



NMUN · DC



INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY BACKGROUND GUIDE 2012

Written By: Cyril Philip, Director; Lauren Shaw, Assistant Director



NMUN · DC

nmun.org/nmun_dc.html

Message from the Secretary-General Regarding Position Papers for the 2012 NMUN-DC Conference

At the 2012 NMUN-DC Conference, each delegation submits one position paper for each committee assignment. Delegates should be aware that their role in each committee impacts the way a position paper should be written. While most delegates will serve as representatives of Member States, some may also serve as observers or NGOs. To understand these fine differences, please refer to the Delegate Preparation Guide.

Position papers should provide a concise review of each delegation's policy regarding the topic areas under discussion and establish precise policies and recommendations in regard to the topics before the committee. International and regional conventions, treaties, declarations, resolutions, and programs of action of relevance to the policy of your State should be identified and addressed. Making recommendations for action by your committee should also be considered. Position papers also serve as a blueprint for individual delegates to remember their country's position throughout the course of the Conference. NGO position papers should be constructed in the same fashion as position papers of countries. Each topic should be addressed briefly in a succinct policy statement representing the relevant views of your assigned NGO. You should also include recommendations for action to be taken by your committee. It will be judged using the same criteria as all country position papers, and is held to the same standard of timeliness.

Please be forewarned, delegates must turn in material that is entirely original. NMUN/NCCA will not tolerate the occurrence of plagiarism. In this regard, the NMUN Secretariat would like to take this opportunity to remind delegates that although United Nations documentation is considered within the public domain, the Conference does not allow the verbatim re-creation of these documents. This plagiarism policy also extends to the written work of the Secretariat contained within the Committee Background Guides. Violation of this policy will be immediately reported to faculty advisors and may result in dismissal from Conference participation. Delegates should report any incidents of plagiarism to the Secretariat.

Delegation's position papers can be awarded as recognition of outstanding pre-Conference preparation. In order to be considered for a Position Paper Award, delegations must have met the formal requirements listed below. Please refer to the sample position paper below this message for a visual example of what your work should look like at its completion. All papers must be typed and formatted in the same manner as this example. The following format specifications are required for all papers:

- Length must not exceed two single-sided pages
- Margins must be set at 1 inch for the whole paper
- Font must be Times New Roman sized between 10 pt. and 12 pt.
- Country/NGO name, school name, and committee name must be clearly labeled on the first page
- Agenda topics must be clearly labeled in separate sections
- National symbols (headers, flags, etc.) are deemed inappropriate for NMUN position papers

To be considered for awards, position papers need to be submitted by e-mail in .pdf or .doc formats by 1 October 2012. As proof of submission, include yourself as an e-mail recipient. Please use the committee name, your assignment, and delegation/school name in both the e-mail subject line and in the filename (example: GA1st_Cuba_Mars College).

1. Send one complete set of all position papers for each of your country/NGO assignments to the Secretary-General at secgen.dc@nmun.org.
2. Send a copy of your position paper for each assigned committee to the corresponding committee e-mail address listed below. Please note, the e-mail addresses will be active on 4 September 2012.

Committee	E-mail Address (after 4 Sept.)
General Assembly First Committee (GA1st)	ga1st.dc@nmun.org
Security Council (SC)	sc.dc@nmun.org
Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)	ecosoc.dc@nmun.org
Human Rights Council (HRC)	hrc.dc@nmun.org
International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)	iaea.dc@nmun.org
World Health Organization (WHO)	who.dc@nmun.org

Once the formal requirements outlined above are met, Conference staff use the following criteria to evaluate Position Papers:

- Overall quality of writing, proper style, grammar, etc.
- Citation of relevant resolutions/documents
- General consistency with bloc/geopolitical constraints
- Consistency with the constraints of the United Nations
- Analysis of issues, rather than reiteration of the Committee Background Guide
- Outline of official policy aims within the committee's mandate

Should you have any questions please feel free to contact the Conference staff.

Sincerely,

Michael Aguilar
Secretary-General
NMUN-DC

Sample Position Paper

The following position paper is designed to be a sample of the standard format that an NMUN position paper should follow. Papers may be no longer than two single-sided pages. Only the first two pages of any submissions will be considered for awards.

Delegation from
Canada

Represented by
University of Jupiter

Position Paper for General Assembly Plenary

The topics before the General Assembly Plenary are: Breaking the Link between Diamonds and Armed Conflict; the Promotion of Alternative Sources of Energy; and the Implementation of the 2001-2010 International Decade to Roll Back Malaria in Developing Countries, Particularly in Africa. Canada is dedicated to collaborative multilateral approaches to ensuring protection and promotion of human security and advancement of sustainable development.

