

Statement
By
H.E. Ambassador Soltanieh
Permanent Representative Islamic Republic of Iran to the
United Nations and Other International Organizations in
Vienna
on
Chairman Text

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates,

The Meetings of the Preparatory Committee of the NPT is supposed to pave the way for constructive and decisive deliberation of the Review Conferences.

The State Parties are expected inform each other about the latest development regarding the implementation of the Treaty and international developments which have and will have impacts on the effective implementation of the Treaty.

The State Parties are free to express their view through statements or working papers on each cluster or article.

The chairperson of the Preparatory Committee is highly expected to facilitate cooperative environment for healthy debates in such a way to prevent confrontation among State Parties to the Treaty. At the same time he or she is expected to facilitate working atmosphere for the representatives of State Parties to fully express their political positions, either concerns or recommendations.

The impartiality of the chairman is essential for success of the meeting. In order to assure that such principle be sustained, the chairman is highly recommended not to enter into debate of State Parties. In the same token there is no justification to expect the chairman to summarize the delicate positions of State Parties on such sensitive issue directly related to national securities. This is neither fair nor wise to entrust the responsibility to one person that is the chairman. Any text accepted by consensus could only be prepared through negotiation. Practically it is not feasible to do so due to time constraint. Therefore the statements of State Parties plus working papers as well as discussions during the meeting which are duly recorded are sufficient. Presentation of a so called factual summary by chairman would create debate or even un-necessary confrontation among State Parties as well

as State Parties and the Chairman, which in any case shall undoubtedly endanger the future of the NPT.

In spite of full contravention of the approach made by chairman with the above mentioned principles, text of so called "factual summary" assumed to be prepared by chairman, distributed Thursday afternoon was carefully studied.

The result of the thorough review shows that it lacks expected balance in reflecting all main concerns and expectation of all State Parties. In addition the text is misleading the factual situation to the effect that it reflects absolutely a wrong message of unanimity on the contents.

Additional serious shortcomings are as follows:

1. There is a legitimate question whether the factual summary is the reflection of statements of all the States parties in this session either individually or through a grouping. Obviously it should be the reflection of all statements. However, the text distributed far from factual since it is either missed many statements or positions especially by non-nuclear weapon States and those of the NAM which consist of 116 States parties to the NPT, i.e. two third of the NPT Parties.
2. The notion of "States parties" in the text, though a reference is made in footnote of disclaimer, it is used inconsistently through the text. In some paragraphs it can not reflect the views of all States parties and in some other ones it covers all parties. Hence, in a factual summary the views of a state or few states can not replace as the views of all.
3. The portion on nuclear disarmament pillar of the Treaty is weak and comparing it with other sections, there exist a clear imbalanced in the whole text. After 40 years of the entry into force of the NPT, "the early date" set out in the Treaty for nuclear disarmament is overlooked. While there has not been any actual nuclear disarmament, some limited steps far from nuclear disarmament have been over-exaggerated.
4. Non-proliferation is untruly focused on non-nuclear weapon States in the text, while the main proliferation risks rests with certain nuclear weapon States who have proliferated nuclear weapon technology through the nuclear sharing and nuclear cooperation with non-parties to the NPT.
5. With regard to Article IV of the NPT, the summary does not reflect the views of developing countries regarding the inalienable rights of the States parties to peaceful uses of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. On the contrary, by highlighting the non-proliferation

while
to be more appropriate than
understanding of the concerns and
reflection
to reflect
the text
is far
away
from
being
an
accurate
reflection
of
the
views
of
all
States
parties

- aspects, imposing new restrictions and suggesting a tighter illegitimate export control has unduly set conditions and limitations.
6. There are references to some exclusive, non-transparent and discriminatory groups or initiatives which have already been rejected and can not in any way be reflected in a summary unless the discriminatory nature and the positions of other countries are reflected as well.
 7. Regarding nuclear terrorism as stated in the meeting, the main responsibility for nuclear security and preventing nuclear terrorist groups to have access to the nuclear weapons or materials within the territory of a nuclear weapon State or under its control rest entirely with that State. However, this fact has not been duly reflected in the text.
 8. On the program of work of the Conference on Disarmament, the position of one side has been high-lightened and the important issue of a balanced and comprehensive program of work with the highest priority of non-nuclear weapon States, namely nuclear disarmament has been overlooked in the text.
 9. With respect to the Safeguards, the views reflected in the text are not those of the large number of countries and the new proposals mentioned in the text are inconsistent with the provisions of Statute of the IAEA.
 10. The Additional Protocol is described as if it is a legally binding instrument which is contrary to the views expressed by almost all parties participated including the NAM position.
 11. Regarding Article X, the views reflected in the text is different from the positions of the large number of countries expressed during our deliberations and the new proposals mentioned in the text are in contravene with the provisions of the Treaty.
 12. In some areas the text goes beyond the mandate of the session. References to the issues such as missiles and discriminatory and non-internationally negotiated arrangements like HCOC are not in any way in the context of the NPT and the PrepCom. We strongly recommend that any chairman text should be bound with the mandate given to session.
 13. Regarding the sensitive issue of nuclear fuel cycle the text is in contradiction with the NPT and the IAEA Statute and the agreement of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. As it was emphasized by the NAM "the provisions of Article IV of the Treaty are very explicit in this regard. therefore leaving neither room for interpretation of the

Treaty, nor setting conditions for the peaceful use of nuclear the NAM requested energy by NNWS”.

14. In the context of the NWFZ in the Middle East the NAM requested “a complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear related equipment, information, material and facilities, resources or devices and the extension of assistance” to Israeli regime which was overlooked in paragraph 43. Moreover the text referred to some political issues outside the mandate of the PrepCom such as the so called peace process.
15. The reference to the exclusively peaceful nuclear activities of the Islamic Republic of Iran has no logic and is absolutely irrelevant. With the resolution of remaining issues according to the work plan, the implementation of Safeguards in the Islamic Republic of Iran is in a routine manner. Furthermore the Prep.Com. Should not be misused by a few States for their narrow political objectives.

In conclusion my delegation is not in position to accept the text be considered as “Factual Summary” of the Preparatory Committee and to be attached to the report. However if the chairman is still willing to reflect his text, my delegation can go along with it to only be reflected as the chair’s own personal working paper with his full responsibility for its content.

~~Thank You.~~

*I however appreciate your understanding
Thank You
accuracy monetary that the majority have
difficulties and decided to reflect the
text as your own w.p.*