

control over weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.⁸⁴⁷

⁸⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 3.

Meeting: non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction

<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Other documents</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Decision and vote (for-against-abstaining)</i>
6518 20 April 2011	Draft resolution submitted by Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Colombia, France, Gabon, Germany, Lebanon, Nigeria, Portugal, Russian Federation, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States (S/2011/257)	Brazil, India	Resolution 1977 (2011) 15-0-0

B. Non-proliferation

Overview

During the period under review, the Security Council held eleven meetings under the item entitled “Non-proliferation”, including one closed meeting, adopted two resolutions under Article 41 of Chapter VII of the Charter and received eight briefings by the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution [1737 \(2006\)](#). The Council imposed new sanctions measures against the Islamic Republic of Iran and, pursuant to resolution [1929 \(2010\)](#), established the Panel of Experts on the Islamic Republic of Iran.⁸⁴⁸ It also extended the mandate of the Panel of Experts for one year.⁸⁴⁹

9 June 2010: imposition of new sanctions measures on the Islamic Republic of Iran

On 9 June 2010, the Council met to consider a draft resolution that would strengthen sanctions measures on the Islamic Republic of Iran.⁸⁵⁰ Prior to the adoption of the resolution, the representative of Brazil stated that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution in order to honour the Tehran

declaration,⁸⁵¹ which she emphasized provided a unique opportunity to solve the problem through dialogue rather than sanctions. She stated that sanctions would lead to the suffering of the people and play into the hands of those on all sides who did not want a peaceful resolution of the issue. The representative further expressed regret that the declaration had neither received the recognition it deserved, nor been given time to bear fruit.⁸⁵² Similarly, the representative of Turkey argued that the adoption of sanctions would negatively affect the momentum created by the Tehran declaration and the overall diplomatic process. He emphasized that adoption of the draft resolution should not be seen as an end to diplomacy, and urged the Islamic Republic of Iran to work towards the implementation of the declaration and to resume talks with the five plus one group (the five permanent members of the Council plus Germany) to discuss its nuclear programme, including the suspension of enrichment.⁸⁵³

The draft resolution ([S/2008/447](#)) was put to the vote, received 9 votes in favour, 5 against (China, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Russian Federation, South Africa, Viet Nam) and 1 abstention (Indonesia). The draft resolution ([S/2008/447](#)) was put to the vote, received 9 votes in favour, 5 against (China, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Russian Federation, South Africa, Viet Nam) and 1 abstention (Indonesia).

⁸⁴⁸ For more information on the sanctions measures, see part VII, sect. III, “Measures not involving the use of armed force in accordance with Article 41 of the Charter”. For information on the mandate of the Committee established pursuant to resolution [1540 \(2004\)](#) and the mandate of the Group of Experts, see part IX, sect. I.B, “Committees established under Chapter VII of the Charter”.

⁸⁴⁹ Resolution [1984 \(2011\)](#).

⁸⁵⁰ [S/2010/283](#).

⁸⁵¹ Joint declaration by the Islamic Republic of Iran, Turkey and Brazil on nuclear fuel, signed in Tehran on 17 May 2010.

⁸⁵² [S/PV.6335](#), pp. 2-3.

⁸⁵³ Ibid., pp. 3-4.

The draft resolution was put to the vote, received 12 votes in favour, 2 against (Brazil, Turkey, and abstention (Lebanon). By resolution 1929 (2010), the Council, concerned by the proliferation risks presented by the nuclear programme of the Islamic Republic of Iran and acting under Article 41 of Chapter VII of the Charter, inter alia, decided that all States should prevent the sale of heavy weapons to the Islamic Republic of Iran; called upon all States to inspect all cargo to and from the Islamic Republic of Iran if the State concerned suspected banned cargo was on board; authorized all States to seize and dispose of prohibited items; called upon all States to prevent the provision of financial services, including insurance or reinsurance, if they had information that provided reasonable grounds to believe that such services could contribute to the Islamic Republic of Iran's banned activities; and requested that the Secretary-General create a panel of up to eight experts ("the Panel of Experts") for an initial period of one year.

