

## Safeguards Statement for 2005

In 2005, safeguards were applied for 156 States with safeguards agreements in force with the Agency. The Agency's findings and conclusions for 2005 are reported below with regard to each type of safeguards agreement. These findings and conclusions are based upon an evaluation of all the information available to the Agency in exercising its rights and fulfilling its safeguards obligations for that year.

1. Seventy States had both comprehensive safeguards agreements in force and additional protocols in force or being otherwise applied:

- (a) For 24 of these States, the Agency found no indication of the diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful nuclear activities and no indication of undeclared nuclear material or activities. On this basis, the Agency concluded that, for these States, all nuclear material remained in peaceful activities.
- (b) For 46 of the States<sup>1</sup>, the Agency found no indication of the diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful nuclear activities. Evaluations regarding the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities for each of these States remained ongoing. On this basis, the Agency concluded that, for these States, declared nuclear material remained in peaceful activities.
- (c) Of these 46 States, the Islamic Republic of Iran (Iran) had been found to have been previously engaged in undeclared nuclear activities. In 2005, the Board of Governors found that Iran's failures and breaches of its obligations to comply with its comprehensive safeguards agreement, as detailed in GOV/2003/75, constituted non-compliance. Verification of the correctness and completeness of Iran's declarations remained ongoing.

2. Safeguards activities were implemented for 77 States with comprehensive safeguards agreements in force, but without additional protocols in force or being otherwise applied<sup>2</sup>. For these States, the Agency found no indication of the diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful nuclear activities. On this basis, the Agency concluded that, for these States, declared nuclear material remained in peaceful activities.

3. As of the end of 2005, 36 non-nuclear-weapon States party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) had not yet brought comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency into force as required by Article III of that Treaty. For these States, the Agency could not draw any safeguards conclusions.

---

<sup>1</sup> And Taiwan, China.

<sup>2</sup> The Agency was not able to perform verification activities in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) in 2005 and could not, therefore, draw any conclusions about the material or activities for that State.

4. Three States had in force safeguards agreements concluded pursuant to INFCIRC/66/Rev.2, which require the application of safeguards to nuclear material, facilities and other items specified in the relevant safeguards agreement. For these States, the Agency found no indication of the diversion of nuclear material or of the misuse of the facilities or other items to which safeguards were applied. On this basis, the Agency concluded that, for these States, nuclear material, facilities or other items to which safeguards were applied remained in peaceful activities.

5. Five nuclear-weapon States had voluntarily offer safeguards agreements in force. Safeguards were implemented with regard to declared nuclear material in selected facilities in four of the five States. For these four States, the Agency found no indication of the diversion of nuclear material to which safeguards were applied. On this basis, the Agency concluded that, for these States, nuclear material to which safeguards were applied in selected facilities remained in peaceful activities.

# **Background to the Safeguards Statement and Executive Summary**

## **1. The Safeguards Conclusions**

1. The Safeguards Statement for 2005 reflects the safeguards conclusions resulting from the implementation of safeguards in accordance with the safeguards agreements concluded by the Agency. The Agency derives these conclusions on the basis of an evaluation of the results of the Agency's verification activities and of all the safeguards relevant information available to it. Sections 1.1–1.6 provide background to the Safeguards Statement. A detailed explanation of the IAEA safeguards system can be found on the Agency's website: [http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/safeg\\_system.pdf](http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/safeg_system.pdf).

### **1.1. States with Comprehensive Safeguards Agreements**

2. Under a comprehensive safeguards agreement, the Agency has the right and obligation to ensure that safeguards are applied, in accordance with the terms of the agreement, on all source or special fissionable material in all peaceful nuclear activities within the territory of the State, under its jurisdiction or carried out under its control anywhere, for the exclusive purpose of verifying that such material is not diverted to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices (paragraph 2 of INFCIRC/153 (Corrected)).

3. Comprehensive safeguards agreements consist of a Part I and a Part II, and definitions. The procedures for implementing the general provisions of Part I are described in Part II. These procedures include the record keeping and reporting obligations of the State with regard to nuclear material, nuclear facilities and locations outside facilities where nuclear material is customarily used (LOFs). They also include provisions related to Agency access to nuclear material, facilities and LOFs.