I. Breaking the Link between Diamonds and Armed Conflict

Canada endorses the Kimberly Process in promoting accountability, transparency, and effective governmental regulation of trade in rough diamonds. We believe the Kimberly Process Certification Scheme (KPCS) is an essential international regulatory mechanism and encourage all Member States to contribute to market accountability by seeking membership, participation, and compliance with its mandate. Canada urges Member States to follow the recommendations of the 2007 Kimberley Process Communiqué to strengthen government oversight of rough diamond trading and manufacturing by developing domestic legal frameworks similar to the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative. We call upon participating States to act in accordance with the KPCS's comprehensive and credible systems of peer review to monitor the continued implementation of the Kimberley Process and ensure full transparency and self-examination of domestic diamond industries. We draw attention to our domestic programs for diamond regulation including Implementing the Export and Import of Rough Diamonds Act and urge Member States to consider these programs in developing the type of domestic regulatory frameworks called for in A/RES/55/56. Canada recognizes the crucial role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the review of rough diamond control measures developed through the Kimberly Process and encourages States to include NGOs, such as Global Witness and Partnership Africa Canada, in the review processes called for in A/RES/58/290. We urge Member States to act in accordance with A/RES/60/182 to optimize the beneficial development impact of artisanal and alluvial diamond miners by establishing a coordinating mechanism for financial and technical assistance through the Working Group of the Kimberly Process of Artisanal Alluvial Producers. Canada calls upon States and NGOs to provide basic educational material regarding diamond valuation and market prices for artisanal diggers, as recommended by the Diamond Development Initiative. Canada will continue to adhere to the 2007 Brussels Declaration on Internal Controls of Participants and is dedicated to ensuring accountability, transparency, and effective regulation of the rough diamond trade through the utilization of voluntary peer review systems and the promotion of increased measures of internal control within all diamond producing States.

II. The Promotion of Alternative Sources of Energy

Canada is dedicated to integrating alternative energy sources into climate change frameworks by diversifying the energy market while improving competitiveness in a sustainable economy, as exemplified through our Turning Corners Report and Project Green climate strategies. We view the international commitment to the promotion of alternative sources of energy called for in the Kyoto Protocol and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Control (UNFCCC) as a catalyst to sustainable development and emission reduction. Canada fulfills its obligations to Article 4 of the UNFCCC by continuing to provide development assistance through the Climate Change Development Fund and calls upon Member States to commit substantial financial and technical investment toward the transfer of sustainable energy technologies and clean energy mechanisms to developing States. We emphasize the need for Member States to follow the recommendations of the 2005 Beijing International Renewable Energy Conference to strengthen domestic policy frameworks to promote clean energy technologies. Canada views dissemination of technology information called for in the 2007 Group of Eight Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy Declaration as a vital step in energy diversification from conventional energy generation. We call

upon Member States to integrate clean electricity from renewable sources into their domestic energy sector by employing investment campaigns similar to our \$1.48 billion initiative ecoENERGY for Renewable Power. Canada encourages States to develop domestic policies of energy efficiency, utilizing regulatory and financing frameworks to accelerate the deployment of clean low-emitting technologies. We call upon Member States to provide knowledge-based advisory services for expanding access to energy in order to fulfill their commitments to Goal 1 of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Canada urges States to address the concerns of the 2007 Human Development Report by promoting tax incentives, similar to the Capital Cost Allowances and Canadian Renewable and Conservation Expenses, to encourage private sector development of energy conservation and renewable energy projects. As a member of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Partnership, Canada is committed to accelerating the development of renewable energy projects, information sharing mechanisms, and energy efficient systems through the voluntary carbon offset system. We are dedicated to leading international efforts toward the development and sharing of best practices on clean energy technologies and highlight our release of the Renewable Energy Technologies Screen software for public and private stakeholders developing projects in energy efficiency, cogeneration, and renewable energy. Canada believes the integration of clean energy into State specific strategies called for in A/62/419/Add.9 will strengthen energy diversification, promote the use of cogeneration, and achieve a synergy between promoting alternative energy while allowing for competitiveness in a sustainable economy.