Following the adoption of the resolution, several speakers highlighted the importance of continuing dialogue to achieve diplomatic solutions, and emphasized that imposing sanctions on specific individuals and entities did not seek to harm the general population.⁸⁵⁴ The representatives of Austria, Japan, and Nigeria also expressed their support for the dual-track process.⁸⁵⁵ The representative of China emphasized that the new resolution was aimed at bringing the Islamic Republic of Iran back to the negotiating table and activating a new round of diplomatic efforts.⁸⁵⁶

The representative of the United Kingdom acknowledged the good-faith efforts of Turkey and Brazil to persuade the Islamic Republic of Iran to engage with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on the Tehran Research Reactor, but argued that his Government could not accept the attempts by the Islamic Republic of Iran to use those efforts to justify its continued defiance of successive Security Council resolutions that mandated a suspension of its enrichment operations.⁸⁵⁷

The representative of the United States said that the Islamic Republic of Iran had chosen to clearly and wilfully violate its commitments to IAEA and the resolutions of the Council. She stressed that the resolution was aimed at reinforcing the need for that country to comply with its international obligations, and pointed out that the Tehran Research Reactor proposal did not respond to the fundamental concerns about the nuclear programme of the Islamic Republic of Iran. She stated that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons⁸⁵⁸ must remain at the centre of global efforts to stop nuclear proliferation.⁸⁵⁹

The representative of Lebanon, while abstaining from the vote and stating that his Government had not reached a final position on the matter, stated that his Government believed that the understanding reflected in the Tehran declaration on enriched uranium was a significant step towards a diplomatic solution to the Iranian nuclear issue. He pointed out that the declaration did not have the necessary support and was not given enough time to yield the expected results. He said that the new sanctions resolution was a sad setback for diplomatic efforts.⁸⁶⁰

The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran stated that his Government opposed the development and use of weapons of mass destruction on religious, as well as security grounds, and that his Government was determined to exercise its inalienable right to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes and to build on its own scientific advances in developing various peaceful aspects of this technology. He stated that his Government had maintained a robust, proactive and unprecedented collaboration with IAEA, and stressed that no amount of pressure or mischief would be able to break his Government's determination to pursue and defend its legal and inalienable rights.⁸⁶¹ In a second statement, the representative of the United Kingdom noted that the statements made by the Islamic Republic of Iran seemed designed as an excuse for not responding to international concerns about its nuclear programme.⁸⁶²

⁸⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 4-5 (United States); pp. 7-8 (France); pp. 8-9 (Russian Federation); and pp. 10-11 (China).

⁸⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 10 (Austria); p. 10 (Japan); and p. 12 (Nigeria).

⁸⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 11.

⁸⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 6.

⁸⁵⁸ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 729, No. 10485.

⁸⁵⁹ S/PV.6335, pp. 4-5.

⁸⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 12.

⁸⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 15-17.

⁸⁶² Ibid., pp. 17-18.

9 June 2011: extension of mandate of the Panel of Experts on the Islamic Republic of Iran

On 9 June 2011, by resolution [1984 \(2011\)](#), the Council, acting under Article 41 of Chapter VII of the Charter, *inter alia*, decided to extend the mandate of the Panel of Experts on the Islamic Republic of Iran until 9 June 2012.

Following the adoption of the resolution, many speakers stressed that the Panel of Experts played a crucial role in ensuring the full implementation of the Council's sanctions on the Islamic Republic of Iran. They also drew attention to the fact that it was important for the Panel to continue to act impartially and independently.⁸⁶³ The representatives of the Russian Federation and China both stressed that the Panel should act strictly in accordance with its mandate as established by resolution [1929 \(2010\)](#).⁸⁶⁴ The representative of Lebanon noted that the resolution was purely technical in nature, and because his Government abstained from voting on resolution [1929 \(2010\)](#), in line with its consistent position, his Government abstained from the vote on resolution [1984 \(2011\)](#).⁸⁶⁵

4 March 2010 to 21 December 2011: briefings by the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution [1737 \(2006\)](#)

From 4 March 2010 to 21 December 2011, the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution [1737 \(2006\)](#) regularly updated the Council on the activities of the Committee.⁸⁶⁶ Activities included the receipt of implementation reports from Member States pursuant to the relevant resolutions, the receipt of notifications pursuant to resolution [1737 \(2006\)](#) and the receipt of and response to queries and written requests for guidance from Member States concerning the sanctions regime.

