

**Tenth Meeting of the CSCAP Study Group on
Countering the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Asia Pacific,
Hanoi, Vietnam December 7-8, 2009
Chairmen's Report
Draft (Jan. 22, 2010)**

The 10th meeting of the Council on Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) Study Group on Countering the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Asia Pacific was held in Hanoi, Vietnam Dec. 7-8, 2009. Over 50 participants from member committees or regional governments attended; an additional 20 members of the Pacific Forum CSIS Young Leaders program were present to contribute next-generation perspectives on these issues. USCSCAP extends sincere thanks to CSCAP Vietnam and the Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam for their excellent work organizing this meeting. The summary that follows represents the views of the chair; while it has been circulated to participants to ensure accuracy, it does not purport to be a consensus document.

The Study Group began with an assessment of *developments that have affected the global nonproliferation regime (GNR)* since the study group last met in June 2009. *Mark Fitzpatrick's (International Institute for Strategic Studies)* presentation began by suggesting that while US leadership is indispensable, it is not sufficient to resolve key issues in disarmament and nonproliferation. President Obama's winning of the Nobel Peace Prize underscores international support for disarmament, sustains the momentum created in Obama's Prague speech, and re-links disarmament with nonproliferation. Fitzpatrick was fairly sanguine about US-Russia negotiations on the follow-on to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START-1), reflecting his assessment that the two would retain key elements of the current treaty and be able to reach a settlement in the near future, thus sustaining the bilateral arms control process. He agreed that completing these negotiations would lay the foundation for progress on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Although the CTBT will not be included in the discussion at the 2010 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference (RevCon), he expected the US to continue pursuing ratification and was hopeful that US leadership would have a positive influence on the remaining eight countries that also must ratify the treaty before it enters into force. Fitzpatrick was less optimistic about the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT). Nevertheless, he did note that despite the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to resolve the differences that have precluded it from moving forward on its program of work, which includes drafting of the FMCT, the US has affirmed its commitment to a moratorium on fissile material production. He remains hopeful that the CD can move forward with its program of work in 2010.

Despite significant proliferation challenges including issues related to nuclear programs in North Korea, Myanmar, Syria, and Iran, and the inability to establish a Middle East nuclear weapon-free zone, Fitzpatrick felt that there have been several positive developments. These include the UN summit in September 2009 that was chaired for the time by a US president and produced UN Security Council Resolution 1887; the positive mood among key participants ahead of the 2010 RevCon as reflected in the agreement in 2009 on an agenda by the Preparatory Committee; the establishment of the African Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone;

and the fact that the major powers are in agreement on the need to respond to the major proliferation challenges. Key future events are the Global Nuclear Security Summit in April followed by the NPT RevCon at the end of April. In addition, Fitzpatrick anticipated that the release of the US Nuclear Posture Review would have an impact on progress on both the CTBT and FMCT.

Next, *Dilip Lahiri (CSCAP India)* offered his perspective on developments in the GNR. While he was encouraged by US support for disarmament, he felt that the timeline Obama was suggesting (i.e., not in his lifetime) was too long and that continued emphasis by the US on the deterrent value of nuclear weapons did not bode well for progress. This skepticism led him to suggest that this attempt by the US to re-link disarmament with nonproliferation might be a “tactical ploy” to ensure the success of the 2010 RevCon.