4. The procedures set out in Part II of a comprehensive safeguards agreement specify that material containing uranium or thorium which has not reached the stage of the nuclear fuel cycle where its composition and purity is suitable for fuel fabrication or for isotopic enrichment (as provided for in paragraph 34(c) of INFCIRC/153) is subject to certain procedures related to the reporting of export and import of such material. Nuclear material which has reached that stage of the fuel cycle and any material produced at a later stage is subject to all the other procedures specified in the agreement. An inventory of such material is established on the basis of an initial report by a State, verified by the Agency and maintained on the basis of subsequent reports by the State and by Agency verification. The Agency performs its verification activities in order to confirm that the declarations by the State are correct and complete.

5. Many States with minimal or no nuclear activities have concluded a small quantities protocol (SQP) to their comprehensive safeguards agreement. For a State with an operative SQP based on the model set out in Annex B to GOV/INF/276 (22 August 1974), the implementation of most of the safeguards measures provided for in Part II of its comprehensive safeguards agreement is held in abeyance as long as the quantity of nuclear material subject to safeguards does not exceed the limits set out in paragraph 37 of INFCIRC/153 (Corr.) and there is no nuclear material in a facility. In 2005,

the Board of Governors approved the modified text of an SQP, which reduces the number of measures held in abeyance and makes an SQP unavailable to a State with an existing or planned facility<sup>3</sup>.

6. While the Agency's authority to verify the correctness and completeness of a State's declarations under its comprehensive safeguards agreement derives from the agreement itself, the tools available to the Agency to do so under such an agreement are limited. The Model Additional Protocol<sup>4</sup> approved by the Board of Governors in 1997 equips the Agency with important supplementary tools which address these limitations by providing the Agency with broader access to information and locations. The measures provided for under an additional protocol significantly increase the Agency's ability to verify the correctness and completeness of a State's declarations under a comprehensive safeguards agreement.

7. To enable the Agency to perform its verification activities effectively and efficiently, the State needs to have complied with the requirements of its safeguards agreements and — if concluded — its additional protocol, including the requirement to establish a State system of accounting for and control of nuclear material (SSAC).

### **1.1.1. States with Comprehensive Safeguards Agreements and Additional Protocols in Force or otherwise Applied**

#### **Status of Implementation**

8. As of 31 December 2005, 70 States — as compared with 61 States in 2004<sup>5</sup> — had both comprehensive safeguards agreements in force and additional protocols in force or being otherwise applied. Of these, 24 States had operative SQPs.

9. Safeguards implementation involved activities carried out in the field and activities carried out at Agency Headquarters in Vienna. The latter activities included the evaluation of States' accounting reports and other declarations required under comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols and the evaluation of safeguards-relevant information from other sources. The Agency carried out some 1700 inspections and 160 complementary accesses utilizing approximately 11 300 calendar-days in the field for verification (CDFVs)<sup>6</sup> in these States.

---

<sup>3</sup> See paragraph 34.

<sup>4</sup> INFCIRC/540 (Corrected), Model Protocol Additional to the Agreement(s) between State(s) and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards.

<sup>5</sup> Additional protocols to existing safeguards agreements entered into force in 2005 with Afghanistan, Estonia, Malta, Nicaragua, Slovakia and Switzerland. Comprehensive safeguards agreements with additional protocols entered into force with Marshall Islands, Palau and the United Republic of Tanzania (Tanzania).

<sup>6</sup> Calendar-days in the field for verification comprise calendar-days spent in performing inspections or complementary access, inspection travel and rest periods.

## Deriving Conclusions

10. In order to meet its obligation under a comprehensive safeguards agreement, the Agency needs to perform necessary evaluation and verification activities in order to conclude that there is no indication of diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful activities and no indication of undeclared nuclear material or activities in the State as a whole.

11. To conclude that there is no indication of diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful activities, the Agency evaluates the results of its verification activities under the relevant safeguards agreement aimed at the detection of a diversion of nuclear material from declared facilities and LOFs and the detection of undeclared production or separation of direct-use<sup>7</sup> material at declared reactors, reprocessing facilities, hot cells and/or enrichment installations. In addition, it evaluates information on facility design features, facility operations, and all other information available about the State's nuclear and nuclear-related activities.