III. Implementation of the 2001-2010 International Decade to Roll Back Malaria in Developing Countries, Particularly in Africa

Canada views the full implementation of the treatment and prevention targets of the 2001-2010 International Decade to Roll Back Malaria in Developing Countries, Especially in Africa, as essential to eradicating malaria and assisting African States to achieve Target 8 of Goal 6 of the MDGs by 2015. We recommend Member States cooperate with the World Health Organization to ensure transparency in the collection of statistical information for Indicators 21 and 22 of the MDGs. Canada reaffirms the targets of the Abuja Declaration Plan of Action stressing regional cooperation in the implementation, monitoring, and management of malaria prevention and treatment initiatives in Africa. To fully implement A/RES/61/228, Canada believes developed States must balance trade and intellectual property obligations with the humanitarian objective of the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health. We continue to implement Paragraph 6 of the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health into our compulsory licensing framework through the Jean Chrétien Pledge to Africa Act. We urge Member States to support compulsory licensing for essential generic medicines by including anti-malarial vaccines and initiating domestic provisions to permit export-only compulsory licenses to domestic pharmaceutical manufacturers, similar to Canada's Access to Medicines Regime. Canada calls upon Member States to establish advanced market commitments on the distribution of pneumococcal vaccines to developing States in cooperation with PATH and the Malaria Vaccine Initiative. We emphasize the need for greater membership in the Roll Back Malaria initiative to strengthen malaria control planning, funding, implementation, and evaluation by promoting increased investment in healthcare systems and greater incorporation of malaria control into all relevant multi-sector activities. Canada continues to implement the Canadian International Development Agency's (CIDA) New Agenda for Action on Health to reduce malaria infection rates among marginalized populations in Africa, increase routine immunizations rates, and reduce infection rates of other neglected infections. Canada will achieve the goal of doubling aid to Africa by 2008-2009 by providing assistance to the Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. We urge Member States to increase donations to intergovernmental organizations and NGOs that support malaria programming in Africa, exemplified by CIDA's contribution of \$26 million to the Canadian Red Cross. We continue our efforts to provide accessible and affordable vector control methods to African States through the Red Cross' Malaria Bed Net Campaign and the African Medical Research Foundation Canada by supplying insecticide-treated mosquito nets and Participatory Malaria Prevention and Treatment tool kits.

Official Welcome

On behalf of the 2012 National Model United Nations Washington D.C. (NMUN-DC) Conference and your committee staff, Cyril Philip and Lauren Shaw, we would like to welcome you to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Cyril has been involved with NMUN as a staff member for eight years and currently works in the finance industry. Lauren has a BA in Political Science and is currently pursuing a Master's in Public Policy; she has been involved with NMUN for six years.

We have worked together throughout the year to prepare for this conference, and aim to provide a greater appreciation of international relations specifically focused on nuclear issues through this committee. In the world today, the IAEA continues to play an essential role in ensuring the safety and non-proliferation of nuclear technology. We have designed our background guide to be a launch pad for further research on the topics.

During the conference, we will discuss and debate pressing issues, concerns, and situations that stand before us as IAEA Member States. The IAEA has consistently been in the news over the past year for a variety of reasons including the Fukushima reactor meltdown and recent tensions regarding Iran's nuclear program and we have tailored our topics around these. We are excited to be a part of your learning experience here at NMUN-DC and look forward to working with all of you.

History of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

In 1957, Atoms For Peace, the predecessor to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), was established as an independent organization within the United Nations (UN) structure to address common concerns about nuclear security, as well as to promote the peaceful use of nuclear technology. The IAEA Special Agreement establishes the organization's relationship with the UN, including submitting annual reports to the General Assembly and making referrals to the Security Council when the Board of Governors identifies an issue relating to international security. Although a part of the UN system, UN Member States are not automatically members of the IAEA; instead, countries sign bilateral agreements with the agency that establish safeguards and inspections standards for the state's nuclear facilities. In addition to this statutory work, the IAEA provides resources to support nuclear programs and conducts research and development to further nuclear technology. Most of the focus in providing resources is based on promoting the three pillars of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty: disarmament, non-proliferation, and the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear technology.

The IAEA has two major bodies. The General Conference is comprised of all 151 Member States. It meets annually and considers the budget, major programs, and structural changes. The Board of Governors is comprised of 35 Member States elected by the General Conference. It meets five times each year to approve safeguards agreements and the published safety standards, as well as to consider security threats that may require referral to the Security Council. Typically, such a referral occurs when a country has violated their safeguards agreement or refused access to IAEA inspectors, indicating that the country is pursuing a nuclear weapons program. The year-round work of the IAEA is performed by the Secretariat in six major departments of management: nuclear sciences and applications, nuclear energy, nuclear safety and security, technical cooperation, and safeguards and verification. The Regular Budget, which in 2012 consisted of \$417.8 million paid in dues by Member States, funds the majority of programming. Dues are paid based on an assessment scheme that is approved of annually by the General Conference. Assistance for nuclear programs in developing states is funded by voluntary contributions to the Technical Cooperation Fund, targeted at \$88 million in 2012.