Lahiri also expressed skepticism about the likelihood of ratifying the CTBT and drafting an FMCT that would be acceptable to all parties. He argued that the focus of these treaties has shifted from disarmament to nonproliferation. Therefore, to promote ratification of the CTBT and proclaim a moratorium on fissile material production is tantamount to preventing development of programs by other countries, which would not be acceptable the nonnuclear weapons states (NNWS) interested in pursuing a nuclear weapon capability. Nevertheless, he did believe that if the US and China signed the CTBT, India and Pakistan would do so as well. However, India does not see a necessary link between the CTBT and disarmament. Lahiri also did not share Fitzpatrick’s optimism about the impact of a START follow-on treaty might have on the prospects for disarmament. Referring to the mindset behind START as “bean-counting,” he argued that this approach would simply promote further wrangling over numbers of weapons or delivery systems and not produce meaningful progress on disarmament. Instead, the focus should be on doctrinal issues such as adoption of “no first-use policies” and de-alerting. If the US is going to be serious about disarmament, these issues should be addressed in its Nuclear Posture Review. With this kind of “out of the box” thinking, Lahiri concluded it would much easier to include India in the disarmament equation and the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons would more likely be realized.

Discussion covered familiar ground, including the link between disarmament and nonproliferation, the prospects for a successful RevCon in 2010, and the anticipated report from the International Commission on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament (ICNND). Present throughout the discussion was the tension among the nuclear weapons states, nonnuclear weapons states, and states that have nuclear weapons and remain outside the NPT.

This tension was reflected in views about recent US efforts to re-link disarmament with nonproliferation and the feasibility of continuing in an incremental fashion rather than embracing a paradigmatic shift as suggested by Lahiri that moves from evaluating numbers of weapons to doctrinal and operational issues. One participant argued that the NWS have lost credibility in their commitment to disarmament and that the alternative is to break with past approaches and pursue a nuclear weapons convention and seek its ratification as soon as possible. The US was seen as the key actor because it has been most reliant on nuclear weapons in its international security posture. Regardless of the approach, the challenge for

the Obama administration is to gain support from Congress and policy elites on disarmament, while convincing its allies that it remains committed to extended deterrence and convincing the rest of the world that it is serious about disarmament. Therefore, the US Nuclear Posture Review is a critical juncture for the GNR. The 2010 RevCon will be the first test.

The suggestion that the disarmament debate should shift to doctrinal issues provoked intense discussion of a declaratory no first-use policy. While the idea of a no first-use policy sounded attractive, some insist it would do little to change attitudes toward nonproliferation and disarmament. Another participant suggested that a verification regime would be needed to make it more meaningful. One participant argued that no-first-use was an important Asian contribution to the disarmament movement; another participant dismissed the notion that it was an Asian concept. This led to a discussion about the influence of extended deterrence in the debate over no first-use. One participant noted that extended deterrence was a unique aspect of US nuclear policy and would remain a cornerstone of US policy; another suggested that extended deterrence was a major obstacle to any effort to promote disarmament. A participant familiar with the much-anticipated ICNND report indicated that it would address the issue of no first-use but avoid using the term because it has become politically sensitive. Instead the commission would recommend that each NWS declare that the sole purpose of maintaining nuclear weapons was to prevent the use by another country, commit to legally binding negative security assurances through UNSC resolutions, and commit to no increase in existing arsenals.

It was clear that the upcoming RevCon will be difficult and strong leadership is needed to avoid getting bogged down. There remains a great deal of skepticism and concern about the ability to sustain the current nuclear status quo amidst the increasing demand for more access to nuclear materials for the development of nuclear power facilities and the ongoing nuclear programs in Iran and North Korea.

The session closed with an acknowledgement that a strong commitment to disarmament and arms control by the US and Russia would change the picture, offer new opportunities for creating political will, and be critical if the momentum to “global zero” is going to be sustained. At the same time, there needs to be better enforcement of the nonproliferation regime, which can be achieved by strengthening the IAEA, improving the ability of states to deal with proliferators, and universalizing a criteria-based nondiscriminatory approach to nonproliferation.