On 4 March 2010, several speakers highlighted elements of the latest report of the Director-General of IAEA as further evidence of Islamic Republic of Iran's continued lack of compliance and cooperation with IAEA and its Security Council obligations as well as the possible military dimension to its nuclear

programme. They concurred that there was no choice but to seek new measures in keeping with the dual-track approach that left the door open for diplomacy.⁸⁶⁷ In contrast, the representatives of the Russian Federation and China stressed the importance of continuing dialogue and diplomatic efforts to resolve the situation and achieve a peaceful settlement.⁸⁶⁸ The representative of the Russian Federation emphasized that room for negotiations still existed, including the pursuit of a convincing and mutually acceptable fuel-exchange model for the Tehran Research Reactor.⁸⁶⁹ While the representative of China expressed hope that all parties concerned would take the broader and more long-term situation into consideration,⁸⁷⁰ the representative of the Russian Federation called on Tehran to make the necessary accommodations to ensure the resumption of dialogue with the five plus one group, with a view towards achieving a negotiated settlement of the situation concerning the Iranian nuclear programme.⁸⁷¹

On 28 June 2010, several speakers expressed concern about the continuing nuclear activities of the Islamic Republic of Iran and its denial to IAEA of access to its facilities. The representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Russian Federation and China expressed their support for the resumption of dialogue to resolve the situation concerning the Iranian nuclear programme and for the dual-track strategy on the Islamic Republic of Iran.⁸⁷² The representative of the United Kingdom joined the representative of the United States in urging the preparation of an ambitious Committee work programme pursuant to resolution [1929 \(2010\)](#).⁸⁷³ The representative of the United States specifically encouraged the Chairman of the Committee to personally engage with the Committee in setting out such a programme, and also encouraged the Committee and the Secretariat to work together to establish the newly created panel of experts which would become

⁸⁶³ [S/PV.6552](#), p. 3 (China); p. 3 (United States); pp. 3-4 (France); p. 4 (Germany); and p. 4 (United Kingdom).

⁸⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 2 (Russian Federation); and p. 3 (China).

⁸⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸⁶⁶ 6280th, 6344th, 6384th, 6442nd, 6502nd, 6563rd, 6607th and 6697th meetings.

⁸⁶⁷ [S/PV.6280](#), p. 4 (United States); p. 5 (United Kingdom); and p. 7 (France).

⁸⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Russian Federation); and pp. 7-8 (China).

⁸⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁸⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁸⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁸⁷² [S/PV.6344](#), p. 3 (United States); pp. 3-4 (United Kingdom); and pp. 4-5 (France); p. 5 (Russian Federation); and pp. 5-6 (China).

⁸⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (United States); and p. 4 (United Kingdom).

the eyes and ears of the Council in the field.⁸⁷⁴ The representative of China stated that all parties were continuing to work actively to promote the implementation of the Tehran Research Reactor agreement (Tehran declaration) signed by Brazil, Turkey and the Islamic Republic of Iran. He maintained that the Islamic Republic of Iran had expressed its willingness to negotiate with the international community and to cooperate with IAEA. He hoped that all parties would seize the opportunity to resume talks and to carry out diplomatic efforts, especially outside the Council, to find a peaceful solution.⁸⁷⁵ The representative of the Russian Federation emphasized that strict compliance with the Council's measures required Member States to refrain from taking additional restrictive steps not covered under the relevant resolutions, especially those of an extraterritorial nature. He expressed concern over the prevention by third-party States of the delivery of supplies to the Islamic Republic of Iran, under the pretext that the supplies were not in compliance with the domestic norms of those States.⁸⁷⁶