The IAEA maintains an active relationship with Member States via safeguards and technical assistance programs. The IAEA, contingent upon a bilateral safeguards agreement with a country, performs safety inspections of nuclear facilities that serve to maintain best practice standards, as well as to guard against possible weapons proliferation. The IAEA also has several programs focused on researching and promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear technology, including its Programme of Action for Cancer Therapy and the Water Resources Programme, monitoring and providing support for the cleanup of the Fukushima site, and pursuing research in radiation technology. As nuclear technology becomes more prevalent through its increased medical functions and potential applications in renewable energy, the role of the IAEA in maintaining safety standards is only likely to grow. Therefore, the continued presence and strength of the IAEA and full participation of Member States remains essential.

I. Monitoring and Strengthening Regional Partnerships

- What is the best course of action to ensure that existing partnerships stay strong going forward as countries grow and develop?
- Should regional groups have a distinct forum amongst themselves or within their areas maintaining bilateral and unilateral programs? Will such forums be valuable?
- Should the current scope of regional partnerships be extended towards enforcement and mediation of nuclear issues rather than just the status quo of knowledge sharing?

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has built several regional partnerships, which focus on a variety of key issues including science/knowledge sharing and non-proliferation. These two areas are essential in order to progress the mission of the IAEA since they are part of the mandate of the organization. Regional partnerships have also helped to strengthen and provide an avenue for expansion of membership and acceptance of the IAEA. The IAEA started regional partnerships with the goal of uniting regional blocks for knowledge sharing initiatives. There is no authority in terms of enforcing rulings or mandates; those matters have been left to bilateral agreements and economic sanctions, as in the current situation with Iran. The regional partnerships founded by the IAEA focusing on education, science, and knowledge sharing are the Asian Network for Education in Nuclear Technology (ANENT), the African Network for Education in Nuclear Science and Technology (AFRA-NEST), and the Latin American Network for Education in Nuclear Technology (LANENT). These three organizations focus on sharing educational resources within regions, providing a forum for policy and strategy regarding nuclear education, and training and leveraging best practices across regions. Overall, Member States have been generally open to engaging in implementation of such knowledge sharing practices. Additionally, membership continues to grow in these regional bodies. For example both Jordan and Japan joined the regional ANENT group in 2012, becoming its 17th and 18th members respectively. However despite eagerness in some areas, these partnerships are very limited.

Beyond the knowledge base partnerships, there are four main regional partnerships focusing on the sharing of nuclear technology: 1) African Regional Cooperative Agreement for Research, Development and Training Related to Nuclear Science and Technology (AFRA); 2) Regional Cooperation Agreement for the Promotion of Nuclear Science and Technology in Latin America and the Caribbean (ARCAL); 3) Regional Cooperative Agreement for Research, Development and Training Related to Nuclear Science and Technology for Asia and the Pacific (RCA); and 4) Cooperative Agreement for Arab States in Asia for Research, Development and Training related to Nuclear Science and Technology (ARASIA). All of these agencies tie socioeconomic development within their respective regions towards peaceful uses of nuclear technology despite differences in socioeconomic status. One example of this important linkage of work done by these partnerships is the recent regional training course held in Amman, Jordan, by ARASIA on May 27, 2012, which covers the basics of starting a nuclear power program correctly and included lectures and exercises for Member States of ARASIA.

However, beyond the knowledge sharing initiatives and the sharing of technology, regional partnerships have little power in the IAEA. Most enforcement and inspection responsibilities fall on the IAEA or through bilateral agreements or sanctions. The IAEA relies almost entirely on external bilateral agreements for enforcement, such as embargoes or trade sanctions. These external agreements can be from a Member State or regional bodies. The IAEA can interact directly with regional bodies for furthering the agencies goals. For example, the IAEA coordinates with the Arab League and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) regarding the situation in Iran. Yet, ANENT and ARASIA have not played any significant role in the current issues with Iran and Israel. Though it is currently beyond their scope or power to mandate in that realm, they may still be able to provide some value or the situation at least calls into question their mandates. Regional IAEA partnerships have not played an active role in the past in ensuring peaceful use of nuclear technology; rather they have played a more passive role by providing information as needed while relying on other regional bodies such as NATO for enforcement of IAEA goals. The limitations of the regional partnerships as they stand are currently just one of the items of contention among many Member States, as some would have them be strengthened while others look to diminish or eliminate their role.

In conclusion, regional IAEA partnerships have been less important while other regional military alliances have played the key roles in conflict management. Yet, the importance of knowledge sharing is glaringly critical towards development and best practices. Furthermore, regional partnerships may benefit by playing a more active role in areas of contention. Regional partnerships have the ability to establish requirements towards nuclear safety protocols for their Member States while also retaining credibility and respect. This also means that they can play a

more direct role in conflict areas, such as by ensuring proper inspection of Iran's nuclear sites. The ability to reform the regional partnerships, therefore, is an important aspect of the IAEA especially in ensuring a continued local presence of the IAEA around the world.