Session two took up *recent developments on the Korean Peninsula and the Six-Party Talks* with presentations by representatives from three of the countries at the table. *Yang Yi (CSCAP China)* began his presentation by stating that China’s consistent goal was the denuclearization of North Korea and that China would spare no effort in achieving this goal. The visit to Pyongyang by Premier Wen Jiabao in the fall of 2009 was a very important and successful event because it demonstrated the importance of maintaining friendly relations and laid the foundation for sustainable cooperation. This was followed by other high-level bilateral interactions that promoted improved relations. Yang Yi highlighted Pyongyang’s new readiness to improve relations with its adversaries and a new willingness by the leadership in the US, South Korea, and Japan to engage North Korea as well. In that context,

the visit by former US President Bill Clinton was an important indication that North Korea is prepared to repair relations with countries involved in Korean Peninsula security issues.

Yang believes that the nuclear weapons tests by North Korea were done more for domestic than international reasons. For him, the DPRK sees nuclear weapons as a means of ensuring its security through stability and survival. Therefore, it is important for all countries involved in Korean security issues to respect the national security interests of other countries, including the DPRK. Further, given the DPRK's shift in attitude and its commitment to return to multilateral talks made during Wen's visit, it is important for all countries involved to honor their commitments to reinvigorate the Six-Party Talks and ensure progress on denuclearization. The visit to Pyongyang by US Special Envoy Stephen Bosworth represented an important step in realizing a return to the multilateral forum since bilateral talks were a DPRK precondition for its return to the Six-Party Talks. He concluded by suggesting that the best solution to the issue remains careful negotiations which will take time and a commitment by all to a peaceful solution.

In his presentation, *Cheon Sung-whun (Korea CSCAP)* began by saying that North Korea's missile launches and the second nuclear test in 2009 reflect its ongoing efforts to develop its capabilities while South Korea demonstrates restraint in responding to these provocations. The UN sanctions illustrate the international condemnation of these actions and should serve as a reminder for Pyongyang to refrain from such provocations. Cheon agreed with Yang that these actions were taken by the DPRK for domestic purposes, but that they were primarily intended to guarantee the transition to the third generation of the Kim regime and complete the *songun* (strong nation) program by 2012. Given these circumstances, Cheon insisted that the DPRK will not bargain away its missiles or nuclear capability regardless of the incentives offered. Therefore, it is time to seek new approaches beyond offering incentives to the DPRK to get them to abandon its efforts to build a nuclear deterrent. Instead, sanctions must be kept in place to ensure the DPRK does not continue its build-up and use it to threaten the ROK. He concluded by stating that the DPRK could never be accepted as a nuclear weapon state if the GNR is to be sustained.

Next, *So Ki-Sok (CSCAP DPRK)* offered his views of the situation in Korea. He began by insisting that the underlying cause of tension on the Peninsula was the unchanging hostile policy of the US against the DPRK. Despite the change in administrations in the US, nothing had changed as it continued to engage in "nuclear war exercises" on the Korean Peninsula. The provision of extended deterrence for Japan and South Korea was offered as evidence of its malign intent against the DPRK. By denying respect, sovereignty, and equality to the DPRK, he felt the US purpose was to eliminate the DPRK. Therefore, North Korea has taken it upon itself to maintain the nuclear balance in the region to prevent further deterioration in regional security. He offered several recommendations to ease tension:

- Remove antagonistic relations through confidence-building measures.
- Establish a bilateral dialogue between the US and North Korea to find a reasonable solution to current problems.

- Establish a peace accord between US and the DPRK since the current Armistice Agreement is “like waste paper” because of US betrayal.
- North-South relations should be improved through reconciliation, unity, and exchange in accordance with North-South declarations of June 15, 2000 and Oct. 4, 2007. In the spirit of national unity, ROK authorities must improve relations.
- Strengthen North-South cooperation and exchange in economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian matters. Tourism in Mt. Kungang and Kaesong should be resumed and both sides should look for mutual benefit and co-prosperity to develop the economy throughout the peninsula, using resources and technology jointly.

He concluded by suggesting that the U.S. should end the double standard evident in its nuclear policy as well as its human rights, and terrorism policies. The US should give up its supremacy in nuclear weapons and move toward universal dismantlement. If it wants a world free of nuclear weapons, it should dismantle its weapons first.