On 15 September 2010, the representative of the United States stated that the Director General of IAEA had reported to the Council that the Islamic Republic of Iran was continuing and expanding its proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities in violation of its international obligations. She noted that its recent actions reminded the Council of the urgent need to redouble its efforts to implement the United Nations sanctions, particularly those new measures adopted in resolution 1929 (2010).⁸⁷⁷ The representative of the United Kingdom expressed his Government's concern about the Iranian nuclear programme as well as the serial violation of the resolutions of the Council by the Islamic Republic of Iran, which was why his country supported resolution 1929 (2010), which introduced further sanctions. He specifically highlighted his Government's concerns over the engagement of the Islamic Republic of Iran in activities related to ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons, and stated that the Council and the Committee would need to consider an appropriate response.⁸⁷⁸

⁸⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁸⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁸⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁸⁷⁷ *S/PV.6384*, pp. 3-4.

⁸⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

On 10 December 2010, the Council heard a briefing by the Chairman of the Committee, who reported on the appointment of the Panel of Experts established under paragraph 29 of resolution 1929 (2010). Following the briefing, speakers welcomed its establishment.⁸⁷⁹ The representative of the United States noted that not much had changed since the adoption of resolution 1929 (2010), as the Islamic Republic of Iran persisted in its non-compliance with IAEA and Council resolutions, as well as its defiance of the international community. She commended Nigeria and Italy on their seizures of illegal arms shipments, and reiterated her country's commitment to the dual-track strategy, with the aim of continuing a phased confidence-building process between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the international community.⁸⁸⁰ The representative of China, hoping that IAEA could play a constructive role in finding an appropriate solution to the Iranian nuclear issue, emphasized that the sanctions were not an end in themselves and could not fundamentally resolve any issue. He pointed out that a new opportunity to restart the dialogue on the Iranian nuclear issue existed, and highlighted the positive and useful dialogue that the European Union and six countries had just carried out in Geneva.⁸⁸¹

On 22 March 2011, the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom expressed concern about the nuclear activities of the Islamic Republic of Iran, including its continuation of enrichment and its lack of cooperation with IAEA, as conveyed in the Agency's latest report.⁸⁸² Many speakers also expressed disappointment with the lack of progress in the discussions held in Istanbul between the five plus one group and the Islamic Republic of Iran.⁸⁸³ While several speakers stressed the right of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, some also called for it to abide by its international obligations.

On 23 June 2011, several speakers expressed concern over the announcements by the Islamic

⁸⁷⁹ *S/PV.6442*, p. 4 (United Kingdom); p. 5 (China); pp. 5-6 (France); pp. 6-7 (Russian Federation); and pp. 7-8 (United States).

⁸⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

⁸⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁸⁸² *S/PV.6502*, p. 3 (United States); and p. 5 (United Kingdom).

⁸⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (United States); p. 6 (Germany); p. 8 (Portugal); p. 8 (Brazil); and pp. 10-11 (France).

Republic of Iran of its intention to significantly boost its uranium enrichment activities and of the successful launch of a satellite into orbit. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the Panel of Experts' recent report made it clear that the Islamic Republic of Iran continued to violate the Council's sanctions. In addition, he noted that IAEA had reported that it was unable to confirm that all nuclear material was being used for peaceful purposes and had concluded that the Islamic Republic of Iran had once again failed to comply with its obligations.⁸⁸⁴ The representative of Germany argued that, given the Islamic Republic of Iran's unwillingness to talk about its nuclear programme, there was no choice other than following up on the pressure track of the dual-track strategy to move it back to the negotiation table.⁸⁸⁵ The representative of France noted that the need to take additional measures would be determined on the basis of the conduct of the Islamic Republic of Iran.⁸⁸⁶ The representatives of China, Portugal and Brazil emphasized that the prompt resumption of dialogue was the only way to reach an adequate and lasting settlement that would meet the common interests of all parties.⁸⁸⁷

On 7 September 2011, most speakers expressed concern over the lack of progress towards a negotiated settlement regarding the transparency of the nuclear activities of the Islamic Republic of Iran, as indicated in the latest report of IAEA. Furthermore, many speakers expressed concern that the final report of the Panel of Experts had not yet been posted on the Committee's website.⁸⁸⁸ The representative of the United States stated that her Government strongly believed that this report should be made available to all States as soon as possible, as it highlighted information and best practices that could help States carry out their

obligations. Failure to circulate these documents contravened the Committee's commitment to transparency and undermined the entire purpose behind having a Panel of Experts.⁸⁸⁹