12. To conclude that there is no indication of undeclared nuclear material and activities in a State, the Agency carries out a comprehensive evaluation of the results of its verification activities under the relevant safeguards agreement and additional protocol, and an evaluation of all information available on the State's nuclear and nuclear-related activities. In order to draw such a conclusion, the Agency needs to have:

- conducted a comprehensive State evaluation based on all information available to the Agency about the State's nuclear and nuclear-related activities (including declarations submitted under the additional protocol, and information collected by the Agency through its verification activities and from other sources);
- implemented complementary access, as necessary, in accordance with the State's additional protocol;
- addressed all anomalies, questions and inconsistencies identified in the course of its evaluation and verification activities.

A conclusion relating to the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities can be drawn for a State only when these activities have been completed and no indication has been found by the Agency that, in its judgement, would give rise to a possible proliferation concern.

13. In drawing these conclusions, the Agency evaluates whether the safeguards activities carried out during the year have satisfied certain performance targets. In those cases where integrated safeguards have not yet been implemented, the Safeguards Criteria function as the performance targets<sup>8</sup>. Under integrated safeguards — the optimum combination of measures of comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols — the performance targets are those set out in the State-specific integrated safeguards approach approved for each State<sup>9</sup>.

## Overall Conclusions for 2005

14. On the basis of the evaluations described in paragraphs 11 and 12, the Agency drew the conclusions referred to in paragraph 1(a) of the Safeguards Statement for 2005 for 24 States —

<sup>7</sup> Direct-use material is nuclear material that can be used for the manufacture of nuclear explosive devices without transmutation or further enrichment (e.g. plutonium and high enriched uranium). There are two categories: unirradiated direct-use material (which requires less conversion time), and irradiated direct-use material.

<sup>8</sup> The Safeguards Criteria specify the activities considered necessary by the Agency to provide a reasonable probability of detecting the diversion of a significant quantity of nuclear material from declared facilities and LOFs.

<sup>9</sup> A State-level approach is based on safeguards verification objectives common to all States which take into account the features of the individual State's nuclear fuel cycle and other relevant State specific factors.

Australia, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Ecuador, Ghana, the Holy See, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Romania, Slovenia and Uzbekistan. For three of these States — Canada, Jamaica and Kuwait — the conclusion in paragraph 1(a) of the Safeguards Statement was drawn for the first time.

15. Because the evaluation process described in paragraph 12 had not yet been completed for 46 States<sup>10</sup>, the conclusion drawn for these States related only to declared nuclear material in peaceful activities.

### **1.1.2. States with Comprehensive Safeguards Agreements but no Additional Protocols in Force or otherwise Applied**

#### **Status of Implementation**

16. As of 31 December 2005, safeguards were implemented for 77 States<sup>11</sup> in this category, 52 of which had operative SQPs. Safeguards implementation involved activities in the field and at Headquarters, including the evaluation of States' accounting reports and declarations required under comprehensive safeguards agreements and the evaluation of safeguards-relevant information from other sources. The Agency carried out some 300 inspections utilizing approximately 2800 CDFVs in the States of this category.

#### **Deriving Conclusions**

17. For a State with a comprehensive safeguards agreement alone, the Agency's right and obligation are as described in paragraph 2 above. Although safeguards strengthening measures under such an agreement<sup>12</sup> have somewhat increased the Agency's ability to detect undeclared nuclear material and activities, the activities that the Agency may conduct in this regard are limited in a State without an additional protocol. Thus, the Safeguards Statement for a State with a comprehensive safeguards agreement alone relates only to the non-diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful activities.

18. In the course of its evaluation, the Agency also seeks to determine whether there is any indication of undeclared nuclear material or activities in the State which would need to be reflected in the Safeguards Statement. However, the measures provided for in the Model Additional Protocol are essential for the Agency to draw a conclusion related to the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities for the State as a whole.

---

<sup>10</sup> See footnote 1.

<sup>11</sup> The 77 States do not include the DPRK, as the Agency was not able to perform verification activities in that State.