Several commentators noted that there had been several visitors to North Korea in recent months and agreed with Yang’s assessment that there had been a shift in North Korea’s attitude toward engagement with other countries. Several also articulated that the best solution to the issue was dialogue and negotiation through the Six-Party Talks. A Russian participant emphasized that it would be useful to bring in outside observers, perhaps from the UN, and focus the dialogue with North Korea on peace and security rather than just denuclearization.

A US participant noted that peace on the peninsula must begin with the ROK and DPRK and not with the US and the DPRK. While some agreed that stability in relations on the peninsula was the key to substantive progress in the denuclearization issue, others questioned the value of broader multilateral engagement with the DPRK without first resolving the nuclear issue. Several felt it was important for the DPRK to return to the Six-Party Talks as a first step to resuming dialogue. Another commentator suggested that the sole purpose of Stephen Bosworth’s visit to North Korea, which occurred as the study group met, was to convince North Korea to return to the Six-Party Talks and not to engage in bilateral negotiations.

Two other commentators noted that China, having made several visits over the past months, had shifted its emphasis from support for sanctions toward ensuring stability and seemed more focused on reassuring North Korea that it was willing to take a more comprehensive approach to the issue. A Chinese commentator agreed that China was trying to take a more “balanced” approach and wanted good relations with its neighbors. Accordingly, it could only make suggestions to North Korea and send “strong signals” that China respects the DPRK leadership. Another Chinese commentator suggested that talk in the US and South Korea about crisis management due to regime failure in North Korea was not useful and would likely delay any movement toward resolving the conflict between North and South Korea. As in the past, several participants called on the DPRK to articulate the specific aspects of US policy that threatens its security and offer suggestions that would eliminate

those concerns. The complaint about “US hostile policy” is too vague. If this meant an end to the US extended deterrence commitments or an end to the US alliances, then progress would not be possible. By the same token, another commentator noted that it would be helpful if the US would better articulate what it specifically meant by its call for denuclearization on the peninsula.

In closing remarks, Yang Yi reiterated his view that China seeks a more balanced approach and wants to reassure the DPRK leadership; both are intended as means to resume the dialogue within the Six-Party Talks. Cheon Seung-whun argued that while the US was attempting to use bilateral dialogue with the DPRK as a means to return to the Six-Party Talks, North Korea was using it as an end in itself. He complained China was being too patient and should take a more urgent view of the situation and provide stronger support to the sanctions regime. So Ki-sok declined any further comment.

Session 3 focused on *disarmament* issues. *David Santoro (CSCAP Canada)* argued that disarmament tends to come in waves and has been led by nongovernmental organizations. This time the nuclear weapon states (NWS) were leading the movement. While each of the five major NWS had a distinct view toward disarmament, there was a difference between the US/UK view of a nuclear free world and that held by Russia, China, and France. The US has pursued disarmament in the context of providing extended deterrence for its allies and the UK, which has been attached to the US extended deterrent, has pushed disarmament, and has been the most vocal supporter of nuclear abolition. France has reduced its arsenal, but has avoided any commitment to abolition. Russia continues to see nuclear weapons as an important component of its security and views disarmament talks as a key aspect of its relations with the US. China, meanwhile, has modernized its arsenal and has been relatively quiet about nuclear abolition. Instead, it has focused on doctrinal issues such as calling for a universal commitment to a no first-use policy and a reduction in the reliance on nuclear weapons in defense policy, while it calls for the US and Russia to lead the disarmament movement. Despite encouraging signs by all five NWS, there will be no significant disarmament recommendations in the 2010 RevCon agenda. Therefore, what is needed is a more constructive dialogue between the NWS and the nonnuclear weapon states (NNWS) to determine what progress is possible in what timeframe for the NWS and what would be considered acceptable progress toward disarmament by the NNWS. Santoro argued that CSCAP could play a very useful role in facilitating this dialogue.

