

---

**Preparatory Committee for the 2010 Review  
Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the  
Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons**

10 May 2007

Original: English

---

**First session**

Vienna, 30 April-11 May 2007

**The question of agenda of the first session of  
the Preparatory Committee for the 2010 NPT  
Review Conference****Working paper submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran**

1. At the outset, let me share my disappointment that the Conference has not been able yet to commence the substantive part of its discussions due to the differences over the agenda of the Conference. It is moreover distressing that delegations, as well as the representatives of civil society, have not been able to present their viewpoints with respect to the substantive aspects of the NPT. It is quite understandable that, although such points of view have certainly been reflected in the general statements of the distinguished representatives, their elaborations have been provided in separate statements to be made in the course of the cluster discussions. We are anxious to hear the statement at this meeting.

2. It seems, however, that artificial distinctions between substantive and procedural aspects have been made at this Conference. My delegation has been accused of wrangling over procedural issues at the expense of substance. I believe if such a distinction is not artificial, the question would be raised as to why some other delegations, who see the agenda as reflecting only on some technical aspects of our business here, are so adamant about just two words being included in the agenda in reaffirming the necessity of compliance with all provisions of the Treaty. Let us therefore not be shy about accepting that the agenda is part of the substantive aspects of the NPT review process and that, in fact, it lays out the framework of our substantive discussions within the process.

3. It is claimed that Iran has suddenly opened the discussions on the formulation of the agenda, which has been subject to months of negotiations with all interested States. Let me clearly put on the record that this formulation was never discussed prior to its formal distribution by the Chair to the States parties to the NPT in New York on 28 March 2007. I immediately reflected the concern of my Government regarding the necessity of a non-discriminatory approach towards all obligations and provisions of the Treaty. On three more occasions last month, our representatives in New York and Vienna appealed to the Chairman to modify his draft of the provisional agenda in order to remove substantive difficulties prior to the commencement of the meeting.



4. Chairpersons in international negotiation possess a very prominent role in facilitating the proceedings of consultations and negotiations by participants. The Chair is not among the parties to a negotiation, and the Chair needs to create an environment for the parties to come forward and reach decisions smoothly. Ambassador Amano, as Chairman of the session, has made tremendous efforts to guide the discussion, and we appreciate his dedication to a successful outcome of the Conference. He, however, on several occasions tried to introduce, of course with good will, “his intention”, “his understanding”, “his vision”, “his ruling” and in fact “his position” in the negotiations. Unfortunately, in some aspects of our work, the inflexibility shown by the Chairman on easily reformulating and modifying his initial suggestion, as well as the lack of transparency in the conduct of the consultations, added to the already complex nature of our discussions and confusion of the parties concerned.

5. Much emphasis has been placed at this Conference on views of the majority versus those of the minority. This categorization has sometimes been used as a tool to put pressure on specific views and parties. If this is an attempt to start the democratization of the international institutions, particularly in the disarmament area, I should publicly put on record that my delegation welcomes such an approach. It is evident that disarmament machinery has been paralysed in recent years by the broad application of the rule of consensus and, accordingly, the Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission, BWC negotiation and the NPT process, be it in the Preparatory Committee or the Review Conferences, are candid examples of victims of the rule of consensus, and of paralysis. If this is the wish, my delegation, in an attempt to break the deadlock, is ready to start the voting procedure on this point of the agenda and to consider such possibility on other occasions when divergent views hinder the meeting of the NPT process to further proceed and reach a conclusion. However, if some believe that the rule of consensus should be strongly observed in the proceeding of the Conference, then we should also respect that the application of the rule of consensus would not always correspond to specific positions. Furthermore, if consensus is the rule of the game, I hope you would then agree with me that it has been inappropriate to try to single out my delegation three times in the formal plenary, while knowing about our position well before the meeting.

6. Transparency in the expression of positions is part of international diplomacy, which enables delegations to fully understand each other and contribute to a successful give-and-take process. But in this Conference some delegations with strong views on the procedural and substantive aspects raised at this meeting have opted to take a silent position and have hidden behind the sincere efforts of the Chairman and other delegations. Accordingly, we have not received, since the start of this process, a clear answer as to who had the objection to the 2002 NPT formulation for the agenda. There also has not been a clear answer as to who was opposed to a minor modification of the existing formulation of the agenda, to include compliance with all provisions of the Treaty. Although we were told that such an inclusion might not be agreed due to the overall agreement that the existing formation should not be opened to further discussion, our conclusion is that the reason for the rejection is that inclusion of the two new words was not agreeable to the some delegations. I think nobody is under the illusion that the formulation of the agenda is sacred and unchangeable. It is evident that the formulation is just a tool to enable us to convey the agreement of the Conference, and it should always provide

sufficient flexibility to reach agreement. Formulations per se cannot be closed to improvements. Nor is “Take it or leave it” our rule of the game. My delegation is seriously concerned about the establishment of an unjustified precedence for subsequent Preparatory Committee meetings and Review Conferences.

7. My delegation participated in the Conference with the determination to effectively contribute to substantive discussions of the Conference. The parties to a treaty are considered to be members of a club determined to collaborate closely with mutual respect for their common cause, encouraging others to join the club. Double standards, confrontation with and isolation of any State party would place the stated goal, the spirit of cooperation and the incentives of the membership in jeopardy. In all frankness, my delegation did not expect such a stalemate at the Conference, particularly over the reflection of a very important issue — the insertion of a small phrase in the draft agenda of the Conference, namely “the compliance with all provisions of the Treaty”, which has proven to be the concern of all other delegations. We thus exerted all our efforts here to carry the important message which the Conference needs to convey in strong terms and in a most reasonable and effective manner. We are very disappointed that some delegations have resorted to procedural tactics to prevent the insertion. Furthermore, unfair propaganda has been promoted since the beginning of the Conference to politicize the position of my delegation through providing misinformation to the media. Had the Chair, instead of insisting on his own proposal, given a chance to the text of the agenda of the 2002 Preparatory Committee, suggested by my delegation at the beginning of the meeting (the agreed language already adopted by consensus), we could have had considerable substantial discussion by now and valuable time would not have been wasted. However, numerous delegations approached us and, while admitting that the concern raised by my delegation was legitimate, appealed to our delegation to include the concern in a manner such that the existing formulation would not be modified.

8. During recent days, my delegation has conveyed all the sentiments of our colleagues and civil society to my capital, considering different options and formulations that could help the meeting proceed, while safeguarding and protecting the essence of our basic principled position, which is a very important basis of the NPT Review Conference. As a last attempt, we concentrated on the initiative presented by the distinguished delegation of South Africa. Since the Friday afternoon session, my delegation has tried its best to explore all the possibilities and to find ways to make this initiative plausible and agreeable.

9. In conclusion, I have the honour to announce that, in a display of good will and flexibility, my Government can accept the proposal of South Africa to include the language as suggested as a footnote to the bottom of the first page of the agenda that refers back to an asterisk (\*) that appears at the end of item 6 of the provisional agenda.

10. I stress that this would be the last possible accommodation that my delegation is able to make at this very critical juncture to advance this Conference. I hope that the flexibility of my delegation will be reciprocated by other concerned delegations and therefore that the Conference will adopt such an approach for approving the agenda of the Conference, and start the substantive discussion immediately.