of all States signatories, especially the NWS, to nuclear disarmament would be essential. In this context, the ratification of the CTBT by Angola, Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Congo and Niue was welcomed. In this regard, they also welcomed the adoption of a “Special Declaration on the 20 Years of the opening for signature of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty” during the Summit of Heads of State and Government of CELAC, held in Quito, Ecuador, the 27th January 2016.

(Final Document, Para 190) The Heads of State or Government, while reaffirming the Declaration on Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) of the 17th Ministerial Conference of NAM held in Algeria in May 2014, and noting that considerable progress has been made in developing and applying the latest ICTs, they expressed

concern that these technologies and means can potentially be used for purposes that are inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international stability and security and may adversely affect the integrity of the infrastructure of States to the detriment of their security in both civil and military fields. They also noted with concern cases of illegal use of new ICTs to the detriment of Members States of the Movement, and expressed strong rejection to those violations. In this regard and while taking into account the ongoing efforts within the United Nations, they called upon Member States to further promote at multilateral levels the consideration of existing and potential threats from the malicious use of ICTs, as well as possible strategies to address these threats. They emphasized that ICT s should be utilized by Member States in a manner consistent with international law and the UN Charter. They called for the intensification of efforts towards safeguarding cyberspace from becoming an arena of conflict, and ensuring instead the exclusive peaceful uses which would enable the full realization of the potential of ICTs for contributing to social and economic development. They stressed that the development of any international legal framework to address issues related to the use of ICTs with implications on international peace and security should be pursued within the UN with the active and equal participation of all States. They highlighted the central role of governments in areas related to public policy aspects of ICT security.

(Final Document, Para 204) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT reiterated the importance of the full implementation of the action plans adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference on nuclear disarmament, on nuclear non-proliferation, on peaceful uses of nuclear energy and on the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East. They expressed concern at the lack of agreement on a number of key priorities of NAM States Parties to the NPT and agreed to continue their collective efforts in pursuing the realization of their priorities at the NPT Review Conferences.

(Final Document, Para 241) The Heads of State or Government noted the adoption, by vote, of the Arms Trade Treaty by the UN General Assembly on 2nd April 2013 and its entry into force on 24 December 2014. They also noted that the Treaty aims at regulating trade in conventional weapons, including small arms and light weapons. They called for balanced, transparent and objective implementation of the Treaty, in strict accordance with the principles of the UN Charter, and the inherent right of each State to security and to individual or collective self-defense. They also underscored that its implementation should, in no way, affect the sovereign right of States to acquire, manufacture, export, import and retain conventional arms and their parts and components for their self-defense, security needs and the maintenance of their territorial integrity. The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the ATT emphasized the importance of ensuring a leading role for NAM States Parties from those regions most affected by the illicit trade of conventional arms in the implementation of the Treaty, as well as in any future institutional arrangements of the Treaty.

	<p>Final Document, Para 245) The Heads of State or Government of NAM 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 Protocols. NAM is of the view that Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS) raise a number of ethical, legal, moral and technical, as well as international peace and security related questions which should be thoroughly deliberated and examined in the context of conformity to international law including international humanitarian law and international human rights law. In this regard, NAM States Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) welcome the informal meetings of CCW experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems held in Geneva in 2014, 2015 and 2016 and support continued deliberations on this issue in the CCW on the basis of an agreed mandate. NAM States Parties to CCW welcome the accession of Iraq to the Convention and its annexed protocols.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 249) The Heads of State or Government commended the 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. They encouraged NAM delegations to continue to actively participate in the Working Group with a view to promote and achieve the objectives of the Movement.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 250) 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>250.1 Continue to pursue the positions and priorities of the Movement, as appropriate, in the relevant international fora; and</p> <p>250.2 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>
--	--

United Nations Fora

<p style="text-align: center;">UN General Assembly</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 166) Reaffirming the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, the Heads of State or Government reiterated their determination to promote multilateralism as the core principle of negotiations in the area of disarmament and nonproliferation. In this regard, they welcomed the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 70/31 on Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 178) The Heads of State or Government commended the efforts of NAM Member States in advancing the goal</p>
---	--

of nuclear disarmament. In this regard, they welcomed the convening, at the initiative of NAM, of the first-ever high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament on 26 September 2013, and underlined the strong support expressed at that meeting for taking urgent and effective measures to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

(Final Document, Para 179) The Heads of State or Government, while recalling General Assembly resolution 68/32, expressed satisfaction at the adoption of resolutions 69/58 and 70/34 on the “follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament” proposed by NAM, through which the Assembly:

179.a Calls for the urgent commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for the early conclusion of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons to prohibit their possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use and to provide for their destruction;

179.b Recalls its decision to convene no later than 2018, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to review the progress made in this regard; and

179.c Welcomes the commemoration and promotion of the 26 September as the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons devoted to furthering this objective.

(Final Document, Para 181) Moreover, the Heads of State or Government underlined the importance of UNGA resolutions 68/32, 69/58 and 70/34 as a roadmap on nuclear disarmament and accordingly stressed the need for an active participation of NAM Member States in all activities related to their implementation, including enhancing public awareness and education on this issue. They commended all efforts aiming at promoting the implementation of these resolutions, including those undertaken by the Group of 21 in the Conference on Disarmament.

(Final Document, Para 183) The Heads of State or Government, in reiterating their support for a comprehensive consideration of the UN disarmament agenda and the ways and means of revitalizing and enhancing the disarmament machinery, reaffirmed that a Fourth Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-IV) remains the most appropriate forum for furthering the priorities established by SSOD-I, including nuclear disarmament as the highest priority for the international community. In this context, while recalling the UNGA resolution 65/66 and its decision 70/551 entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”, they stressed the importance of active participation in the open-ended working group established by the resolution to consider and reaching consensus on the objectives and agenda of SSOD-IV, including the possible establishment of a preparatory committee. In this regard, they welcomed the convening of this Open Ended Working Group for its substantive sessions in 2016 and 2017 and the election of Ecuador to chair it.

(Final Document, Para 189) The Heads of State or Government recognized the common interest of all mankind and the inalienable, legitimate the sovereign rights of all State in the exploration and use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes, and reconfirmed their stand to oppose and reject any act denying or violating it and emphasized that prevention of an arms race in outer space, including a ban to deploy or use weapons therein, would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasized the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also reemphasized the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD, inter alia, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, taking note of the joint Russian-Chinese initiative of a draft treaty on the “Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects” (PPWT) presented in the Conference on Disarmament on 12 February 2008 and in 2014. They noted that this initiative is a constructive contribution to the work of the Conference, and is a good basis for further discussion toward adopting an international legally-binding instrument. In this context, they noted the adoption of General Assembly resolution 70/27 on no first emplacement of weapons in outer space with a view to ensuring its exclusive peaceful use.

(Final Document, Para 192) The Heads of State or Government remained convinced of the need for a multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive, transparent and non-discriminatory approach toward the issue of 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 emphasized the contribution of peaceful uses of space technologies, including space launch vehicle technologies, to human advancement, such as for telecommunications and data gathering on natural disasters. They also emphasized the need to keep the issue of missiles in all its aspects on the agenda of the UN General Assembly and welcomed that the Panel of Governmental Experts established in accordance with Resolution 59/67 successfully concluded its work in 2008 and submitted its report to the 63rd session of the UN General Assembly. While welcoming the consensus adoption of the UNGA decision 69/517 on “Missiles”, they encouraged follow up efforts to further examine the elements contained in the conclusions of the Secretary- General’s Report A/63/176. Pending the achievement of such a universal approach related to delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction, any initiative to address these concerns effectively and in a sustainable and comprehensive manner should be through an inclusive process of negotiations in a forum where all States could participate as equals. They stressed the importance of the security concerns of all States at regional and global levels in any approach to the issue of missiles in all its aspects.

(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia's Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.

(Final Document, Para 196) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their full support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. As a priority step to this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the fulfillment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone. 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 precondition and further delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) full-scope safeguards according to Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and to conduct its nuclear related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime. They called for the earliest implementation of relevant IAEA resolutions on "Application of IAEA Safeguards in the Middle East". They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States, and condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. In this context they also condemned the statement made by the then Prime Minister of Israel on 11 December 2006, related to the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel. They urged the continued consideration of the issue of Israeli nuclear capabilities in the context of the IAEA, including at the General Conference. They were of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons, which allow one party to threaten its neighbours, and the region. They 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 197) The Heads of State or Government 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 welcomed the initiative presented in 1990 by the Arab Republic of Egypt on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, and its initiative presented before the 68th session of the United Nations General Assembly on 28th September 2013 containing implementation steps in support of the establishment of the Zone. They also stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East. They took note with appreciation of the letters sent, in 2013 and 2014, to the United Nations Secretary-General, renewing the support for the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction, reflected in the note A/68/781 by the Secretary-General, by: Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

(Final Document, Para 200) The Heads of State or Government emphasized the importance of the observance of environmental norms in the preparation and implementation of disarmament and arms limitation agreements, and in this regard, they welcomed the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 70/30 on this matter without a vote. 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.

(Final Document, Para 233) 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 70/36 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 non-proliferation in order to help maintain international peace and security and to contribute to global efforts

against terrorism. They called upon all Member States to support international efforts to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. They also urged all Member States to take and strengthen national measures, as appropriate, to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and materials and technologies related to their manufacture.

(Final Document, Para 234) While noting the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004), resolution 1673 (2006), resolution 1810 (2008) and resolution 1977 (2011) by the Security Council, the Heads of State or Government underlined the need to ensure that any action by the Security Council does not undermine the UN Charter and existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction and of international Organizations established in this regard, as well as the role of the General Assembly. They further cautioned against the continuing practice of the Security Council to utilize its authority to define the legislative requirements for Member States in implementing Security Council decisions. In this regard, they 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 235) Mindful of the threat posed to humankind by the existing weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons and underlining the need for the total elimination of such weapons, the Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the need to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction and therefore supported the necessity of monitoring the situation and triggering international action as required. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government welcomed the adoption of the General Assembly Resolution 69/27 entitled “Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament”.