Next, *Lyndon Burford (CSCAP New Zealand)* focused on how the New Agenda Coalition (NAC) was working to translate political will for disarmament into action. Recognizing the traditional rift between the NWS (“look at all we are doing to achieve disarmament”) and the NNWS (“you are not doing nearly enough to achieve disarmament”), the NAC has sought incremental progress while keeping the goal of abolition in sight. The dialogue between the two groups should focus on operational issues with the intent being to delegitimize nuclear weapons as a component of national security and deglamorize possession of the weapons themselves. He argued that CSCAP could contribute by establishing a dedicated group to discuss disarmament and the process of getting to “zero.”

The discussion focused on what one commentator termed qualitative vs. quantitative disarmament and on the need to include all NWS in the dialogue. One participant felt that there were more than enough multilateral forums to host the discussion; what is needed is a willingness to take action and make more bold declarations regarding their commitment to disarmament rather than being satisfied with the current approach of waiting for the NWS to incrementally decrease the sizes of their respective arsenals. This illustrates the importance of bringing all countries into the discussion. Given the role of extended deterrence in US nuclear doctrine, it is critical that those countries under the US nuclear umbrella be included in discussions about delegitimizing nuclear weapons and operational factors.

There were several suggestions on how to best proceed. One approach could be a critique of the draft nuclear weapon convention, which was developed in the late 1990s; there has been little effort to examine the details and improve it. Another suggestion was to include all NWS in the START dialogues being held between the US and Russia. Another encouraged an examination of national doctrines for definitions of robustness, targeting, and survivability. This would allow discussions of what might be acceptable in terms of minimal deterrence capability and other operational adjustments. A key to future cuts will be verification measures. Ultimately, it will be necessary to both deglamorize and delegitimize nuclear weapons, but as long as nuclear deterrence is seen as the ultimate security guarantee, it will be difficult to make progress. Throughout the discussion, there was a consensus that disarmament cannot be achieved without the full participation of all countries and will require a serious examination of the operational and doctrinal components of nuclear deterrence.

The fourth session focused on the *challenges associated with the growing interest in the development of nuclear power facilities* as an alternative source of energy in the Asia-Pacific region. *Togzhan Kassenova (Center for International Trade and Security)* opened the session by noting that currently there are more than 450 nuclear power facilities projected to be built around the world over the next decade, with 53 already under construction. She noted a large number of nuclear power facilities already built in Northeast Asia with a growing interest in the technology in Southeast Asia. She highlighted some of the safety and security risks associated with nuclear energy including accidents, diversion of materials, proliferation, nuclear terrorism, nuclear proliferation, environmental impact, and public health issues. Region-specific issues that must be addressed especially in Southeast Asia, which currently lacks experience with nuclear energy facilities, include the necessary resources including technical expertise, the development of a strong regulatory oversight, establishment of strategic trade control measures, prevention of terrorism and piracy, and ensuring the safety of nuclear power facilities are situated in geographically stable regions.

Ta Minh Tuan (CSCAP Vietnam) addressed the specific issue of how countries in Southeast Asia should deal with enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing as they anticipate the expansion of nuclear power facilities in the region. He endorsed an ASEAN version of the European Union's EURATOM to develop nuclear energy capacity, create a market for nuclear power, and distribute it through the region. In addition, he suggested linking the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone (SEANWFZ) with nonproliferation regimes. Specifically, ASEAN countries should modify the Bangkok Treaty to include a ban on

reprocessing and enrichment facilities and establish regional spent fuel storage facilities. He also argued that as countries pursued the development of nuclear energy facilities, it would be necessary to establish a code of conduct for import and export of fissile material, encourage transparency and establish a body within ASEAN to deal with SEANWFZ and other issues related to the introduction of nuclear energy facilities in the region.