II. Nuclear Disaster Prevention: Making Nuclear Power Safer

- Do the benefits of nuclear energy outweigh the possibility of a nuclear disaster? Should Member States continue to build and operate nuclear energy plants even if they cannot guarantee lifetime safety standards?
- Should International Atomic Energy Agency funding for nuclear program assistance be restricted to Member States who agree to a more rigorous safeguards regime?
- Should the IAEA provide an international licensing program to fully standardize reactor designs and training minimums or is it the sovereign responsibility of Member States to ensure safe standards are met?

As more countries continue to develop nuclear technology programs, world dependence on nuclear power plants for energy grows. Currently there are 436 nuclear reactors operating for energy purposes in 30 countries, with an additional 66 plants under construction. In 2010, 13.5% of global energy production occurred in nuclear power plants. Although not all countries use nuclear technology for energy production, the potential environmental problems resulting from a nuclear crisis make disaster prevention an inherently global issue. There is new concern and focus on nuclear energy programs since the 2011 disaster at the Fukushima power plant in Japan, with many countries now reconsidering their domestic nuclear energy policies. For example, Germany has announced that it will fully phase out the use of nuclear energy by 2022. While discontinuation is one option, the IAEA is considering all different methods of making nuclear power safer. To do this it must focus on the issues of aging nuclear power plants, best practice sharing, negative health impacts from radiation, and waste management systems.

Many countries that rely heavily on nuclear power, including many countries in Europe such as Germany, generate this power in reactors that have been in operation for many years. While facilities can be updated over time to ensure safety standards are met and to incorporate new technologies, the global aging of nuclear power plants increases the risk of a disaster. Although there is no global standard for the lifespan of a nuclear power plant, most plants were designed to have operating lives of 30-40 years, with a possible extension to 60 years with exceptional maintenance and upgrades. Therefore, the issue cannot be put off any longer and must be addressed in the very near future. In particular, countries that invested early in nuclear energy technology must consider how long they can continue to upgrade and operate older plants before they must be decommissioned to ensure safety.

While the process of upgrading and decommissioning plants is the primary focus of the developed world, many developing countries are more concerned with promoting research and development to improve the safety of the plants under construction. The three major nuclear disasters—Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and Fukushima—all occurred due to operational systems errors, including design deficiencies and back-up system failures, indicating that the events could have been prevented with better planning and construction. While most countries with older nuclear energy programs developed their reactors independently, resulting in a variety of designs, many contemporary reactors are produced by private companies and follow the same plans. This commonality increases possibilities for countries to cooperate to share best-practice standards and to improve safety, as well as to provide any necessary assistance in the event of a disaster. The IAEA has initiated a database, the Safety Knowledge Base on Aging and Long-term Operation, to improve information sharing about reactor designs and upgrades. However, providing Member States with this knowledge does not resolve issues of capacity or build political will to share or implement such information.

The implementation of best-practice standards is critical in reducing the probability of future nuclear crises. Although the major disasters of the past have occurred due to systems errors, the possibility of human error must also be considered. An analysis of small-scale commercial nuclear power errors within the United States attributed 81% of incidents to human error. To prevent future disasters, Member States must consider how to recruit and train individuals who can operate power plants safely. While human casualties in past incidents have been low, there is a very real danger involved in nuclear power errors. Everyone is naturally exposed to some degree of radiation every day and these low, natural levels are not harmful to human health. However, past instances of extreme radiation exposure, particularly caused by the previously mentioned major nuclear disasters, has resulted in death due to acute radiation syndrome and high instances of cancer among survivors.

The IAEA and countries with nuclear programs must also consider safe methods of waste management. Even if all construction of new nuclear facilities stopped and currently operating facilities shut down, the waste already produced by nuclear energy generation will remain highly radioactive for several years. Further, continued production of nuclear energy creates even more waste. Standards for waste management are critical in ensuring long-term safety from nuclear energy disasters. While some countries will discontinue their nuclear energy programs, other countries will likely continue to use them, and even more will continue to invest in their own nuclear technology. It is critical for the IAEA to consider providing and enforcing universal safety standards to prevent future nuclear crises, rather than continuing to provide such standards on a case-by-case basis. By addressing the safety concerns of nuclear energy proactively, the IAEA may be able to help prevent a fourth nuclear energy catastrophe.