(Final Document, Para 241) The Heads of State or Government noted the adoption, by vote, of the Arms Trade Treaty by the UN General Assembly on 2nd April 2013 and its entry into force on 24 December 2014. They also noted that the Treaty aims at regulating trade in conventional weapons, including small arms and light weapons. They called for balanced, transparent and objective implementation of the Treaty, in strict accordance with the principles of the UN Charter, and the inherent right of each State to security and to individual or collective self-defense. They also underscored that its implementation should, in no way, affect the sovereign right of States to acquire, manufacture, export, import and retain conventional arms and their parts and components for their self-defense, security needs and the maintenance of their territorial integrity. The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the ATT emphasized the importance of ensuring a leading role for NAM States Parties from those regions most affected by the illicit trade of conventional arms in the implementation of the Treaty, as well as in any future institutional arrangements of the Treaty.

	<p>(Final Document, Para 247) The Heads of State or Government underlined the importance of the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 69/57, taking into consideration the possible harmful effects to human health and the environment, caused by the use of weapons and munitions containing depleted uranium.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 248) The Heads of State or Government welcomed the adoption without a vote of General Assembly Resolution 70/32 on the relationship between disarmament and development. They also 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 the unilateral, bilateral, regional and multilateral measures aimed at reducing military expenditures, thereby contributing to strengthening regional and international peace and security and recognized that confidence building measures assisted in this regard.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">SSOD</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 174) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that progress in nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is essential to strengthening international peace and security. They stressed the importance of ensuring that efforts aimed at nuclear non-proliferation are parallel to simultaneous efforts aimed at nuclear disarmament. 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. Nevertheless, they stressed that nuclear disarmament, as the highest priority established by SSOD-I and as a multilateral legal obligation, should not be made conditional on confidence building measures or other disarmament efforts.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 177) The Heads of State or Government expressed their appreciation for the efforts undertaken, in particular by those representatives of Member States of the Non-Aligned Movement who served as the Presidents of the CD for the commencement of its substantive work, including negotiations. They noted the various proposals on the program of Work of the CD as contained in the documents CD/1864, a decision adopted by CD on 29 May 2009 but not implemented, CD/1933/Rev.1, CD/1952, and CD/1955 which were presented successively by Algeria, Egypt, Iran and Iraq between 2009 to 2013 sessions. They called on the CD to agree by consensus on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work without any further delay taking into account the security interests of all States. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the principle contained in the final document of the SSOD-I that “The adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to</p>

	<p>security and to ensure that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage”. They agreed to continue coordination of efforts at the NAM Chapter in Geneva.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 183) The Heads of State or Government, in reiterating their support for a comprehensive consideration of the UN disarmament agenda and the ways and means of revitalizing and enhancing the disarmament machinery, reaffirmed that a Fourth Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-IV) remains the most appropriate forum for furthering the priorities established by SSOD-I, including nuclear disarmament as the highest priority for the international community. In this context, while recalling the UNGA resolution 65/66 and its decision 70/551 entitled “Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament”, they stressed the importance of active participation in the open-ended working group established by the resolution to consider and reaching consensus on the objectives and agenda of SSOD-IV, including the possible establishment of a preparatory committee. In this regard, they welcomed the convening of this Open Ended Working Group for its substantive sessions in 2016 and 2017 and the election of Ecuador to chair it.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p>
<p>Test Ban and CTBT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 173) The Heads of State or Government reiterated, with concern, that improvements in existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as provided for in the military doctrines of some NWS, including the United States Nuclear Posture Review, violate their legal obligations on nuclear disarmament, as well as the commitments made to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in their military and security policies and contravene the negative security assurances provided by the NWS. They stressed once again that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate also the commitments undertaken at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and at the NPT Review Conferences by the NWS.</p>

	<p>(Final Document, Para 186) The Heads of State or Government stressed the significance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, 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 realized, the continued commitment of all States signatories, especially the NWS, to nuclear disarmament would be essential. In this context, the ratification of the CTBT by Angola, Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Congo and Niue was welcomed. In this regard, they also welcomed the adoption of a “Special Declaration on the 20 Years of the opening for signature of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty” during the Summit of Heads of State and Government of CELAC, held in Quito, Ecuador, the 27th January 2016.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Conference on Disarmament</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 176) 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, inter alia, establishing an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament as soon as possible and as the highest priority. They emphasized the necessity to start negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, without further delay, on a comprehensive nuclear weapons convention that sets, inter alia, a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 177) The Heads of State or Government expressed their appreciation for the efforts undertaken, in particular by those representatives of Member States of the Non-Aligned Movement who served as the Presidents of the CD for the commencement of its substantive work, including negotiations. They noted the various proposals on the program of Work of the CD as contained in the documents CD/1864, a decision adopted by CD on 29 May 2009 but not implemented, CD/1933/Rev.1, CD/1952, and CD/1955 which were presented successively by Algeria, Egypt, Iran and Iraq between 2009 to 2013 sessions. They called on the CD to agree by consensus on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work without any further delay taking into account the security interests of all States. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance of the principle contained in the final document of the SSOD-I that “The adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to security and to ensure that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage”. They agreed to continue coordination of efforts at the NAM Chapter in Geneva.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 179) The Heads of State or Government, while recalling General Assembly resolution 68/32, expressed satisfaction at the adoption of resolutions 69/58 and 70/34 on the “follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament” proposed by NAM, through which the Assembly:</p>

179.a Calls for the urgent commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for the early conclusion of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons to prohibit their possession, development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use and to provide for their destruction;

179.b Recalls its decision to convene no later than 2018, a United Nations high-level international conference on nuclear disarmament to review the progress made in this regard; and

179.c Welcomes the commemoration and promotion of the 26 September as the International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons devoted to furthering this objective.

(Final Document, Para 181) Moreover, the Heads of State or Government underlined the importance of UNGA resolutions 68/32, 69/58 and 70/34 as a roadmap on nuclear disarmament and accordingly stressed the need for an active participation of NAM Member States in all activities related to their implementation, including enhancing public awareness and education on this issue. They commended all efforts aiming at promoting the implementation of these resolutions, including those undertaken by the Group of 21 in the Conference on Disarmament.

(Final Document, Para 189) The Heads of State or Government recognized the common interest of all mankind and the inalienable, legitimate the sovereign rights of all State in the exploration and use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes, and reconfirmed their stand to oppose and reject any act denying or violating it and emphasized that prevention of an arms race in outer space, including a ban to deploy or use weapons therein, would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasized the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also reemphasized the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD, inter alia, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, taking note of the joint Russian-Chinese initiative of a draft treaty on the “Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects” (PPWT) presented in the Conference on Disarmament on 12 February 2008 and in 2014. They noted that this initiative is a constructive contribution to the work of the Conference, and is a good basis for further discussion toward adopting an international legally-binding instrument. In this context, they noted the adoption of General Assembly resolution 70/27 on no first emplacement of weapons in outer space with a view to ensuring its exclusive peaceful use.

(Final Document, Para 235) Mindful of the threat posed to humankind by the existing weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons and underlining the need for the total elimination of such weapons, the Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the need to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction and therefore supported the necessity of monitoring the situation and

	<p>triggering international action as required. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government welcomed the adoption of the General Assembly Resolution 69/27 entitled “Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament”.</p>
<p>UN Disarmament Commission</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 175) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the importance and the relevance of the UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) as the sole specialized, deliberative body within the UN multilateral disarmament machinery and reiterated their full support for its work. They expressed regret that UNDC was unable to reach agreement on any recommendation since 2000 due to the lack of political will and inflexible positions of some Nuclear-Weapons States, despite NAM’s constructive role and concrete proposals throughout the deliberations, especially in the Working Group on “Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons”. They called upon UN Member States to display the necessary political will and flexibility in order to enable the Commission to agree on substantive outcomes in its current cycle.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p>
<p>UNIDIR and UNODA</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 184) The Heads of State or Government, while recalling the vital importance of the principle of equitable geographic representation, called for its fair application in the appointment and recruitment to leadership, senior and managerial positions in the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs. The Heads of State or Government called also for transparency and balanced representation in the composition of the membership of the Groups of Governmental Experts established in the field of disarmament and international security. They also underlined the importance of transparency and openness of the work of such groups.</p>

	<p>(Final Document, Para 238) 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 recognized the need to establish and maintain controls over private ownership of small arms. They called on all States, in particular major arms producing States, to ensure that the supply of small arms and light weapons is limited only to Governments or to entities duly authorized by Governments and to implement legal restrictions and prohibitions preventing the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. They encouraged all initiatives by States to mobilize resources and expertise as well as to provide assistance to strengthen the full implementation of the UN Program of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 239) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the total validity of the Programme of Action and emphasized the importance of its prompt and full implementation and stressed that international assistance and cooperation is an essential aspect in its implementation. They welcomed the successful conclusion of the Second UN Conference to Review the Progress made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action, held in New York, from 27 August to 7 September 2012. They acknowledged the efforts undertaken by the Member States and regional and sub-regional organizations to implement the Programme of Action. 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 240) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that the international assistance to support the implementation of the Programme of Action is still not commensurate with the needs of affected countries, taking into account the growing magnitude of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects and the danger it continues to pose. They called for ensuring the adequacy, effectiveness and sustainability of such international assistance. They called for the provision of concrete assistance, including technical and financial assistance to developing countries upon their request. They emphasized that such assistance should not be made conditional on being part of, or detracting from, the recipient States' Official Development Assistance. They also called on the UN, in its activities in support of the implementation of the PoA, to rely further on the expertise available in developing countries.</p>
<p>UN Regional Centers for Peace and Disarmament</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 201) The Heads of State or Government emphasized 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>

**International Atomic
Energy Agency**

(Final Document, Para 196) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their full support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. As a priority step to this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the fulfillment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone. 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 precondition and further delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) full-scope safeguards according to Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and to conduct its nuclear related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime. They called for the earliest implementation of relevant IAEA resolutions on “Application of IAEA Safeguards in the Middle East”. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States, and condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. In this context they also condemned the statement made by the then Prime Minister of Israel on 11 December 2006, related to the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel. They urged the continued consideration of the issue of Israeli nuclear capabilities in the context of the IAEA, including at the General Conference. They were of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons, which allow one party to threaten its neighbours, and the region. They 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 198) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the efforts of the Arab Group in Vienna to keep the question of the Israeli nuclear capabilities under consideration of the General Conference of the IAEA.