The discussion revealed disagreement regarding the risks associated with nuclear power facilities. While some argued that the safety and security concerns raised by Kassenova were overblown and was largely about public perceptions, others suggested that the most important risks were lackadaisical attitudes toward proliferation in a region that has a history of transshipment of contraband and transnational crime syndicates with a growing interest in nuclear materials. Several participants noted the need for all countries in Southeast Asia to adopt the Additional Protocol to the IAEA's Comprehensive Safeguards. Given the growing interest in nuclear energy in the region, it will be important to ensure that all countries are fully integrated into the IAEA system of safeguards. This will encourage better cooperation and help ensure transparency. There was agreement that cross-border cooperation would be very important to deal with issues such as pooling resources to produce proliferation resistant fuel and reasonable costs, organizing response to accidents, and finding workable solutions to handling spent fuel.

The second day of the study group began with a *review of the CSCAP WMD handbook* on preventing the proliferation of WMD led by *Carl Baker (USCSCAP)*. During the review, there were several recommendations to improve the handbook. There was also a lengthy discussion about the need to establish an appropriate balance between disarmament and nonproliferation in the handbook. Participants were asked to provide specific comments and recommended changes to USCSCAP not later than Jan. 15, 2010.

The remainder of the study group meeting was used for breakout sessions to evaluate suggestions made during the past nine study group meetings that might be considered appropriate for inclusion in a CSCAP Action Plan. Breakout groups included: Nonproliferation Regime Compliance and Implementation, Disarmament, Peaceful Use of Nuclear Energy, and Nuclear Weapons Free Zones. Following the breakout session, each group returned for a plenary session and provided a synopsis of the discussion. While each group took a slightly different approach, each provided recommendations that should be addressed to promote action by countries in the region.

Nonproliferation Regime Compliance and Implementation

The group examining previous proposals for improving compliance with the global nonproliferation regime began by agreeing on three basic nonproliferation principles and then proposed several actions to support those principles. The principles included:

- A political commitment to establish national legal and administrative measures to ensure effective compliance with treaties and conventions;

- Clarify the criteria for withdrawal from treaties and the abdication of associated responsibilities.
- Make nonproliferation a permanent agenda item of the ASEAN Regional Forum and other relevant organizations and forums in the Asia-Pacific region.

Within this framework, the group recommended countries in the region should take several actions to promote compliance with the global nonproliferation regime. These include:

- Develop a safe and secure trade system to include a separate regional export regime or to work with Nuclear Suppliers Group to establish a complementary trade regime.
- Strengthen test ban controls by ratifying and supporting robust implementation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- Strengthen fissile material controls by supporting negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty.
- Promote and comply with enhanced nuclear safeguards and security by signing and ratifying the IAEA Comprehensive Safeguards and the Additional Protocol, joining the Global Initiative to Counter Nuclear Terrorism, identifying best practices for national implementation of UNSC Resolution 1540 and assisting other member countries to meet the highest international standards, and joining and implementing relevant IAEA and UN conventions on physical protection, nuclear safety, and materials accounting.
- Cooperate with and assisting the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons to build national capacities to implement the obligations of the Chemical Weapons Convention, report regularly to the Implementation Support Unit under the Biological Weapons Convention confidence-building measures, strengthen laboratory bio-security measures, and build effective disease surveillance and bio-forensic capacity.
- Promote global supply chain security by joining and implementing the World Customs Organization's SAFE standards, adopting cargo security standards based on practices recommended by the World Customs Organization and the Container Security Initiative.
- Develop an export controls outreach program to build a strong public-private partnership to prevent WMD proliferation.

Disarmament

This group focused on four major recommendations to create conditions for global disarmament and promote better understanding among NWS and NNWS. Specific policy recommendations in each of these areas could be developed as a regional action plan to

discourage inclusion of nuclear weapons in operational doctrine and promote nuclear disarmament.