III. The Situation in Iran

- What, if any, further action should the International Atomic Energy Agency take on its own to assuage the threatening Iranian nuclear program? Are Iran's nuclear ambitions a true threat or can they possibly stabilize the region?
- Should the International Atomic Energy Agency rely on external action such as sanctions and military strikes by Member States in order to gain compliance from Iran? What role should the International Atomic Energy Agency play if this does occur?
- Would bilateral discussions relieve tensions between western powers such as the United States and the European Union towards Iran? Are there any alternatives to such talks?

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has played a strong role in attempting to reign in the potential weaponization of nuclear technology in Iran over the past few years. This has been a focal point of the organization and continues to involve parties across the world. Many countries and regional organizations including the United States (US) and the European Union believe strong sanctions against Iran may be the only deterrent towards its development of weaponized nuclear technology. Other countries, such as Israel, have opted towards subterfuge using other more clandestine methods, which could produce a wider conflict. The situation in Iran, therefore, is a critical issue that needs to be addressed.

Iran originally started its nuclear program with the assistance of the Atoms for Peace program (predecessor to the IAEA). After the Iranian Revolution of 1979, the program was run independently of the IAEA and other Member States, and Iran was able to create several nuclear power reactors. However, through IAEA investigations, it was revealed that the country had started to develop weaponized nuclear technology in the early part of the 21st century. The major opposition to Iran's suspected nuclear weapons program has come from the US and other western countries (including Israel). They consider a nuclear power in the region to be a major threat to their political and economic interests. These concerns have only grown as several Middle Eastern countries such as Egypt, Libya, and others continue to have regime changes as a result of the Arab Spring. However, there are certain Member States that view a nuclear Iran as a positive and not as significant a threat as perceived by western countries.

The situation has currently escalated into a major focus point for the IAEA due to recent events over the past two years. On February 22, 2012, a senior IAEA expert team returned from Iran having been denied access to the military site at Parchin during a check for suspected development of a nuclear weapon. No documents or agreements were created as a result of that inspection and, as such, the Director General decided to pursue a resolution to the situation. Iran has declared 15 nuclear facilities under its "Safeguards Agreement"; yet, according to the latest report to the Director General, several locations are suspected of nuclear enrichment and illegal activities and there are also still many nuclear sites that need to be verified by Iran to the IAEA. On May 20, 2012, the Director General of the IAEA, Yukiya Amano, visited Tehran to assess the situation. He visited with the Secretary of the Supreme National Security Council, Saeed Jalili, and other government representatives. The last time a Director General of the IAEA visited Iran was in 2009, signifying that this was a major event and that the issued had escalated. The end result was an expectation of a cooperation framework to allow the re-admittance of IAEA inspectors into Iran. On June 8, 2012, the IAEA and the Iranian delegation met in Vienna to work on this cooperative framework. However, this yielded no progress and no future dates were set to re-start negotiations. As of July 2012, the situation is at a standstill. However while little progress is made through the IAEA, other Member States continue to contemplate independent action. As inaction increases, silent bilateral action by Member States with a vested interest continues as evidenced by recent assassinations in Iran of nuclear scientists and suspected cyber-attacks. Therefore, this

continues to be a pressing issue for the organization and must be addressed promptly before the situation escalates further or becomes permanently intractable.

Annotated Bibliography

History of the International Atomic Energy Agency

Arms Control Association. (2005). *NPT At A Glance*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/nptfact>.

The Arms Control Association provides a non-governmental organization's perspective on the major weapons treaties and implementation programs. This resource can be used to research non-IAEA nuclear safety programming. It can also provide external suggestions for improvements to safeguard agreements and nuclear facility security. By examining an outside source, delegates may find a more critical analysis of IAEA programming than what is provided by the agency.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2012). *IAEA Budget for 2012*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://www.iaea.org/About/budget.html>.

The IAEA's annual budget document breaks down the specific funding allocations out of the Regular Budget, including safeguards inspections and research and development. The document also includes the rationale for providing funding for specific projects. Delegates may also wish to examine the outlays of the Technical Cooperation Fund to understand the assistance provided by the IAEA to developing nuclear programs.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2012). *IAEA Primer*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Factsheets/English/iaea-primer.pdf>.

The IAEA Primer provides a succinct explanation of the IAEA's structure and the functions of the major bodies. It also elaborates upon the IAEA's relationship with Member States and the UN. The Primer is an excellent initial source that provides names of more in-depth IAEA sources. Delegates can use the Primer as a starting point for research into the IAEA and nuclear technology.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2012). *Our Work*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://iaea.org/OurWork/>.

This Web site provides a summary of the major projects and programs of the IAEA, which currently includes research into cancer-fighting radiation therapies and the ongoing cleanup at Fukushima. It includes links to program-specific Web sites, such as research and development and facility inspections. It also provides information on other international organizations that partner with the IAEA such as the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Programme.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (1959). *The Texts Of The Agency's Agreements With The UN*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Infocircs/Others/infocirc11.pdf>.