On 21 December 2011, speakers continued to express concern about the non-publication of the final report of the Panel of Experts on the Islamic Republic of Iran. The representative of the United States stated that her Government remained seriously concerned that the report had yet to be released to the wider United Nations membership owing to the continued objections of some members of the Council. She also drew the Council's attention to the recently released report by the Director General of IAEA, which concluded that the Islamic Republic of Iran remained in non-compliance with its international nuclear obligations and added to the evidence that it was misleading the international community about its nuclear activities. She highlighted the Islamic Republic of Iran's self-proclaimed intention to start enrichment at the underground Qom facility. Stressing that the behaviour of the Islamic Republic of Iran plainly belied the purported peaceful nature of its nuclear programme, she called for the Council to redouble its efforts to implement sanctions that had already been imposed.⁸⁹⁰

The representative of South Africa stated that a renewed dedication by the Islamic Republic of Iran to intensify cooperation with IAEA, without preconditions, was of the utmost importance.⁸⁹¹ Many speakers expressed their support for the sanctions regime,⁸⁹² and, in particular, the representative of the United Kingdom said that sanctions were a key tool to convince the Islamic Republic of Iran to engage seriously in response to the offers on the table.⁸⁹³

⁸⁸⁴ [S/PV.6563](#), p. 3.

⁸⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8 (Germany).

⁸⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (France).

⁸⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (China); pp. 8-9 (Portugal); and pp. 10-11 (Brazil).

⁸⁸⁸ [S/PV.6607](#), p. 3 (United States); p. 5 (France); p. 6 (Germany); p. 11 (Gabon); and p. 12 (United Kingdom).

⁸⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁸⁹⁰ [S/PV.6697](#), p. 3.

⁸⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁸⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 3 (United States); p. 8 (France); p. 10 (Germany); and p. 13 (Russian Federation).

⁸⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

Meetings: non-proliferation

<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Sub-item</i>	<i>Other documents</i>	<i>Rule 37 invitations</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Decision and vote (for-against-abstaining)</i>
6280 4 March 2010	Briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006)			Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) (Japan), 5 Council members (China, France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States)	
6334 (closed) 8 June 2010			44 Member States	All Council members and all invitees	
6335 9 June 2010		Draft resolution submitted by France, Germany, United Kingdom, United States (S/2010/283)	Germany, Islamic Republic of Iran	14 Council members, ^a Islamic Republic of Iran	Resolution 1929 (2010) 12-2-1 ^b
6344 28 June 2010	Briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006)			Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) (Japan), 5 Council members (China, France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States)	
6384 15 September 2010	Briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006)			Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) (Japan), 5 Council members (China, France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States)	
6442 10 December 2010	Briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006)			Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) (Japan), 5 Council members (China, France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States)	

**Part I. Consideration of questions under the responsibility of
the Security Council for the maintenance of
international peace and security**

<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Sub-item</i>	<i>Other documents</i>	<i>Rule 37 invitations</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Decision and vote (for-against-abstaining)</i>
6502 22 March 2011	Briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006)			Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) (Colombia), 14 Council members ^c	
6552 9 June 2011		Draft resolution submitted by France, Germany, United Kingdom, United States (S/2011/348)		7 Council members (China, France, Germany, Lebanon, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States)	Resolution 1984 (2011) 14-0-1 ^d
6563 23 June 2011	Briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006)			Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) (Colombia), all Council members	
6607 7 September 2011	Briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006)			Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) (Colombia), all Council members	
6697 21 December 2011	Briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006)			Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) (Colombia), all Council members	

^a Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China, France, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom and United States.

^b *For*: Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, France, Gabon, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States; *against*: Brazil, Turkey; *abstaining*: Lebanon.

^c Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Gabon, Germany, India, Lebanon, Nigeria, Portugal, Russian Federation, South Africa, United Kingdom and United States.

^d *For*: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Gabon, Germany, India, Nigeria, Portugal, Russian Federation, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States; *abstaining*: Lebanon.