(Final Document, Para 199) The Heads of State or Government underscored the Movement’s principled position concerning non-use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity of any State. In this regard, they condemned the Israeli attack against a Syrian facility

on September 6, 2007, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the UN Charter and welcomed Syria's cooperation with the IAEA in this regard.

(Final Document, Para 210) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They continued to note with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They again emphasized that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and 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. They expressed their full confidence in the impartiality and professionalism of the IAEA and strongly rejected any politically motivated attempts by any State to politicize the work of the IAEA, including its technical co-operation programme, in violation of its Statute, as well as any pressure or interference in the Agency's activities which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the IAEA and the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.

(Final Document, Para 213) The Heads of State or Government took note of the adoption, through a vote, in 2010 and 2011, by the IAEA Board of Governors, of three proposals of assurance of supply mechanisms in the framework of the multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle. They highlighted that this issue should be conducted through wide, integral and transparent consultations and negotiations, focusing on its technical, legal, political and economic implications, before any further decision is taken about this complex and sensitive matter. They emphasized that decisions should be made by consensus, with the participation of all IAEA member States, and any proposal from IAEA must be consistent with its Statute, without any prejudice to the inalienable right of its member States to research, develop and use for peaceful purposes of nuclear sciences, in all its aspects, including the inalienable right of each State Party, if it so decides, to develop, for peaceful purposes, a full national nuclear fuel cycle in accordance with its rights and obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(Final Document, Para 214) The Heads of State or Government, emphasizing the importance of the positive role played by the Non-Aligned Members in the IAEA, stressed the necessity that all members of the IAEA strictly observe its Statute. They stressed that any pressure or interference in the Agency's 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

	<p>a clear distinction has to be made between the legal obligations of Member States under their respective safeguards agreements and their voluntary undertakings, in order to ensure that such voluntary undertakings are not turned into legal safeguards obligations. Bearing in mind the Agency's responsibility in protecting safeguards' confidential information and given the undesirable incidents of leakage of such information, they emphasized the need for strengthening the regime for the protection of safeguards confidential information.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 215) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities - operational or under construction- poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the UN Charter and regulations of the IAEA. They recognized the urgent need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument prohibiting attacks or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 216) The Heads of State or Government affirmed the need to strengthen the Radiological Safety and Protection Systems at facilities utilizing 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. They noted the efforts of the IAEA in this regard, including through the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety which was unanimously endorsed by the IAEA General Conference. 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 Trans-boundary Movement of Radioactive Waste of the IAEA as a means of enhancing the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive waste on their territories.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 218) The Heads of State or Government emphasized the need to improve national, regional and international preparedness and response to nuclear accidents and called for a strengthened role of the IAEA in emergency preparedness and response, including through assisting Member States, upon their request, on emergency preparedness and response to nuclear accidents, promoting capacity building, including education and training in the field of crisis management.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 220) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that the IAEA is the sole intergovernmental organization within the UN system with the mandate and expertise to deal with the technical subjects of nuclear safety and nuclear security.</p>
<p>UN Security Council</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 196) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their full support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass</p>

destruction. As a priority step to this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the fulfillment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone. 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 precondition and further delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) full-scope safeguards according to Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and to conduct its nuclear related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime. They called for the earliest implementation of relevant IAEA resolutions on “Application of IAEA Safeguards in the Middle East”. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States, and condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. In this context they also condemned the statement made by the then Prime Minister of Israel on 11 December 2006, related to the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel. They urged the continued consideration of the issue of Israeli nuclear capabilities in the context of the IAEA, including at the General Conference. They were of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons, which allow one party to threaten its neighbours, and the region. They 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 197) The Heads of State or Government 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 welcomed the initiative presented in 1990 by the Arab Republic of Egypt on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, and its initiative presented before the 68th session of the United Nations General Assembly on 28th September 2013 containing implementation steps in support of the establishment of the Zone. They also stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East. They took note with appreciation of the

	<p>letters sent, in 2013 and 2014, to the United Nations Secretary-General, renewing the support for the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction, reflected in the note A/68/781 by the Secretary-General, by: Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 234) While noting the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004), resolution 1673 (2006), resolution 1810 (2008) and resolution 1977 (2011) by the Security Council, the Heads of State or Government underlined the need to ensure that any action by the Security Council does not undermine the UN Charter and existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction and of international Organizations established in this regard, as well as the role of the General Assembly. They further cautioned against the continuing practice of the Security Council to utilize its authority to define the legislative requirements for Member States in implementing Security Council decisions. In this regard, they 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>Chemical and Biological Weapons</p>	
---	--

<p>Chemical Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 225) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) welcomed the successful conclusion of its Third Review Conference. They reiterated that a transparent, holistic and balanced approach shall prevail in follow-up to the recommendations adopted by the Third Review Conference. They invited all States that have not yet signed or ratified the Convention to do so as soon as possible with a view to its universality. They reaffirmed that the effective contribution of the Convention to international and regional peace and security can be enhanced through its full implementation, and in this context also encouraged all States Parties that have not yet done so to engage with the Technical Secretariat of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons on the steps that need to be undertaken for the national implementation of the Convention. They reaffirmed the importance of international cooperation in the field of chemical activities for purposes not prohibited under CWC. They reiterated their call on the developed countries to promote international cooperation for the benefit of States Parties through the transfer of technology, material and equipment for peaceful purposes in the chemical field and the removal of all and any restrictions that are contrary to the letter and spirit of the Convention. They recalled that the full, balanced, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of all provisions of the Convention, in particular economic and technical development through international cooperation, is fundamental to the achievement of its object and purpose.</p>
--------------------------------	---

(Final Document, Para 226) The Heads of State or Government welcomed the successful destruction by Libya in February 2014 of all its Category 1 Chemical Weapons. They expressed their serious concern that certain possessor States parties did not meet their obligations regarding the deadlines for the total elimination of chemical weapons and that nearly 15% of declared chemical weapons still remained to be destroyed as of 31st January 2015. They therefore urged all possessor State Parties to take every necessary measure to ensure their compliance with their “Detailed plan for the destruction of Chemical Weapons remaining after the final extended destruction deadline of 29 April 2012”, in the shortest time possible, in order to uphold the credibility and integrity of the Convention.

(Final Document, Para 227) The Heads of State or Government of the NAM States Parties to the CWC underlined that the use of chemical weapons and toxic chemicals as a weapon anywhere by anyone and under any circumstances is reprehensible and completely contrary to the provisions of the Convention, legal norms and standards of the international community. They acknowledge the elimination of the Syrian chemical weapons and the constructive cooperation of the Syrian Arab Republic regarding the implementation of the provisions of the Convention. They also commend the cooperation of the Syrian Arab Republic in implementing the relevant Executive Council of the OPCW decisions, in particular decisions taken by Executive Council with regard to destruction of Syrian chemical weapons production facilities.

(Final Document, Para 228) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the CWC reaffirmed that the implementation of the Article X of the CWC on assistance and protection against chemical weapons make a significant contribution to countering the threats of use of chemical weapons. They stressed the importance of achieving and maintaining a high level of readiness of the OPCW to provide timely and needed assistance and protection against use or threat of use of chemical weapons, including assistance to the victims of chemical weapons.

(Final Document, Para 229) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the CWC welcomed the decision on Components of an agreed framework for the full implementation of Article XI adopted at the 16th Conference of the States Parties to the CWC and considered it as a positive step towards achieving the goal of the full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of Article XI. They attached high importance to the adoption of a Plan of Action for the full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of all the provisions of Article XI. They welcomed the proposal of the Action Plan of Article XI presented by the NAM CWC States and China, which is currently being discussed at the OPCW. They looked forward to the continuation of Article XI consultations with a view to further deliberate the Document of the facilitators as soon as possible for negotiations by delegations in order to adopt a decision in this regard.

	<p>(Final Document, Para 230) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the CWC, while paying due respect to the chemical weapons victims and their families, declared their firm conviction that international support to provide special care and assistance to all victims suffering the effects of exposure to chemical weapons is an urgent humanitarian need and that the States Parties to the Convention as well as the OPCW should pay urgent attention to meeting these needs. In this context, they welcomed the decision adopted at the 16th Session of the Conference of States Parties to establish an International Support Network for Victims of Chemical Weapons and a voluntary Trust Fund for this purpose.</p>
<p>Biological Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 222) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC) reaffirmed that the possibility of any use of bacteriological (biological) agents and toxins as weapons should be completely excluded, and the conviction that such use would be repugnant to the conscience of humankind. They recognized the particular importance of strengthening the Convention through the resumption of the multilateral negotiations for a legally binding Protocol dealing with all Articles of the Convention, in a balanced and comprehensive manner, including through verification measures bearing in mind that the lack of such verification regime poses a challenge to the effectiveness of the Convention, and urged the party rejecting negotiations to reconsider its policy. They also stressed the importance of universal adherence to the Convention and welcomed the recent accession of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania to the Convention. They reiterated their call to promote international cooperation for peaceful purposes, including scientific-technical exchange. They underlined the importance to maintain close coordination among the NAM States Parties to the Convention and highlighted that the BTWC forms a whole and that, although it is possible to consider certain aspects separately, it is critical to deal with all of the issues interrelated to this Convention in a balanced and comprehensive manner.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 223) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the BTWC welcomed the active participation by NAM States Parties in the Seventh BTWC Review Conference held in Switzerland from 5-22 December 2011, to advance their positions on this Convention, particularly their key role in the adoption of the important decisions related to the implementation of Article X of the BTWC, especially by emphasizing the need for enhancing international cooperation, assistance and exchanges in toxins, biological agents equipment and technology for peaceful purposes, bearing in mind the Action Plan on the implementation of Article X submitted by the NAM States Parties at the Sixth Review Conference, and the additional NAM States Parties' proposal on a mechanism for the full, implementation of Article X of the Convention presented more recently. They further encouraged the BTWC States Parties to implement the Article X, as set forth in paragraphs 50-61 of the Final Document of the seventh BTWC Review Conference. They also welcomed the outcome of the Seventh Review Conference and in particular its decision to include cooperation</p>

