

**Statement**

by

**H.E.Ambassador Soltanieh**

Permanent Representative of Islamic Republic of Iran

at

**Board of Governors of the IAEA**

June 17, 2009

**In the Name of God**

**The Most Gracious and the Most Merciful**

**Madam Chair, Distinguished colleagues**

At the outset I would like to state that my delegation associates itself with the statement made by the distinguished representative of Cuba on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. I would also like to extend the sincere appreciation of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Non-Aligned Movement for its continued support.

After six years of the most robust and intrusive inspection in the history of the Agency, and in spite of the continuous declaration of the Director General in over 20 reports to the Board of Governors, that there is no evidence of diversion of nuclear materials and activities to prohibited purposes, the issue is still on the agenda of the Board of Governors. The simple question is; why?

Although I have already answered the question at several occasions but it is worthy recalling again and putting on record. The issue is on the agenda due to political motivation and pressures exerted by couple of countries with a

hidden agenda, in full contravention with the spirit and letter of the IAEA Statute. Those are trying to turn the Agency to a “UN Watchdog” with maximum intrusiveness in safeguards in order to interfere to the national security of majority of Member States, under the pretext of non-proliferation.

**Madam Chair,**

Due to time constraint I limit myself to few examples:

Attempts in turning the Additional Protocol which is voluntary to a mandatory instrument, taking steps to go beyond the Additional Protocol; the US proposal to establish the committee on strengthening Safeguards, which of course failed after two years; politicizing technical cooperation through imposing discrimination and more restrictions, are among those examples of a preplanned hidden agenda. Such attempts are made where the international community is seriously concerned about the non-compliance with Article VI of NPT regarding nuclear disarmament as well as violation of Article I in transferring nuclear materials and technology to Israeli regime, the only non-party to NPT in the Middle East, the last but not the least is the double standard policy which has jeopardized the NPT credibility and universality. Such concerns were conveyed by almost all parties in the recent meeting of NPT in New York.

**Madam Chair,**

I refrain from elaborating in detail the DG reports including relevant paragraphs of SIR at this meeting. I will however reflect our comments on shortcomings and inconsistencies together with realities on the ground in

written. Reading carefully the reports of the Director General one could easily notice the bitter fact that the issue is political and not technical any more. He has rightly reported that the issue is still on agenda since the concerned state, United States, has not delivered the original document on the so-called alleged studies to the Agency and did not even permit the Agency to deliver the copy, which had in its access, to Iran during discussion. He therefore considers dialogue with accusing State as the only solution since Agency has already conducted its technical mandate according to Statute and Comprehensive Safeguards.

I have to recall that the issue started with a single technical question in 2003: Where is the source of contamination of LEU and HEU particles found in Natanz?

Iran reacted in the most cooperative and transparent manner in order to clarify the matter.

After the most intensive intrusive inspection in the life time of the Agency, including swipe sampling, interview, and thorough review of documents, the Agency concluded in June 2004 that the assertion of Iran was correct that is the source of contamination is not as the result of enrichment in Iran and has foreign source. However due to politically motivated policies and conducts of few States the issue has not been removed from the agenda of the Board of Governors since then. At the eve of each meeting of Board a certain State brought a new allegation which after months of robust inspection proved to be baseless. Based on these facts I caution that the continuation of status quo, keeping the issue of peaceful uses of nuclear energy of Iran in the agenda, has serious consequences on the cooperative environment among Member States thus the integrity and credibility of the Agency. Therefore

the Director General is expected to declare that the implementation of safeguards in Iran shall be conducted in a routine manner, as was envisaged in the Work Plan (INFCIRC/711) agreed upon between Iran and the Agency, as soon as possible.

**Madam Chairperson,**

In conclusion I would like to reiterate the following points:

1-The Government of Islamic Republic of Iran shall not deprive its Great Nation from its inalienable right utilizing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, including nuclear fuel cycle, specifically enrichment, at the same time it shall continue its full cooperation with the Agency in accordance with its obligation under NPT comprehensive Safeguards Agreement. The world has noticed that Iranian people with the background of thousand years of civilization and contribution of science to humankind are united on the issue of nuclear energy.

2- The Islamic Republic of Iran is of the strong view that the nuclear issues shall be elaborated merely within the framework of the Agency as the sole pertinent technical organization.

3-The last but not the least I declare that the Islamic Republic of Iran has always welcomed constructive and just dialogue; based on the principle of mutual respect, without any pre-condition, in order to deal with global and regional challenges particularly the nuclear armament which is immediate threat to global peace and security. I therefore advise those who have declared a change in their foreign policy to translate their words into sincere action and seize the unique opportunity by choosing civilized approach that is dialogue rather repeating their inefficient uncivilized provocative conducts,

language of threat and compensate their past mistakes. Majority of Member States expect to see such declared changes in the attitudes and conducts of the certain State vis-à-vis the IAEA too and to compensate the damage already inflicted to the credibility and independence of the Agency.

**Thank you for your kind attention**