<sup>12</sup> Measures introduced in the mid-1990s, such as the voluntary reporting scheme, early provision of design information, environmental sampling and satellite imagery.

## **Overall Conclusions for 2005**

19. On the basis of the evaluation described in paragraph 11, and as reflected in paragraph 2 of the Safeguards Statement, the Agency concluded that for the 77 States referred to in paragraph 16 above, declared nuclear material remained in peaceful activities.

### **1.2. States with no Safeguards Agreements in Force**

20. As of 31 December 2005, 36 non-nuclear-weapon States party to the NPT had yet to bring comprehensive safeguards agreements into force pursuant to the Treaty<sup>13</sup>. As indicated in paragraph 3 of the Safeguards Statement, for these States, the Agency could not draw any safeguards conclusions.

### **1.3. States with Safeguards Agreements based on INFCIRC/66/Rev.2**

#### **Status of Implementation**

21. As of 31 December 2005, safeguards agreements based on INFCIRC/66/Rev.2 were implemented at a number of facilities in India, Israel and Pakistan. None of these States had concluded an additional protocol with the Agency. The Agency carried out 45 inspections utilizing some 400 CDFVs in these States.

#### **Deriving Conclusions**

22. The conclusion described in paragraph 4 of the Safeguards Statement is reported collectively for these three States, and relates to the nuclear material, facilities and other items to which safeguards were applied. To draw such a conclusion in respect of these States, the Agency evaluates all safeguards relevant information available, including verification results, and information about facility design features and facility operations.

## **Overall Conclusions for 2005**

23. On the basis of the results of its verification and evaluation activities, the Agency concluded that nuclear material, facilities or other items to which safeguards were applied in the three States remained in peaceful activities.

### **1.4. States with Voluntary Offer Agreements**

#### **Status of Implementation**

24. As of 31 December 2005, safeguards were implemented at facilities selected by the Agency in four of the five States with voluntary offer safeguards agreements in force: China, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (United Kingdom) and the United States of America. Safeguards activities in the Russian Federation were limited to the evaluation of accounting reports on the export and import of nuclear material since no facilities were selected in 2005 from Russia's list of designated facilities. All five of these States have signed additional protocols with the Agency; by the end of 2005, the additional protocols were in force in China, France and the United Kingdom. These three States – inter alia – provided declarations on export to non-nuclear-weapon States of the

---

<sup>13</sup> Andorra, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Kenya, Liberia, Mauritania, Federated States of Micronesia, Mozambique, Oman, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, São Tome and Príncipe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Timor Leste, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, and Vanuatu. Comprehensive safeguards agreements entered into force with Turkmenistan on 3 January 2006, Uganda on 14 February 2006 and Haiti on 9 March 2006.

specified equipment and non-nuclear material specified in the relevant annex to their respective additional protocols. The Agency carried out some 100 safeguards inspections utilizing approximately 1100 CDFVs in order to verify declared nuclear material in the facilities selected in these States.

## **Deriving Conclusions**

25. The conclusion contained in paragraph 5 of the Safeguards Statement is reported for the four nuclear-weapon States in which safeguards were applied to nuclear material in selected facilities. To draw the safeguards conclusion, the Agency evaluates all relevant information, including verification results and information about facility design features and operations.

## **Overall Conclusions for 2005**

26. On the basis of the results of its verification and evaluation activities, the Agency concluded for each of these four States that nuclear material to which safeguards were applied in selected facilities remained in peaceful activities.

### **1.5. Islamic Republic of Iran**

27. During 2005, the Director General submitted six reports to the Board of Governors on the implementation of the comprehensive safeguards agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran<sup>14</sup>, and the Board adopted two resolutions on the subject<sup>15</sup>.

28. In 2005, Iran continued to cooperate in the implementation of its comprehensive safeguards agreement, and to act as if its additional protocol were in force<sup>16</sup>. Iran also provided the Agency with access to interview certain personnel. Corrective actions were undertaken by Iran in relation to the breaches of its obligations under its safeguards agreement summarized in GOV/2004/83 (15 November 2004) and GOV/2005/67 (2 September 2005).