	<p>and assistance as one of the Standing Agenda Items, with a particular focus on strengthening cooperation and assistance under Article X, as well as the Conference's decision to establish a database system to facilitate requests for and offers of exchange of assistance and cooperation among States Parties, and the establishment of a Sponsorship Programme, funded by voluntary contributions from States Parties, in order to support and increase the participation of developing States Parties in the meetings of the inter-sessional programme in the framework of the BTWC.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 224) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the BTWC emphasized the importance of the BTWC role in the international legal architecture related to WMD and in particular in the total prohibition on all biological and toxin weapons. They further emphasized the need for enhancing, without restrictions, international cooperation and assistance and exchanges in toxic biological agents equipment and technology for peaceful purposes without any discrimination, in conformity with the Convention. They reaffirmed that the respective mandates of this Convention and other international organizations should be respected, while utilizing the experiences of the relevant multilateral organizations dealing with human and animal health on issues that are of direct relevance to the Convention, and that no actions should be taken to undermine the convention and/or interfere with its mandate.</p>
--	---

Outer Space

<p style="text-align: center;">International Cooperation on Outer Space</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 189) The Heads of State or Government recognized the common interest of all mankind and the inalienable, legitimate the sovereign rights of all State in the exploration and use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes, and reconfirmed their stand to oppose and reject any act denying or violating it and emphasized that prevention of an arms race in outer space, including a ban to deploy or use weapons therein, would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasized the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also reemphasized the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD, inter alia, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, taking note of the joint Russian-Chinese initiative of a draft treaty on the “Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects” (PPWT) presented in the Conference on Disarmament on 12 February 2008 and in 2014. They noted that this initiative is a constructive contribution to the work of the Conference, and is a good basis for further discussion toward adopting an international legally-binding instrument. In this context, they noted the adoption of General Assembly resolution 70/27 on no first</p>
--	--

	<p>emplacement of weapons in outer space with a view to ensuring its exclusive peaceful use.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 192) The Heads of State or Government remained convinced of the need for a multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive, transparent and non-discriminatory approach toward the issue of 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 emphasized the contribution of peaceful uses of space technologies, including space launch vehicle technologies, to human advancement, such as for telecommunications and data gathering on natural disasters. They also emphasized the need to keep the issue of missiles in all its aspects on the agenda of the UN General Assembly and welcomed that the Panel of Governmental Experts established in accordance with Resolution 59/67 successfully concluded its work in 2008 and submitted its report to the 63rd session of the UN General Assembly. While welcoming the consensus adoption of the UNGA decision 69/517 on “Missiles”, they encouraged follow up efforts to further examine the elements contained in the conclusions of the Secretary- General’s Report A/63/176. Pending the achievement of such a universal approach related to delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction, any initiative to address these concerns effectively and in a sustainable and comprehensive manner should be through an inclusive process of negotiations in a forum where all States could participate as equals. They stressed the importance of the security concerns of all States at regional and global levels in any approach to the issue of missiles in all its aspects.</p>
<p>International Treaty on Outer Space</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 189) The Heads of State or Government recognized the common interest of all mankind and the inalienable, legitimate the sovereign rights of all State in the exploration and use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes, and reconfirmed their stand to oppose and reject any act denying or violating it and emphasized that prevention of an arms race in outer space, including a ban to deploy or use weapons therein, would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasized the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also reemphasized the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD, inter alia, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, taking note of the joint Russian-Chinese initiative of a draft treaty on the “Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects” (PPWT) presented in the Conference on Disarmament on 12 February 2008 and in 2014. They noted that this initiative is a constructive contribution to the work of the Conference, and is a good basis for further discussion toward adopting an international legally-binding instrument. In this context, they noted the adoption of General Assembly resolution 70/27 on no first</p>

	<p>emplacement of weapons in outer space with a view to ensuring its exclusive peaceful use.</p>
<p>Missile Defense Systems</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 188) The Heads of State or Government continued to be concerned over the negative implications of the development and deployment of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense systems and the threat of weaponization of outer space which have, inter alia, contributed to the further erosion of an international climate conducive to the promotion of disarmament and the strengthening of international security. The abrogation of the ABM Treaty brought new challenges to strategic stability and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They remained seriously concerned at the negative security consequences of the deployment of strategic missile defence systems which could trigger an arms race(s) and lead to the further development of advanced missile systems and an increase in the number of nuclear weapons.</p>
<p>Information Security</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 190) The Heads of State or Government, while reaffirming the Declaration on Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) of the 17th Ministerial Conference of NAM held in Algeria in May 2014, and noting that considerable progress has been made in developing and applying the latest ICTs, they expressed concern that these technologies and means can potentially be used for purposes that are inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international stability and security and may adversely affect the integrity of the infrastructure of States to the detriment of their security in both civil and military fields. They also noted with concern cases of illegal use of new ICTs to the detriment of Members States of the Movement, and expressed strong rejection to those violations. In this regard and while taking into account the ongoing efforts within the United Nations, they called upon Member States to further promote at multilateral levels the consideration of existing and potential threats from the malicious use of ICTs, as well as possible strategies to address these threats. They emphasized that ICT s should be utilized by Member States in a manner consistent with international law and the UN Charter. They called for the intensification of efforts towards safeguarding cyberspace from becoming an arena of conflict, and ensuring instead the exclusive peaceful uses which would enable the full realization of the potential of ICTs for contributing to social and economic development. They stressed that the development of any international legal framework to address issues related to the use of ICTs with implications on international peace and security should be pursued within the UN with the active and equal participation of all States. They highlighted the central role of governments in areas related to public policy aspects of ICT security.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 191) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the Declaration on Information and Communication Technologies of the 17th Ministerial Conference of NAM held in Algeria, and reiterated the importance of ensuring that the use of such</p>

	<p>technologies is fully in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, International Law and, especially, the principles of sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs and the well-established principle of peaceful coexistence among States.</p>
<p>Nonproliferation</p>	
<p>Proliferation-Sensitive Information Safeguards</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 214) The Heads of State or Government, emphasizing the importance of the positive role played by the Non-Aligned Members in the IAEA, stressed the necessity that all members of the IAEA strictly observe its Statute. They stressed that any pressure or interference in the Agency’s 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. Bearing in mind the Agency’s responsibility in protecting safeguards’ confidential information and given the undesirable incidents of leakage of such information, they emphasized the need for strengthening the regime for the protection of safeguards confidential information.</p>
<p>Nonproliferation and Noncompliance</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 221) The Heads of State or Government stressed that the issues related to proliferation, should be resolved through political and diplomatic means, and that measures and initiatives taken in this regard should be within the framework of international law, relevant conventions and the UN Charter, and should contribute to the promotion of international peace, and security.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 232) The Heads of State or Government regretted unsubstantiated allegations of noncompliance with relevant instruments on weapons of mass destruction and called on States Parties to such instruments that make such allegations to follow procedures set out in those instruments and to provide necessary substantiation for their allegations. They called upon all States Parties to the respective international instruments to implement fully and in a transparent manner all their obligations under these instruments.</p>
<p>Nonproliferation and Peaceful Uses</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 210) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They continued to note with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They again emphasized</p>

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. They expressed their full confidence in the impartiality and professionalism of the IAEA and strongly rejected any politically motivated attempts by any State to politicize the work of the IAEA, including its technical co-operation programme, in violation of its Statute, as well as any pressure or interference in the Agency's activities which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the IAEA and the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.

(Final Document, Para 211) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT emphasized once more that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I and II 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.

(Final Document, Para 213) The Heads of State or Government took note of the adoption, through a vote, in 2010 and 2011, by the IAEA Board of Governors, of three proposals of assurance of supply mechanisms in the framework of the multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle. They highlighted that this issue should be conducted through wide, integral and transparent consultations and negotiations, focusing on its technical, legal, political and economic implications, before any further decision is taken about this complex and sensitive matter. They emphasized that decisions should be made by consensus, with the participation of all IAEA member States, and any proposal from IAEA must be consistent with its Statute, without any prejudice to the inalienable right of its member States to research, develop and use for peaceful purposes of nuclear sciences, in all its aspects, including the inalienable right of each State Party, if it so decides, to develop, for peaceful purposes, a full national nuclear fuel cycle in accordance with its rights and obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(Final Document, Para 219) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that measures and initiatives aimed at strengthening nuclear safety and nuclear security must not be used as a pretext or leverage to violate, deny or restrict the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.