This document provides the full text of all of the IAEA's agreements with the UN. These agreements, including the Special Agreement that clarifies its status within the UN structure, are critical to understanding how the IAEA works with the UN on certain issues. This document is particularly helpful in understanding the relationship between the Board of Governors and the Security Council, which establishes the IAEA's response in case of a nuclear weapons threat.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.) *Statute of the IAEA*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: http://www.iaea.org/About/statute_text.html

The Statute is the IAEA's founding document and establishes its mandate and organizational structure. This includes the policy-making bodies and the Secretariat. The Statute also provides information about the process on how countries join the IAEA. Understanding the Statute and the structure of the IAEA will aid delegates in simulating the agency accurately.

United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs. (2012). *Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://www.un.org/disarmament/WMD/Nuclear/NPT.shtml>.

The UN Office for Disarmament Affairs provides information about all of the UN's efforts to implement various arms control treaties. It contains specific information about the membership status and non-proliferation efforts taken by many Member States. It also provides additional background information and statistics on nuclear weapons arsenals and any ongoing disarmament processes.

I. Monitoring and Strengthening Regional Partnerships

Asian Network for Education in Nuclear Technology. (n.d.). *Asian Network for Education in Nuclear Technology Web site*. Retrieved on May 1, 2012, from: <http://www.anent-iaea.org/>.

The Asian Network for Education in Nuclear Technology Web site provides key information regarding current projects within the region. This is one of the essential regional bodies as it incorporates the Middle East region and has had an increasing membership base compared to the other regional bodies. Delegates should be familiar with the body's current projects and how the mandate for such an organizational body can change or be adapted to the new global environment.

Cooperative Agreement for Arab States in Asia for Research, Development and Training related to Nuclear Science and Technology. (n.d.). *Cooperative Agreement for Arab States in Asia for Research, Development and Training related to Nuclear Science and Technology Web Site*. Retrieved on May 1, 2012, from:

<http://web.aec.org.sy/arasias/Home.aspx>.

The Cooperative Agreement for Arab States in Asia for Research, Development and Training related to Nuclear Science and Technology Web site provides links to current projects and courses held by the organization. It also provides in-depth information about goals and responsibilities of the organization of which some are knowledge sharing. Delegates should understand the agency's limitations and ways to improve upon this body as an example for the other regional partnerships.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.). *Guidelines and Operating rules for the ARASIA Programme*. Retrieved on May 1, 2012, from: http://web.aec.org.sy/arasias/Documents/guidelines_operatin_rules.pdf.

This is a great example of a fully functional cooperation agreement and can be used by delegates to delve into the structure of the agreements in their creation or adaption of the current system. ARASIA's agreement outlines specific co-operations for research projects and even delves into funding systems for regional cooperation. This source can help delegates understand how these agreements work in order to better understand the issue at hand and how it can be improved.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2012). *Regional/Cooperative Agreements*. Retrieved on May 1, 2012, from: <http://www.iaea.org/technicalcooperation/Regions/Reg-Coop-Agreements.html>.

This is a snapshot of the existing regional cooperation within the framework of the IAEA. The Web site provides links to all four major regional bodies that cover the world and can be used to determine what, if any, role is played by their specific delegation. It should also be used as a gateway to see where effective regional cooperation can be applied across regions or for cross-regional cooperation.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2012). *Nuclear Sciences and Applications: Collaborating Centres*. Retrieved on May 1, 2012, from: <http://www-naweb.iaea.org/na/collaborating-centres.html>.

Similar to the Regional Agreements, this Web site focuses primarily on collaboration of nuclear science technology in various regions. The areas of consideration are food safety, environmental issues, water resources, and human health. There are links to collaboration centers for all major geographic areas.

II. Nuclear Disaster Prevention: Making Nuclear Power Safer

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2012). *Department of Nuclear Energy*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/ST/NE/Main/index.html>.

This is the primary Web site for the IAEA's research and programs related to the production of nuclear energy. It provides links to several helpful background resources, such as statistics about nuclear energy usage and locations of reactors, as well as IAEA initiatives to promote nuclear safety technology cooperation. Understanding the current IAEA programs will assist delegates as they make recommendations for future actions.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2008). *Knowledge Management and Networking For Enhanced Safety*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://www.iaea.org/km/cnkm/papers/ledermaniaea.pdf>.

This paper outlines the initiative the IAEA has begun to promote best-practice networking between Member States. Understanding how such a database could be used will be helpful in recommending global safety standards. Delegates can also consider how countries can take advantage of regional partnerships to further promote safe nuclear energy.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2012). *Waste Technology*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/ST/NE/NEFW/Technical_Areas/WTS/home.html.