29. Verification of the correctness and completeness of Iran's declarations continued in 2005. The Agency was still not in a position to conclude that there were no undeclared nuclear material or activities in Iran after three years of intensive Agency verification. At the close of 2005, there remained two major issues of direct relevance to these efforts: the origin of low enriched uranium (LEU) and high enriched uranium (HEU) particle contamination found at various locations in Iran; and the extent and nature of Iran's enrichment programme.

30. In addition to its implementation of the comprehensive safeguards agreement and additional protocol with Iran, in 2005, the Agency continued to perform monitoring activities related to Iran's voluntary suspension of enrichment-related and reprocessing activities. On 1 August 2005, Iran informed the Agency of its decision to resume the uranium conversion activities at the Uranium Conversion Facility at Esfahan.

---

<sup>14</sup> INFCIRC/648, GOV/INF/2005/13; GOV/2005/61, 62, 67 and 87.

<sup>15</sup> GOV/2005/64 and 77.

<sup>16</sup> On 6 February 2006, the Agency received a letter from Iran informing it that Iran's voluntary commitment to implement the provisions of the additional protocol had been suspended as of the date of the letter.

31. In a resolution adopted in September 2005 (GOV/2005/77), the Board found that Iran's many failures and breaches of its obligations to comply with its comprehensive safeguards agreement, as detailed in GOV/2003/75, constituted non-compliance in the context of Article XII.C of the Agency's Statute.

## **1.6. Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

32. Since December 2002, the Agency has not been able to perform any verification activities in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). The Agency is, therefore, unable to draw any conclusions about that State's nuclear material or activities.

## **2. Factors affecting the Effectiveness of the Safeguards System**

### **Additional Protocols**

33. One of the greatest challenges for the Agency is to be able to detect undeclared nuclear material and activities. For States with a comprehensive safeguards agreement but no additional protocol in force, the Agency's ability to do so is limited. As of the end of the year, 77 States with comprehensive safeguards agreements did not have additional protocols in force or being otherwise applied.

### **Small Quantities Protocols**

34. In 2005, the Director General submitted a report to the Board of Governors drawing attention to the limitations of SQPs (see paragraph 5 above). After recognizing that the SQP, in its present form, constituted a weakness in the Agency's safeguards system, the Board decided on 20 September 2005 that, although SQPs should remain part of the Agency's safeguards system, they should be subject to the modifications in the standard text and the change in the SQP criteria referred to in the Director General's report. The Board also decided that, henceforth, it would approve only SQP texts based on the revised standard text. The changes endorsed by the Board have the effect of (i) making an SQP unavailable to a State with an existing or planned facility; (ii) requiring States to provide initial reports on nuclear material and notification as soon as a decision has been taken to construct or to authorize construction of a nuclear facility; and (iii) allowing for Agency inspection. The Board authorized the Director General to conclude exchanges of letters with all States with SQPs to give effect to these modifications.

## **3. Strengthening the Effectiveness and Improving the Efficiency of Safeguards**

35. In 2005, further progress was made in strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards in several areas, such as the implementation of integrated safeguards, the development of safeguards approaches, procedures and technology and cooperation with State and regional systems of accounting for and control of nuclear material (SSACs/RSACs).

36. Integrated safeguards were implemented throughout 2005 in Australia, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Norway, Peru and Uzbekistan. During 2005, implementation of integrated safeguards was initiated for Bulgaria and Slovenia. In addition, integrated safeguards approaches were developed and approved for Canada and Poland.

37. The Agency continued to replace obsolete analogue surveillance systems with digital systems, installing unattended monitoring systems and expanding remote monitoring capabilities. During 2005, 94 new digital surveillance systems involving 186 cameras were installed in the field. By the end of the year, the Agency had installed 123 surveillance and radiation monitoring systems with remote monitoring capabilities.

38. Following the revelations about extensive covert networks related to the procurement and supply of sensitive nuclear technology, the Agency undertook to strengthen its capabilities for analysing information on such networks. The Nuclear Trade Analysis Unit (NUTRAN) was established in the Department of Safeguards in November 2004 in order to facilitate analysis of covert nuclear trade activities. In 2005, the unit analysed available information on covert nuclear procurements and contributed to the process of preparing and updating State evaluation reports.