<p style="text-align: center;">Non-State Proliferation</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 233) 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 70/36 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 non-proliferation in order to help maintain international peace and security and to contribute to global efforts against terrorism. They called upon all Member States to support international efforts to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. They also urged all Member States to take and strengthen national measures, as appropriate, to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and materials and technologies related to their manufacture.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 234) While noting the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004), resolution 1673 (2006), resolution 1810 (2008) and resolution 1977 (2011) by the Security Council, the Heads of State or Government underlined the need to ensure that any action by the Security Council does not undermine the UN Charter and existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction and of international Organizations established in this regard, as well as the role of the General Assembly. They further cautioned against the continuing practice of the Security Council to utilize its authority to define the legislative requirements for Member States in implementing Security Council decisions. In this regard, they stressed the importance of the issue of non-state actors acquiring weapons of mass destruction to be addressed in an inclusive manner by the General Assembly, taking into account the views of all Member States.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">WMD Terrorism</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 233) 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 70/36 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 non-proliferation in order to help maintain international peace and security and to contribute to global efforts</p>

	<p>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 234) While noting the adoption of resolution 1540 (2004), resolution 1673 (2006), resolution 1810 (2008) and resolution 1977 (2011) by the Security Council, the Heads of State or Government underlined the need to ensure that any action by the Security Council does not undermine the UN Charter and existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction and of international Organizations established in this regard, as well as the role of the General Assembly. They further cautioned against the continuing practice of the Security Council to utilize its authority to define the legislative requirements for Member States in implementing Security Council decisions. In this regard, they 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>Peaceful Uses</p>	
-----------------------------	--

<p>Access to Nuclear Technology</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 210) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They continued to note with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They again emphasized that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and 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. They expressed their full confidence in the impartiality and professionalism of the IAEA and strongly rejected any politically motivated attempts by any State to politicize the work of the IAEA, including its technical co-operation programme, in violation of its Statute, as well as any pressure or interference in the Agency’s activities which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the IAEA and the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 211) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT emphasized once more that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all</p>
--	---

	<p>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 and II 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 212) The Heads of State or Government stressed the need for the further development of the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in developing countries and the full respect for their right to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. They underlined particularly the responsibility of developed countries to facilitate, to the fullest extent possible, the transfer, to developing countries, of nuclear equipment, materials, scientific and technological information for peaceful purposes.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 213) The Heads of State or Government took note of the adoption, through a vote, in 2010 and 2011, by the IAEA Board of Governors, of three proposals of assurance of supply mechanisms in the framework of the multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle. They highlighted that this issue should be conducted through wide, integral and transparent consultations and negotiations, focusing on its technical, legal, political and economic implications, before any further decision is taken about this complex and sensitive matter. They emphasized that decisions should be made by consensus, with the participation of all IAEA member States, and any proposal from IAEA must be consistent with its Statute, without any prejudice to the inalienable right of its member States to research, develop and use for peaceful purposes of nuclear sciences, in all its aspects, including the inalienable right of each State Party, if it so decides, to develop, for peaceful purposes, a full national nuclear fuel cycle in accordance with its rights and obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 219) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that measures and initiatives aimed at strengthening nuclear safety and nuclear security must not be used as a pretext or leverage to violate, deny or restrict the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.</p>
<p>Attack or Threat of Attack Against Peaceful Nuclear Facilities</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 199) The Heads of State or Government underscored the Movement's principled position concerning non-use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity of any State. In this regard, they condemned the Israeli attack against a Syrian facility on September 6, 2007, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the UN</p>

	<p>Charter and welcomed Syria’s cooperation with the IAEA in this regard.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 215) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities - operational or under construction- poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the UN Charter and regulations of the IAEA. They recognized the urgent need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument prohibiting attacks or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</p>
<p>UN and IAEA Authority</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 210) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They continued to note with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They again emphasized that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and 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. They expressed their full confidence in the impartiality and professionalism of the IAEA and strongly rejected any politically motivated attempts by any State to politicize the work of the IAEA, including its technical co-operation programme, in violation of its Statute, as well as any pressure or interference in the Agency’s activities which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the IAEA and the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 213) The Heads of State or Government took note of the adoption, through a vote, in 2010 and 2011, by the IAEA Board of Governors, of three proposals of assurance of supply mechanisms in the framework of the multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle. They highlighted that this issue should be conducted through wide, integral and transparent consultations and negotiations, focusing on its technical, legal, political and economic implications, before any further decision is taken about this complex and sensitive matter. They emphasized that decisions should be made by consensus, with the participation of all IAEA member States, and any proposal from IAEA must be consistent with its Statute, without any prejudice to the inalienable right of its member States to research, develop and use for peaceful purposes of nuclear sciences, in all its aspects, including the inalienable right of each State Party, if it so decides, to develop, for peaceful purposes, a full national nuclear fuel cycle in accordance with its rights and obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.</p>

	<p>(Final Document, Para 214) The Heads of State or Government, emphasizing the importance of the positive role played by the Non-Aligned Members in the IAEA, stressed the necessity that all members of the IAEA strictly observe its Statute. They stressed that any pressure or interference in the Agency’s 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. Bearing in mind the Agency’s responsibility in protecting safeguards’ confidential information and given the undesirable incidents of leakage of such information, they emphasized the need for strengthening the regime for the protection of safeguards confidential information.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 215) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities - operational or under construction- poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the UN Charter and regulations of the IAEA. They recognized the urgent need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument prohibiting attacks or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 216) The Heads of State or Government affirmed the need to strengthen the Radiological Safety and Protection Systems at facilities utilizing 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. They noted the efforts of the IAEA in this regard, including through the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety which was unanimously endorsed by the IAEA General Conference. 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 Trans-boundary Movement of Radioactive Waste of the IAEA as a means of enhancing the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive waste on their territories.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 220) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that the IAEA is the sole intergovernmental organization within the UN system with the mandate and expertise to deal with the technical subjects of nuclear safety and nuclear security.</p>
<p>Inalienable Right Through NPT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 210) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to develop</p>

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 emphasized 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. They expressed their full confidence in the impartiality and professionalism of the IAEA and strongly rejected any politically motivated attempts by any State to politicize the work of the IAEA, including its technical co-operation programme, in violation of its Statute, as well as any pressure or interference in the Agency's activities which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the IAEA and the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.

(Final Document, Para 211) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT emphasized once more that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I and II 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.

(Final Document, Para 213) The Heads of State or Government took note of the adoption, through a vote, in 2010 and 2011, by the IAEA Board of Governors, of three proposals of assurance of supply mechanisms in the framework of the multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle. They highlighted that this issue should be conducted through wide, integral and transparent consultations and negotiations, focusing on its technical, legal, political and economic implications, before any further decision is taken about this complex and sensitive matter. They emphasized that decisions should be made by consensus, with the participation of all IAEA member States, and any proposal from IAEA must be consistent with its Statute, without any prejudice to the inalienable right of its member States to research, develop and use for peaceful purposes of nuclear sciences, in all its aspects, including the inalienable right of each State Party, if it so decides, to develop, for peaceful purposes, a full national nuclear fuel cycle in accordance with its rights and obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(Final Document, Para 219) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that measures and initiatives aimed at strengthening

	<p>nuclear safety and nuclear security must not be used as a pretext or leverage to violate, deny or restrict the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.</p>
<p>NWFZs</p>	
<p>Contributions to Disarmament</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p>
<p>Contributions to Nonproliferation</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p>
<p>Treaty of Tlatelolco</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of</p>

	<p>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 and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p>
<p>Treaty of Pelindaba</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p>
<p>Treaty of Bangkok</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p>
<p>Treaty of Rarotonga</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and</p>

	<p>important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p>
<p>Treaty of Semipalatinsk</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p>
<p>Mongolia as a NWFZ</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 195) Recalling the convening of the Third Conference of the States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Established Nuclear Weapon Free Zones and Mongolia held in New York, on 24 April 2015, the Heads of State or Government called on</p>

	<p>the States parties and signatories to those Treaties to implement further ways and means of co-operation among themselves, their treaty agencies and other interested States. They expressed their support for Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status and its policy aimed at institutionalizing that status.</p>
<p>Middle East WMDFZ</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 196) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their full support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. As a priority step to this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the fulfillment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone. 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 precondition and further delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) full-scope safeguards according to Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and to conduct its nuclear related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime. They called for the earliest implementation of relevant IAEA resolutions on "Application of IAEA Safeguards in the Middle East". They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States, and condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. In this context they also condemned the statement made by the then Prime Minister of Israel on 11 December 2006, related to the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel. They urged the continued consideration of the issue of Israeli nuclear capabilities in the context of the IAEA, including at the General Conference. They were of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons, which allow one party to threaten its neighbours, and the region. They 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 197) The Heads of State or Government took into consideration the draft resolution tabled by the Syrian Arab Republic, on behalf of the Arab Group, before the Security Council on</p>

29 December 2003 on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. They welcomed the initiative presented in 1990 by the Arab Republic of Egypt on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, and its initiative presented before the 68th session of the United Nations General Assembly on 28th September 2013 containing implementation steps in support of the establishment of the Zone. They also stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East. They took note with appreciation of the letters sent, in 2013 and 2014, to the United Nations Secretary-General, renewing the support for the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction, reflected in the note A/68/781 by the Secretary-General, by: Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

(Final Document, Para 204) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT reiterated the importance of the full implementation of the action plans adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference on nuclear disarmament, on nuclear non-proliferation, on peaceful uses of nuclear energy and on the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East. They expressed concern at the lack of agreement on a number of key priorities of NAM States Parties to the NPT and agreed to continue their collective efforts in pursuing the realization of their priorities at the NPT Review Conferences.

(Final Document, Para 205) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT welcomed the adoption by consensus of a detailed plan of action on “the Middle East, particularly implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East” in the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

(Final Document, Para 206) While expressing deep concern over the long delay in the implementation of the 1995 Resolution on establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, the Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT strongly urged the United Nations Secretary-General and the three cosponsors of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East to fully implement it, without any further delay, to achieve on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference. Recalling the consensus decision contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference on convening, in 2012, a Conference on the establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East, they expressed their profound disappointment and serious concern that the conference was not convened in 2012 as scheduled. They underscored that the failure to convene the Conference is contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East and contradicts and violates the collective agreement of the States Parties contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They strongly

	<p>rejected the arguments presented by the Conveners for not convening the Conference on schedule.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 207) NAM States Parties to the NPT expressed their disappointment that as a result of the opposition by the US, UK and Canada at the concluding session of the 2015 NPT Review Conference, consensus on measures regarding the process to establish a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction was not achieved. They further underscored that efforts related to the establishment of the Zone should be undertaken in accordance with the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East as well as the relevant United Nations Resolutions. The Heads of State or Government reiterated in this regard the common position of the NAM States Parties to the NPT as reflected in working paper NPT/CONF.2015/WP.49 presented at the 2015 Review Conference, and called for concrete and urgent steps for its implementation.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 208) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States Parties to the Treaty to the full and indiscriminate implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty. They further called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they underlined the agreement by consensus at the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, which reaffirmed the previous agreements, on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT; and on providing effective, unconditional and non-discriminatory universal legally binding security assurances to all NNWS parties to the Treaty, which would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.</p>
--	--