This Web site is the IAEA's introduction to the issue of nuclear waste management. It is an excellent resource for understanding the key problems with radioactive waste, including transportation and longevity. It also provides information about several IAEA programs that address waste management issues, as well as recommended best practices for countries, such as redundant cooling systems.

Nuclear Energy Institute. (2010). *Licensing New Nuclear Power Plants*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/factsheet/licensingnewnuclearpowerplants>.

As Member States design and construct new nuclear power facilities, it is important to consider the implementation of common standards to promote rigorous safety expectations. This source provides information about current reactor plans and their safety systems. It also elaborates on proposed licensing programs that can enforce safety standards.

Nuclear Energy Institute. (2012). *World Statistics*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/nuclear_statistics/worldstatistics/.

This collection of statistics provides a succinct listing of information about nuclear energy programs including the number of active and decommissioned reactors and any past incidents. It analyzes many common issues in nuclear energy safety, including proper training and power failure. It also provides country-specific information about nuclear energy programs.

United States Department of Energy. (2009). *Human Performance Handbook*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: http://www.hss.doe.gov/nuclearsafety/techstds/docs/handbook/doe-hdbk-1028-2009_volume1.pdf.

In this source, the Department of Energy provides its internal analysis of systems errors within energy provision in the US. The section about nuclear energy is a broad sample of reactor styles and ages and can be helpful in thinking about potential future problems with nuclear reactors. It also provides information about the common causes of systems errors, which are often attributable to mistakes made by workers.

World Nuclear Association. (2012). *Nuclear Radiation and Health Effects*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf05.html>.

Major nuclear disasters like Fukushima keep nuclear safety in the news, and for this reason it is important for Member States to consider the potential risks of radiation exposure, as well as methods to mitigate health hazards. This source is an excellent primer on the health risks of radiation. It also provides information about the levels of radiation exposure caused by previous nuclear disasters.

World Nuclear Association. (2012). *Safety of Nuclear Power Reactors*. Retrieved on May 24, 2012, from: <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/default.aspx?id=15612&terms=Safety%20of%20Nuclear%20Power%20Reactors>.

This collection of information provides a good starting point for research into nuclear power reactors, including a history of nuclear energy and analysis of past incidents at nuclear energy facilities. It provides a clear breakdown of the technical information related to nuclear energy. It also provides a list of several other sources delegates can use to expand their research.

III. The Situation in Iran

Borger, J. (2012). *IAEA Chief to Visit Iran for Nuclear Talks*. Guardian UK. Retrieved on May 25, 2012, from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/may/20/iaea-visit-iran-nuclear-talks>.

Borger provides a detailed review of the proposed action during the Director General's meeting in Tehran on May 20, 2012. This article provides deep context to the situation and also provides dates and information about future follow-up action as a result of this meeting. Delegates should aim to keep track of recent news articles up until the conference to ensure proper awareness of this continually changing story.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2012). *IAEA Statement After Iran Meeting*. Retrieved on June 16, 2012, from: <http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/pressreleases/2012/prn201216.html>.

After the IAEA meeting on June 8, 2012, the IAEA issued this statement. As shown by the statement, there is intended clear action as the meeting was set up in good faith but no resolution was then implemented. Delegates need to be aware of current events and keep a close eye as more news arises from this ever-escalating issue.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2012). *IAEA and Iran*. Retrieved on May 1, 2012, from: <http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/focus/iaeairan/index.shtml>.

This is the primary source of information regarding the IAEA and Iran. This Web site provides links to recent applicable news on the situation as well as key reports, resolutions, and communications on the situation in Iran. Delegates should regularly check this source until the conference as it is constantly updated with the most pertinent information relating to the issue.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2012). *Country Factsheets: Iran*. Retrieved on May 1, 2012, from: <http://ola.iaea.org/factSheets/CountryDetails.asp?country=IR>.

This factsheet provides key information regarding Iran's current nuclear status and potential capabilities. This Web site provides up-to-date information on the country's nuclear progress and information about its goals. This is a key resource for delegates who are not as familiar with the situation and want to understand it from Iran's point of view.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (2011). *Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement and Relevant Provisions of United Nations Security Council resolutions in the Islamic Republic of Iran*. Retrieved on May 1, 2012, from: <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Board/2011/gov2011-69.pdf>.

This resolution provides key information regarding the implementation of Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) safeguards in Iran. The resolution outlines the key concerns of the IAEA with respect to Iran, which includes inspections of suspected nuclear weapon sites, and this resolution helps delegates to understand the problems in the region. This is an important document for delegates who want to understand the current actions and opinions by the IAEA in order to ensure a resolution to the current situation.