39. The effectiveness and efficiency of Agency safeguards depend, to a large extent, on the effectiveness of SSACs and RSACs, and on the level of their cooperation. The Agency continued to liaise with SSACs and RSACs on safeguards implementation issues such as the quality of operators' systems for the measurement of nuclear material, the timeliness and accuracy of State reports and declarations, and support for the Agency's verification activities. Emphasis was placed on training and on the introduction of assistance programmes such as the Agency's SSAC advisory service (ISSAS).

40. The Agency has continued to consult with States on the issue of visas for designated inspectors. Nearly all States with significant nuclear activities — and all States with additional protocols — have undertaken to provide designated Agency inspectors with multiple-entry visas valid for at least one year upon request by the Agency. Four States have not yet fully implemented this provision.

41. The Standing Advisory Group on Safeguards Implementation (SAGSI) held two plenary meetings in 2005. The main safeguards implementation issues considered by SAGSI in 2005 were a revised model safeguards approach for centrifuge enrichment plants, improved safeguards measures for research reactors, more efficient safeguards approaches for spent fuel transfers to dry storage, further development of State-level safeguards approaches (SLAs) and the safeguards R&D programme.

42. In June 2005, the Board of Governors decided to establish an Advisory Committee on Safeguards and Verification within the Framework of the IAEA Statute. The Advisory Committee is to consider ways and means to strengthen the safeguards system and make relevant recommendations to the Board. The first Committee meeting was held in November 2005. At the request of Member States, the Agency proposed a number of areas for the Committee's consideration.

#### **4. Safeguards Expenditures and Resources**

43. The safeguards programme operated with an increased Regular Budget allocation in accordance with the overall four-year budget increase approved by the 47<sup>th</sup> IAEA General Conference in 2003. In 2005, safeguards expenditure from the Safeguards Regular Budget was \$130 million. In addition, \$12.9 million was spent from voluntary contributions from Member States (extrabudgetary funding). One hundred per cent of the safeguards Regular Budget was spent in 2005 including the carryover of \$8.9 million from 2004.

#### **5. Further Activities supporting the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime**

44. The Agency continued to experience difficulties in obtaining information from States under the monitoring scheme approved by the Board of Governors in 1999 regarding separated neptunium and americium. This undermines the Agency's ability to sustain its earlier assessment regarding the associated proliferation risk.

45. In 2005, the Agency continued to receive reports from Member States on events involving trafficking in nuclear and other radioactive material. The number of events involving nuclear material reported in 2005 increased as compared to those of 2004.

46. Developing proliferation resistant nuclear systems continued to be an important component of the Agency's International Project on Innovative Reactors and Fuel Cycles (INPRO). In addition to its work on INPRO, the Agency continued to participate in the Proliferation Resistance and Physical Protection Evaluation Methodology Expert Group of the Generation IV International Forum (GIF).

## 6. List of States referred to in each of the paragraphs of the Safeguards Statement for 2005

| <b>List of States</b>  |
|--|
| <p><b>The 24 States referred to in paragraph 1(a) are:</b><br/>Australia, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Ecuador, Ghana, the Holy See, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Romania, Slovenia and Uzbekistan.</p>   |
| <p><b>The 46 States<sup>17</sup> referred to in paragraph 1(b) States:</b><br/>Afghanistan, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Rep. of Congo, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Islamic Rep. of Iran, Ireland, Italy, Republic of Korea, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Seychelles, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay, Tajikistan and United Republic of Tanzania.</p>   |
| <p><b>The 77 States referred to in paragraph 2 are:</b><br/>Albania, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Saint Kitts &amp; Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia &amp; Montenegro, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Vietnam, Republic of Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.</p> |
| <p><b>The 36 States referred to in paragraph 3 are:</b><br/>Andorra, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Kenya, Liberia, Mauritania, Federated States of Micronesia, Mozambique, Oman, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, São Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Timor Leste, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda and Vanuatu.</p>  |
| <p><b>The three States referred to in paragraph 4 are:</b><br/>India, Israel and Pakistan.</p>   |
| <p><b>The four States referred to in paragraph 5 are:</b><br/>China, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.</p>  |

<sup>17</sup> And Taiwan, China.