Security Assurances

<p style="text-align: center;">Nuclear-Weapon States Role</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 172) The Heads of State or Government remained deeply concerned at the strategic defence doctrines of the 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. They therefore strongly called upon them to exclude completely the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons from their military and security doctrines.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 173) The Heads of State or Government reiterated, with concern, that improvements in existing nuclear</p>
--	--

	<p>weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as provided for in the military doctrines of some NWS, including the United States Nuclear Posture Review, violate their legal obligations on nuclear disarmament, as well as the commitments made to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in their military and security policies and contravene the negative security assurances provided by the NWS. They stressed once again that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate also the commitments undertaken at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and at the NPT Review Conferences by the NWS.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 185) 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. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they called for the early commencement of negotiations on effective, universal, unconditional, non-discriminatory, irrevocable and legally binding security assurances to all NNWS by all the nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under all circumstances as a matter of high priority. They expressed concern that despite long standing requests by NNWS to receive such legally binding universal assurances, no tangible progress has been achieved in this regard.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 209) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT called upon the NWS to fully comply with their commitments not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against NNWS 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>Legally-Binding International Convention or Instrument</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 209) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT called upon the NWS to fully comply with their commitments not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against NNWS 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>(Final Document, Para 215) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inviolability of peaceful nuclear activities and that any attack or threat of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities - operational or under construction- poses a great danger to human beings and the environment, and constitutes a grave violation of international law, principles and purposes of the UN Charter and regulations of the IAEA. They recognized the urgent need for a comprehensive multilaterally negotiated instrument prohibiting attacks or threat of attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.</p>
<p>NWFZs and Security Assurances</p>	

	<p>(Final Document, Para 193) The Heads of State or Government believed that the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones (NWFZs) created by the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok, Pelindaba, the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone treaty as well as Mongolia’s Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Status are positive steps and important measures towards strengthening global nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They reiterated that in the context of NWFZs, it is essential that NWS should provide unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons to all States of the zone. They urged States to conclude agreements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned with a view to establishing new NWFZs in regions where they do not exist, in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD-I) and the Principles and Guidelines adopted by the UN Disarmament Commission in 1999.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 194) The Heads of State or Government called upon all the nuclear-weapon States to ratify related protocols to all treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones, withdraw any reservations or interpretative declarations incompatible with their object and purpose, and respect the denuclearization status of these zones.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 209) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT called upon the NWS to fully comply with their commitments not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against NNWS 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 173) The Heads of State or Government reiterated, with concern, that improvements in existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as provided for in the military doctrines of some NWS, including the United States Nuclear Posture Review, violate their legal obligations on nuclear disarmament, as well as the commitments made to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in their military and security policies and contravene the negative security assurances provided by the NWS. They stressed once again that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate also the commitments undertaken at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and at the NPT Review Conferences by the NWS.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 208) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States Parties to the Treaty to the full and indiscriminate implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty. They further called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to</p>

	<p>accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they underlined the agreement by consensus at the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, which reaffirmed the previous agreements, on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT; and on providing effective, unconditional and non-discriminatory universal legally binding security assurances to all NNWS parties to the Treaty, which would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 209) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT called upon the NWS to fully comply with their commitments not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against NNWS 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	
-------------------------	--

United States	<p>(Final Document, Para 173) The Heads of State or Government reiterated, with concern, that improvements in existing nuclear weapons and the development of new types of nuclear weapons as provided for in the military doctrines of some NWS, including the United States Nuclear Posture Review, violate their legal obligations on nuclear disarmament, as well as the commitments made to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in their military and security policies and contravene the negative security assurances provided by the NWS. They stressed once again that these improvements as well as the development of new types of such weapons violate also the commitments undertaken at the time of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and at the NPT Review Conferences by the NWS.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 187) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the conclusion and entry into force of the New START Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status, although they may contribute to risk reduction, cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons. In this context they called on the United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to such cuts, to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, thus contributing to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations and facilitating the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons at the earliest date.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 207) NAM States Parties to the NPT expressed their disappointment that as a result of the opposition by the</p>
----------------------	---

	<p>US, UK and Canada at the concluding session of the 2015 NPT Review Conference, consensus on measures regarding the process to establish a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction was not achieved. They further underscored that efforts related to the establishment of the Zone should be undertaken in accordance with the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East as well as the relevant United Nations Resolutions. The Heads of State or Government reiterated in this regard the common position of the NAM States Parties to the NPT as reflected in working paper NPT/CONF.2015/WP.49 presented at the 2015 Review Conference, and called for concrete and urgent steps for its implementation.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Russia</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 187) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the conclusion and entry into force of the New START Treaty between the Russian Federation and the United States, stressed that reductions in deployments and in operational status, although they may contribute to risk reduction, cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in, and the total elimination of, nuclear weapons. In this context they called on the United States and the Russian Federation to apply the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability to such cuts, to further reduce their nuclear arsenals, both warheads and delivery systems, thus contributing to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations and facilitating the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons at the earliest date.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 189) The Heads of State or Government recognized the common interest of all mankind and the inalienable, legitimate the sovereign rights of all State in the exploration and use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes, and reconfirmed their stand to oppose and reject any act denying or violating it and emphasized that prevention of an arms race in outer space, including a ban to deploy or use weapons therein, would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasized the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also reemphasized the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD, inter alia, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, taking note of the joint Russian-Chinese initiative of a draft treaty on the “Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects” (PPWT) presented in the Conference on Disarmament on 12 February 2008 and in 2014. They noted that this initiative is a constructive contribution to the work of the Conference, and is a good basis for further discussion toward adopting an international legally-binding instrument. In this context, they noted the adoption of General Assembly resolution 70/27 on no first emplacement of weapons in outer space with a view to ensuring its exclusive peaceful use.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">United Kingdom</p>	

	<p>(Final Document, Para 207) NAM States Parties to the NPT expressed their disappointment that as a result of the opposition by the US, UK and Canada at the concluding session of the 2015 NPT Review Conference, consensus on measures regarding the process to establish a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction was not achieved. They further underscored that efforts related to the establishment of the Zone should be undertaken in accordance with the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East as well as the relevant United Nations Resolutions. The Heads of State or Government reiterated in this regard the common position of the NAM States Parties to the NPT as reflected in working paper NPT/CONF.2015/WP.49 presented at the 2015 Review Conference, and called for concrete and urgent steps for its implementation.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">China</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 189) The Heads of State or Government recognized the common interest of all mankind and the inalienable, legitimate the sovereign rights of all State in the exploration and use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes, and reconfirmed their stand to oppose and reject any act denying or violating it and emphasized that prevention of an arms race in outer space, including a ban to deploy or use weapons therein, would avert a grave danger for international peace and security. They further emphasized the paramount importance of strict compliance with existing arms limitation and disarmament agreements relevant to outer space, including bilateral agreements, and with the existing legal regime concerning the use of outer space. They also reemphasized the urgent need for the commencement of substantive work in the CD, inter alia, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, taking note of the joint Russian-Chinese initiative of a draft treaty on the “Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects” (PPWT) presented in the Conference on Disarmament on 12 February 2008 and in 2014. They noted that this initiative is a constructive contribution to the work of the Conference, and is a good basis for further discussion toward adopting an international legally-binding instrument. In this context, they noted the adoption of General Assembly resolution 70/27 on no first emplacement of weapons in outer space with a view to ensuring its exclusive peaceful use.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 229) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the CWC welcomed the decision on Components of an agreed framework for the full implementation of Article XI adopted at the 16th Conference of the States Parties to the CWC and considered it as a positive step towards achieving the goal of the full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of Article XI. They attached high importance to the adoption of a Plan of Action for the full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of all the provisions of Article XI. They welcomed the proposal of the Action Plan of Article XI presented by the NAM CWC States and China, which is currently being discussed at the OPCW. They looked forward to the continuation of Article XI consultations with a view to further</p>

	<p>deliberate the Document of the facilitators as soon as possible for negotiations by delegations in order to adopt a decision in this regard.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Israel</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 196) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their full support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. As a priority step to this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the fulfillment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone. 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 precondition and further delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) full-scope safeguards according to Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and to conduct its nuclear related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime. They called for the earliest implementation of relevant IAEA resolutions on “Application of IAEA Safeguards in the Middle East”. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States, and condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. In this context they also condemned the statement made by the then Prime Minister of Israel on 11 December 2006, related to the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel. They urged the continued consideration of the issue of Israeli nuclear capabilities in the context of the IAEA, including at the General Conference. They were of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons, which allow one party to threaten its neighbours, and the region. They 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 198) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their support for the efforts of the Arab Group in Vienna to keep the question of the Israeli nuclear capabilities under consideration of the General Conference of the IAEA.</p>

	<p>(Final Document, Para 199) The Heads of State or Government underscored the Movement’s principled position concerning non-use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity of any State. In this regard, they condemned the Israeli attack against a Syrian facility on September 6, 2007, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the UN Charter and welcomed Syria’s cooperation with the IAEA in this regard.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 231) The Heads of State or Government once again condemned the Israeli military aggression against the Gaza Strip in 2009 and the occupying power’s indiscriminate shelling and bombing of Palestinian civilian areas and expressed their grave concern over the reported use in civilian areas of harmful and potentially fatal incendiary weapons, such as white phosphorous. In this regard, they reiterated their call for a thorough investigation of this serious matter by relevant bodies under the appropriate international conventions and agreements.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">South Africa</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 170) The Heads of State or Government acknowledged the significant contribution towards realizing the objective of nuclear disarmament made by NAM Member and Observer States, including through the voluntary renunciation of the possession of nuclear weapons by Belarus, Kazakhstan, South Africa and Ukraine.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Iran</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 196) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their full support for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. As a priority step to this end, they reaffirmed the need for the speedy establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East in accordance with the Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and paragraph 14 of the Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. They called upon all parties concerned to take urgent and practical steps towards the fulfillment of the proposal initiated by Iran in 1974 for the establishment of such a zone. 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 precondition and further delay, to place promptly all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) full-scope safeguards according to Security Council Resolution 487 (1981) and to conduct its nuclear related activities in conformity with the non-proliferation regime. They called for the earliest implementation of relevant IAEA resolutions on “Application of IAEA Safeguards in the Middle East”. They expressed great concern over the acquisition of nuclear capability by Israel which poses a serious and continuing threat to the security of neighbouring and other States, and condemned Israel for continuing to develop and stockpile nuclear arsenals. In this context they also condemned the</p>