- Develop a package of ideas for reducing the role of nuclear weapons in the security policies of NWS. Taking these actions would help reduce perceptions of the utility and usability of nuclear weapons and help delegitimize their use. Prominent initiatives could include:
 - Limit the missions assigned to nuclear weapons, and consider a declaratory policy that mandates their use only as a last resort and exclusively in response to the use of nuclear weapons.
 - Take more substantive measures to make nuclear arsenals “slow to take offense.”
 - Develop stronger negative security assurances.
 - Further development of international legal norms against the use or possession of such weapons.
- Support the establishment of a formal dialogue mechanism between NWS and NNWS. At the global level, the group would study steps to achieve global denuclearization and to maximize the cumulative security benefits expected to arise from the elimination of nuclear weapons. This could include transparency measures related to technical capabilities and intent. In the Asia-Pacific region, countries with a direct stake in nuclear weapon postures and extended nuclear deterrence should meet to discuss the potential for security concerns to be met by smaller nuclear arsenals and postures of minimal nuclear deterrence.
- Participate in the development of a roadmap to global zero that could be reviewed and revised as circumstances change.
- Establish a mechanism that promotes the reaffirmation by all countries of their obligations, responsibilities, and intentions to participate in the process of achieving the benefits of a world free of nuclear weapons.

Peaceful Use of Nuclear Energy

Given resource requirements and constraints associated with the peaceful use of nuclear energy, all recommendations should avoid duplication and seek complementarities with existing organizations. Specifically, the group recommended that all countries interested in pursuing nuclear energy capacity should actively participate in established regional initiatives including the Asia-Pacific Safeguards Network and the Regional Cooperative Agreement. In addition, the following recommendations would help promote a strong nonproliferation culture as countries begin building and operating nuclear power facilities:

- Build capacity within the region through technical cooperation in emergency response to nuclear-related incidents, safety and security for waste management, and research partnerships to establish common testing and facility standards.
- Cooperate in creating multinational oversight by creating a regional nuclear authority similar to EURATOM and ABACC to supplement IAEA safeguards and promote regional standardization.
- Develop centralized regional facilities for storage and disposal of spent fuel and low-level waste materials.
- Encourage countries with expertise in nuclear energy to help develop and implement national strategies on nuclear energy to include areas such as resources, facility safety and security, and proliferation risks.
- Re-establish the CSCAP Nuclear Energy Experts Group to promote transparency, build confidence, share expertise and best practices in nuclear energy management, examine prospects for a regional multinational fuel cycle, and conduct energy needs assessments.
- Investigate the feasibility of a regional or sub-regional reprocessing and enrichment-free zones to reduce the prospects for emerging nuclear energy programs to serve as a platform for the development of a nuclear weapons program.

Nuclear Weapon Free Zones

This group focused on enhancing and updating the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) in the context of the emergence of de facto nuclear weapon states in the region and in anticipation of the installation of nuclear power facilities in the region. Specific recommendations include:

- Amend the Bangkok Treaty to allow de facto nuclear weapon states to accede to the treaty, prohibit reprocessing and enrichment of uranium in the region, and encourage the establishment of a regional fuel depository.
- Establish a SEANWFZ unit within the ASEAN Secretariat to promote closer coordination with the IAEA and other NWFZs, promote information sharing among members, and provide support for development of national-level standards for WMD-related requirements.
- Establish a regional nuclear safety network.
- Establish a comprehensive monitoring and detection mechanism, a regional emergency response capability, and an enforcement mechanism to ensure transparency and compliance with IAEA and UN WMD-related requirements.

During the wrap-up session the co-chairs agreed that the breakout sessions were very helpful in identifying ideas that could be further developed into actionable proposals for adoption by countries in the region. Future meetings will focus on further exploration of the ideas gathered during these sessions and expand them into specific action plan recommendations. Although the date for the next study group meeting has not been set, the co-chairs anticipate that it will be held in conjunction with the next ARF Intersessional Meeting on Disarmament and Nonproliferation, which is tentatively scheduled to be held in Singapore in the June-July 2010 timeframe.