Remarks on Chair’s Summary

Mr. Chairman,

At the outset, let me extend to you my delegation’s appreciation for all the efforts you exerted throughout the work of the Second Preparatory Committee. We thank you for the broad summary you submitted yesterday and in this regard, we would like to acknowledge the comprehensive and inclusive nature of the report.

My delegation has five main observations on the report regarding several clusters which we would like to share:

First: We believe the chair’s summary did not accurately reflect the overwhelming disappointment by state parties with the lack of implementation of Article VI of the NPT related to nuclear disarmament. Although the report makes mention of it, it did not, in our view, capture the general frustration with the lack of progress on nuclear disarmament which seemed to be the trend in the discussions. In fact, the report refers to other conceptual issues related to nuclear disarmament before first referring to what we detected as wide-spread criticism of the nuclear weapon states non-implementation of Article VI on nuclear disarmament. It’s not clear for my delegation why the views of certain countries in this section were specifically outlined, while not resorting to the same methodology in other sections with other countries.

Second: We were surprised to detect a complete absence, on the paragraphs related to the Middle East, of any reference to the urgent need for Israel to adhere to the NPT as a non-nuclear weapon State, and subject its all its nuclear facilities to comprehensive safeguards and comply with relevant Security Council resolutions. Despite an overwhelming reference in both national and groups’ statements of the particular importance dedicated to the case of Israel’s non-adherence to the NPT under cluster II specific issues, the reference was completely omitted within this section, despite a modest reference to universality in Paragraph 6. We believe, and expected that given the overwhelming attention to Israel’s case, it should have warranted much greater attention in the chair’s summary, and not completely overlooked. Although the summary makes reference to several other country-specific cases, it is surprising that the one case which was addressed on multiple occasions was omitted.
Third: Egypt regrets the reference made in the summary that the implementation of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East was a priority to many States, as we have always worked on the assumption that this was a priority, and even a binding commitment, for all States parties to the Treaty. Moreover, we believe the reference to conditions conducive to the establishment of a WMD free zone represents a dangerous conceptual foundation to follow, as it opens the door for states of the region to pursue, from each country’s narrow national perspective, policies that run contrary to the principles and objectives of the non-proliferation regime and their relevant commitments in this regard.

Fourth: The Chair’s summary also overlooked the criticism leveled by many state parties to states engaged in different forms of nuclear cooperation with states non-party to the NPT. This significant issue was unfortunately, not reflected in the summary, despite the grave implications it has on both the credibility and sustainability of the NPT and the non-proliferation regime as a whole. Nuclear cooperation with states non-party to the NPT was raised on multiple occasions in both national and regional statements and we expected that an issue of such significance would not be neglected.

Fifth: Egypt reiterates its strong rejection of any mischaracterization of the additional protocol together with the comprehensive safeguards agreement as the current standard for verification pursuant to Article 3 of the NPT, which clearly sets the Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement as the only standard for verification according to the NPT.

Thank you.