	<p>statement made by the then Prime Minister of Israel on 11 December 2006, related to the possession of nuclear weapons by Israel. They urged the continued consideration of the issue of Israeli nuclear capabilities in the context of the IAEA, including at the General Conference. They were of the view that stability cannot be achieved in a region where massive imbalances in military capabilities are maintained particularly through the possession of nuclear weapons, which allow one party to threaten its neighbours, and the region. They 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 197) The Heads of State or Government 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 welcomed the initiative presented in 1990 by the Arab Republic of Egypt on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, and its initiative presented before the 68th session of the United Nations General Assembly on 28th September 2013 containing implementation steps in support of the establishment of the Zone. They also stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East. They took note with appreciation of the letters sent, in 2013 and 2014, to the United Nations Secretary-General, renewing the support for the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction, reflected in the note A/68/781 by the Secretary-General, by: Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Syria</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 197) The Heads of State or Government 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 welcomed the initiative presented in 1990 by the Arab Republic of Egypt on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, and its initiative presented before the 68th session of the United Nations General Assembly on 28th September 2013 containing implementation steps in support of the establishment of the Zone. They also stressed that necessary steps should be taken in different international fora for the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East. They took note with appreciation of the</p>

	<p>letters sent, in 2013 and 2014, to the United Nations Secretary-General, renewing the support for the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction, reflected in the note A/68/781 by the Secretary-General, by: Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 199) The Heads of State or Government underscored the Movement’s principled position concerning non-use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity of any State. In this regard, they condemned the Israeli attack against a Syrian facility on September 6, 2007, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the UN Charter and welcomed Syria’s cooperation with the IAEA in this regard.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 227) The Heads of State or Government of the NAM States Parties to the CWC underlined that the use of chemical weapons and toxic chemicals as a weapon anywhere by anyone and under any circumstances is reprehensible and completely contrary to the provisions of the Convention, legal norms and standards of the international community. They acknowledge the elimination of the Syrian chemical weapons and the constructive cooperation of the Syrian Arab Republic regarding the implementation of the provisions of the Convention. They also commend the cooperation of the Syrian Arab Republic in implementing the relevant Executive Council of the OPCW decisions, in particular decisions taken by Executive Council with regard to destruction of Syrian chemical weapons production facilities.</p>
--	---

Non-Proliferation Treaty Related

<p style="text-align: center;">Disarmament Through the NPT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 171) The Heads of State or Government, while noting the statements by NWS of their intention to pursue actions in achieving a world free of nuclear weapons, reaffirmed the need for urgent concrete actions by the NWS to achieve this goal in accordance with their nuclear disarmament legal obligations and commitments. They reaffirmed the importance of the application of the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability by NWS in all measures related to the fulfillment of their nuclear disarmament obligations.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 202) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, and recognizing the crucial role of the NPT in nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, were of the view that the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, represent an outcome that</p>
---	---

	<p>can be built upon and further enhanced in the near future, to fully address the priorities of the Movement, in particular to realise a world free from nuclear weapons. They called upon NWS to implement fully and effectively their obligations under the Treaty, in particular in the area of nuclear disarmament, and the outcomes of its Review Conferences, in particular the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, the 2000 Review Conference and the 2010 Review Conference.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 208) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States Parties to the Treaty to the full and indiscriminate implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty. They further called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they underlined the agreement by consensus at the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, which reaffirmed the previous agreements, on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT; and on providing effective, unconditional and non-discriminatory universal legally binding security assurances to all NNWS parties to the Treaty, which would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.</p>
<p>1995 Review and Extension of the NPT</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 202) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, and recognizing the crucial role of the NPT in nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, were of the view that the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, represent an outcome that can be built upon and further enhanced in the near future, to fully address the priorities of the Movement, in particular to realise a world free from nuclear weapons. They called upon NWS to implement fully and effectively their obligations under the Treaty, in particular in the area of nuclear disarmament, and the outcomes of its Review Conferences, in particular the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, the 2000 Review Conference and the 2010 Review Conference.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 204) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT reiterated the importance of the full implementation of the action plans adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference on nuclear disarmament, on nuclear non-proliferation, on peaceful uses of nuclear energy and on the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East. They expressed concern at the lack of agreement on a number of key priorities of NAM States Parties to the</p>

NPT and agreed to continue their collective efforts in pursuing the realization of their priorities at the NPT Review Conferences.

(Final Document, Para 205) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT welcomed the adoption by consensus of a detailed plan of action on “the Middle East, particularly implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East” in the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

(Final Document, Para 206) While expressing deep concern over the long delay in the implementation of the 1995 Resolution on establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, the Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT strongly urged the United Nations Secretary- General and the three cosponsors of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East to fully implement it, without any further delay, to achieve on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference. Recalling the consensus decision contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference on convening, in 2012, a Conference on the establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East, they expressed their profound disappointment and serious concern that the conference was not convened in 2012 as scheduled. They underscored that the failure to convene the Conference is contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East and contradicts and violates the collective agreement of the States Parties contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They strongly rejected the arguments presented by the Conveners for not convening the Conference on schedule.

(Final Document, Para 207) NAM States Parties to the NPT expressed their disappointment that as a result of the opposition by the US, UK and Canada at the concluding session of the 2015 NPT Review Conference, consensus on measures regarding the process to establish a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction was not achieved. They further underscored that efforts related to the establishment of the Zone should be undertaken in accordance with the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East as well as the relevant United Nations Resolutions. The Heads of State or Government reiterated in this regard the common position of the NAM States Parties to the NPT as reflected in working paper NPT/CONF.2015/WP.49 presented at the 2015 Review Conference, and called for concrete and urgent steps for its implementation.

(Final Document, Para 208) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States Parties to the Treaty to the full and indiscriminate implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty. They further called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to

	<p>nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they underlined the agreement by consensus at the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, which reaffirmed the previous agreements, on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT; and on providing effective, unconditional and non-discriminatory universal legally binding security assurances to all NNWS parties to the Treaty, which would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.</p>
<p>Access to Technology and Technology Transfer</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 210) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. They continued to note with concern that undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology, for peaceful purposes persist. They again emphasized that proliferation concerns are best addressed through multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive and 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. They expressed their full confidence in the impartiality and professionalism of the IAEA and strongly rejected any politically motivated attempts by any State to politicize the work of the IAEA, including its technical co-operation programme, in violation of its Statute, as well as any pressure or interference in the Agency’s activities which could jeopardize the efficiency and credibility of the IAEA and the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 211) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT emphasized once more that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I and II 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 212) The Heads of State or Government stressed the need for the further development of the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in developing countries and the full respect for their right to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. They underlined particularly</p>

	<p>the responsibility of developed countries to facilitate, to the fullest extent possible, the transfer, to developing countries, of nuclear equipment, materials, scientific and technological information for peaceful purposes.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 213) The Heads of State or Government took note of the adoption, through a vote, in 2010 and 2011, by the IAEA Board of Governors, of three proposals of assurance of supply mechanisms in the framework of the multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle. They highlighted that this issue should be conducted through wide, integral and transparent consultations and negotiations, focusing on its technical, legal, political and economic implications, before any further decision is taken about this complex and sensitive matter. They emphasized that decisions should be made by consensus, with the participation of all IAEA member States, and any proposal from IAEA must be consistent with its Statute, without any prejudice to the inalienable right of its member States to research, develop and use for peaceful purposes of nuclear sciences, in all its aspects, including the inalienable right of each State Party, if it so decides, to develop, for peaceful purposes, a full national nuclear fuel cycle in accordance with its rights and obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 219) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that measures and initiatives aimed at strengthening nuclear safety and nuclear security must not be used as a pretext or leverage to violate, deny or restrict the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.</p>
<p>2000 and 2010 Action Plans</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 169) The Heads of State or Government reiterated their deep concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament and the lack of progress by the Nuclear-Weapon States (NWS) to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals in accordance with their relevant multilateral legal obligations. They 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. They called upon the NWS to fulfill their multilateral legal obligations on nuclear disarmament and to implement the unequivocal undertaking they provided in 2000 and further reiterated in 2010 so as to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons. They emphasized, in this regard, the urgent need to commence and to bring to a conclusion negotiations on comprehensive and complete nuclear disarmament without any further delay.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 202) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), while reaffirming the package of agreements of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT, and recognizing</p>

the crucial role of the NPT in nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, were of the view that the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, represent an outcome that can be built upon and further enhanced in the near future, to fully address the priorities of the Movement, in particular to realise a world free from nuclear weapons. They called upon NWS to implement fully and effectively their obligations under the Treaty, in particular in the area of nuclear disarmament, and the outcomes of its Review Conferences, in particular the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, the 2000 Review Conference and the 2010 Review Conference.

(Final Document, Para 203) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT stressed the importance of the review of the operation of the Treaty in the framework of the NPT Review Conferences and in this context emphasized that the inclusion of the Review Part of the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference as an opinion of the President and not as a consensus language should not be considered as a precedent to be followed in the future without prejudice to the prerogatives of the Review Conference.

(Final Document, Para 204) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT reiterated the importance of the full implementation of the action plans adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference on nuclear disarmament, on nuclear non-proliferation, on peaceful uses of nuclear energy and on the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East. They expressed concern at the lack of agreement on a number of key priorities of NAM States Parties to the NPT and agreed to continue their collective efforts in pursuing the realization of their priorities at the NPT Review Conferences.

(Final Document, Para 205) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT welcomed the adoption by consensus of a detailed plan of action on “the Middle East, particularly implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East” in the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Follow-on actions” of the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

(Final Document, Para 206) While expressing deep concern over the long delay in the implementation of the 1995 Resolution on establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, the Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT strongly urged the United Nations Secretary- General and the three cosponsors of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East to fully implement it, without any further delay, to achieve on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference. Recalling the consensus decision contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference on convening, in 2012, a Conference on the establishment of a NWFZ in the Middle East, they expressed their profound disappointment and serious concern that the conference was not convened in 2012 as scheduled. They underscored that the failure to convene the Conference is contrary to the letter and spirit of

	<p>the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East and contradicts and violates the collective agreement of the States Parties contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. They strongly rejected the arguments presented by the Conveners for not convening the Conference on schedule.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 208) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the NPT reiterated their call for the firm commitment by all States Parties to the Treaty to the full and indiscriminate implementation of all the provisions of the Treaty. They further called for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty, particularly an unequivocal undertaking by the NWS to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, they underlined the agreement by consensus at the 2010 Review Conference of the NPT, which reaffirmed the previous agreements, on practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons; the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the NPT; and on providing effective, unconditional and non-discriminatory universal legally binding security assurances to all NNWS parties to the Treaty, which would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.</p>
--	---

Nuclear Safety and Security

<p style="text-align: center;">IAEA and Safety and Security</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 214) The Heads of State or Government, emphasizing the importance of the positive role played by the Non-Aligned Members in the IAEA, stressed the necessity that all members of the IAEA strictly observe its Statute. They stressed that any pressure or interference in the Agency’s 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. Bearing in mind the Agency’s responsibility in protecting safeguards’ confidential information and given the undesirable incidents of leakage of such information, they emphasized the need for strengthening the regime for the protection of safeguards confidential information.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 216) The Heads of State or Government affirmed the need to strengthen the Radiological Safety and Protection Systems at facilities utilizing radioactive materials as well as at radioactive waste management facilities, including the safe transportation of these materials. They reaffirmed the need to</p>
--	--

	<p>strengthen existing international regulations relating to safety and security of transportation of such materials. They noted the efforts of the IAEA in this regard, including through the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety which was unanimously endorsed by the IAEA General Conference. 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 Trans-boundary Movement of Radioactive Waste of the IAEA as a means of enhancing the protection of all States from the dumping of radioactive waste on their territories.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 218) The Heads of State or Government emphasized the need to improve national, regional and international preparedness and response to nuclear accidents and called for a strengthened role of the IAEA in emergency preparedness and response, including through assisting Member States, upon their request, on emergency preparedness and response to nuclear accidents, promoting capacity building, including education and training in the field of crisis management.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 220) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that the IAEA is the sole intergovernmental organization within the UN system with the mandate and expertise to deal with the technical subjects of nuclear safety and nuclear security.</p>
<p>Individual State Responsibilities</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 217) The Heads of State or Government recognized that the primary responsibility for nuclear safety and nuclear security rests with the individual States. In that sense, they underlined that States with nuclear power programs have a central role in their own countries in ensuring the application of the highest standards of nuclear safety and the responsibility for providing a timely, transparent and adequate response to nuclear accidents in order to minimize their consequences. They stressed the need for a rapid, timely, continuous, reliable and transparent dissemination of information on nuclear accidents with significant transboundary radiological effects in accordance with relevant international conventions.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 218) The Heads of State or Government emphasized the need to improve national, regional and international preparedness and response to nuclear accidents and called for a strengthened role of the IAEA in emergency preparedness and response, including through assisting Member States, upon their request, on emergency preparedness and response to nuclear accidents, promoting capacity building, including education and training in the field of crisis management.</p>
<p>Emergency Preparedness</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 217) The Heads of State or Government recognized that the primary responsibility for nuclear safety and nuclear security rests with the individual States. In that sense, they</p>

	<p>underlined that States with nuclear power programs have a central role in their own countries in ensuring the application of the highest standards of nuclear safety and the responsibility for providing a timely, transparent and adequate response to nuclear accidents in order to minimize their consequences. They stressed the need for a rapid, timely, continuous, reliable and transparent dissemination of information on nuclear accidents with significant transboundary radiological effects in accordance with relevant international conventions.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 218) The Heads of State or Government emphasized the need to improve national, regional and international preparedness and response to nuclear accidents and called for a strengthened role of the IAEA in emergency preparedness and response, including through assisting Member States, upon their request, on emergency preparedness and response to nuclear accidents, promoting capacity building, including education and training in the field of crisis management.</p>
<p>Conventional Weapons</p>	
<p>Licit Access to Conventional Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 236) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the sovereign right of States to acquire, manufacture, export, import and retain conventional arms and their parts and components for their self-defence and security needs. They expressed their concern about unilateral coercive measures and emphasized that no undue restriction should be placed on the transfer of such arms.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 237) The Heads of State or Government recognized 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>Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 245) The Heads of State or Government of NAM 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 Protocols. NAM is of the view that Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS) raise a number of ethical, legal, moral and technical, as well as international peace and security related questions which should be thoroughly deliberated and examined in the context of conformity to international law including international humanitarian law and international human rights law. In this regard, NAM States Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) welcome the informal meetings of</p>

	<p>CCW experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems held in Geneva in 2014, 2015 and 2016 and support continued deliberations on this issue in the CCW on the basis of an agreed mandate. NAM States Parties to CCW welcome the accession of Iraq to the Convention and its annexed protocols.</p>
<p>Cluster Munitions</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 245) The Heads of State or Government of NAM 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 Protocols. NAM is of the view that Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS) raise a number of ethical, legal, moral and technical, as well as international peace and security related questions which should be thoroughly deliberated and examined in the context of conformity to international law including international humanitarian law and international human rights law. In this regard, NAM States Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) welcome the informal meetings of CCW experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems held in Geneva in 2014, 2015 and 2016 and support continued deliberations on this issue in the CCW on the basis of an agreed mandate. NAM States Parties to CCW welcome the accession of Iraq to the Convention and its annexed protocols.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 246) The Heads of State or Government recognized the adverse humanitarian impact caused by the use of cluster munitions and expressed solidarity with the cluster munitions-affected countries. They called upon all States in a position to do so, to consider providing the necessary financial, technical and humanitarian assistance to unexploded cluster munitions 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 unexploded cluster munitions clearance. They also noted the first Review Conference of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, held in Dubrovnik, Croatia from 7-11 September 2015.</p>
<p>Incendiary Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 231) The Heads of State or Government once again condemned the Israeli military aggression against the Gaza Strip in 2009 and the occupying power's indiscriminate shelling and bombing of Palestinian civilian areas and expressed their grave concern over the reported use in civilian areas of harmful and potentially fatal incendiary weapons, such as white phosphorous. In this regard, they reiterated their call for a thorough investigation of this serious matter by relevant bodies under the appropriate international conventions and agreements.</p>
<p>Anti-Personnel Mines</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 242) The Heads of State or Government continued to deplore the use, in contravention of international</p>

	<p>humanitarian law of anti-personnel mines in conflict situations aimed at maiming, killing and terrorizing 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 243) The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (the Mine Ban Convention) reiterated their commitment to the full implementation of the Maputo Action Plan. They invited those States that have not yet done so to consider becoming parties to the Convention. They also welcomed the Global Conference on Assisting Landmine and other Explosive Remnants of War Survivors in the Context of Disability Rights and other Domains, held in Medellin, on 3rd-4th April 2014.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 244) 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 leaving explosives outside their territories during the 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 245) The Heads of State or Government of NAM 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 Protocols. NAM is of the view that Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS) raise a number of ethical, legal, moral and technical, as well as international peace and security related questions which should be thoroughly deliberated and examined in the context of conformity to international law including international humanitarian law and international human rights law. In this regard, NAM States Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) welcome the informal meetings of CCW experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems held in Geneva in 2014, 2015 and 2016 and support continued deliberations on this issue in the CCW on the basis of an agreed mandate. NAM States</p>

	<p>Parties to CCW welcome the accession of Iraq to the Convention and its annexed protocols.</p>
<p align="center">Small Arms and Light Weapons</p>	<p>(Final Document, Para 238) 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 recognized the need to establish and maintain controls over private ownership of small arms. They called on all States, in particular major arms producing States, to ensure that the supply of small arms and light weapons is limited only to Governments or to entities duly authorized by Governments and to implement legal restrictions and prohibitions preventing the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. They encouraged all initiatives by States to mobilize resources and expertise as well as to provide assistance to strengthen the full implementation of the UN Program of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects.</p> <p>(Final Document, Para 239) The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the total validity of the Programme of Action and emphasized the importance of its prompt and full implementation and stressed that international assistance and cooperation is an essential aspect in its implementation. They welcomed the successful conclusion of the Second UN Conference to Review the Progress made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action, held in New York, from 27 August to 7 September 2012. They acknowledged the efforts undertaken by the Member States and regional and sub-regional organizations to implement the Programme of Action. 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 240) The Heads of State or Government emphasized that the international assistance to support the implementation of the Programme of Action is still not commensurate with the needs of affected countries, taking into account the growing magnitude of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects and the danger it continues to pose. They called for ensuring the adequacy, effectiveness and sustainability of such international assistance. They called for the provision of concrete assistance, including technical and financial assistance to developing countries upon their request. They emphasized that such assistance should not be made conditional on being part of, or detracting from, the recipient States' Official Development Assistance. They also called on the UN, in its activities in support of the implementation of the PoA, to rely further on the expertise available in developing countries.</p>
<p align="center">Arms Trade Treaty</p>	

	<p>(Final Document, Para 241) The Heads of State or Government noted the adoption, by vote, of the Arms Trade Treaty by the UN General Assembly on 2nd April 2013 and its entry into force on 24 December 2014. They also noted that the Treaty aims at regulating trade in conventional weapons, including small arms and light weapons. They called for balanced, transparent and objective implementation of the Treaty, in strict accordance with the principles of the UN Charter, and the inherent right of each State to security and to individual or collective selfdefense. They also underscored that its implementation should, in no way, affect the sovereign right of States to acquire, manufacture, export, import and retain conventional arms and their parts and components for their self-defense, security needs and the maintenance of their territorial integrity. The Heads of State or Government of NAM States Parties to the ATT emphasized the importance of ensuring a leading role for NAM States Parties from those regions most affected by the illicit trade of conventional arms in the implementation of the Treaty, as well as in any future institutional arrangements of the Treaty.</p>
--	--