

A. Safeguards Statement for 2019^{1, 2}

In 2019, safeguards were applied for 183 States^{3, 4} with safeguards agreements in force with the Agency. The Secretariat's findings and conclusions for 2019 are reported below with regard to each type of safeguards agreement. These findings and conclusions are based upon an evaluation of all safeguards relevant information available to the Agency in exercising its rights and fulfilling its safeguards obligations for that year.

1. One hundred and thirty-one States had both comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols in force⁵:

- (a) For 69 of these States⁴, the Secretariat found no indication of the diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful nuclear activities and no indication of undeclared nuclear material or activities. On this basis, the Secretariat concluded that, for these States, all nuclear material remained in peaceful activities.**
- (b) For 62 of these States, the Secretariat found no indication of the diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful nuclear activities. Evaluations regarding the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities for each of these States remained ongoing. On this basis, the Secretariat concluded that, for these States, declared nuclear material remained in peaceful activities.**

2. Safeguards activities were implemented for 44 States with comprehensive safeguards agreements in force, but without additional protocols in force. For these States, the Secretariat found no indication of the diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful nuclear activities. On this basis, the Secretariat concluded that, for these States, declared nuclear material remained in peaceful activities.

3. As of the end of 2019, 10 States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) had yet to bring into force comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency as required by Article III of that Treaty. For these States Parties, the Secretariat could not draw any safeguards conclusions.

4. Three States had safeguards agreements based on INFCIRC/66/Rev.2 in force, requiring the application of safeguards to nuclear material, facilities and other items specified in the relevant safeguards agreement. One of these States, India, had an additional protocol in force. For these States, the Secretariat found no indication of the diversion of nuclear material or of the misuse of the facilities or other items to which safeguards had been applied. On this

¹ The designations employed and the presentation of material in this report, including the numbers cited, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Agency or its Member States concerning the legal status of any country or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

² The referenced number of States Parties to the NPT is based on the number of instruments of ratification, accession or succession that have been deposited.

³ These States do not include the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), where the Agency did not implement safeguards and, therefore, could not draw any conclusion.

⁴ And Taiwan, China.

⁵ Or an additional protocol being provisionally applied, pending its entry into force.

basis, the Secretariat concluded that, for these States, nuclear material, facilities or other items to which safeguards had been applied remained in peaceful activities.

5. Five nuclear-weapon States had voluntary offer agreements and additional protocols in force. Safeguards were implemented with regard to declared nuclear material in selected facilities in all five States. For these States, the Secretariat found no indication of the diversion of nuclear material to which safeguards had been applied. On this basis, the Secretariat concluded that, for these States, nuclear material in selected facilities to which safeguards had been applied remained in peaceful activities or had been withdrawn from safeguards as provided for in the agreements.

B. Background to the Safeguards Statement and Summary

B.1. Safeguards conclusions

1. The *Safeguards Statement* reflects the Secretariat’s findings and conclusions resulting from the Agency’s activities under the safeguards agreements in force. The Secretariat derives these conclusions on the basis of an evaluation of the results of its safeguards activities and of all other safeguards relevant information available to it. The Secretariat follows uniform internal processes and defined procedures to draw independent and objective safeguards conclusions based on its own verification activities and findings. This section provides background to the *Safeguards Statement*.

Fact box 1. Safeguards activities overview



2. A summary of the status of safeguards agreements and other information presented below is given in Tables 1 to 5 in Section B.7.

B.1.1. States with comprehensive safeguards agreements in force

3. Under a comprehensive safeguards agreement, the Agency has the “right and obligation to ensure that safeguards will be applied, in accordance with the terms of the agreement, on all source or special fissionable material in all peaceful nuclear activities within the territory of the State, under its jurisdiction or carried out under its control anywhere, for the exclusive purpose of verifying that such material is not diverted to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”.⁹

⁶ Significant quantity — the approximate amount of nuclear material for which the possibility of manufacturing a nuclear explosive device cannot be excluded.

⁷ Material balance areas (MBAs) containing locations outside facilities where nuclear material is customarily used (LOFs).

⁸ Calendar-days in the field for verification comprise calendar-days spent on performing inspections, complementary accesses, design information verifications at facilities and information verifications at LOFs and on the associated travel and rest periods.

⁹ Paragraph 2 of INFCIRC/153 (Corrected).

4. Comprehensive safeguards agreements consist of Part I, Part II, and Definitions. Part I consists of general provisions and Part II describes the procedures for implementing those provisions. These procedures include the record keeping and reporting obligations of the State with regard to nuclear material, nuclear facilities and LOFs. They also include procedures related to Agency access to nuclear material, nuclear facilities and LOFs.

5. The procedures set out in Part II of a comprehensive safeguards agreement include certain reporting requirements related to the export and import of material containing uranium or thorium which has not yet reached the stage of processing where its composition and purity make it suitable for fuel fabrication or for isotopic enrichment. Nuclear material which has reached that stage of processing, and any nuclear material produced at a later stage, is subject to all the other safeguards procedures specified in the agreement. An inventory of such nuclear material is established on the basis of an initial report by a State, which is then verified by the Agency and maintained on the basis of subsequent reports by the State and by Agency verification. The Agency performs its verification and evaluation activities in order to confirm that these declarations by the State are correct and complete — i.e. to confirm that all nuclear material in the State remains in peaceful activities.

Small quantities protocols

6. Many States with minimal or no nuclear activities have concluded a small quantities protocol (SQP) to their comprehensive safeguards agreement. Under an SQP based on the original standard text¹⁰ submitted to the Board of Governors in 1974, the implementation of most of the safeguards procedures in Part II of a comprehensive safeguards agreement are held in abeyance as long as certain criteria are met. In 2005, the Board of Governors approved the revision¹¹ of the standard text of the SQP. This revision changed the eligibility criteria for an SQP, making it unavailable to a State with an existing or planned facility, and reduced the number of measures held in abeyance. Of particular importance is the fact that, under the revised standard text of the SQP, the requirement that the State provide the Agency with an initial inventory report and the Agency's right to carry out ad hoc and special inspections are no longer held in abeyance.

Additional protocols

7. Although the Agency has the authority under a comprehensive safeguards agreement to verify the peaceful use of all nuclear material in a State (i.e. the correctness and completeness of the State's declarations), the tools available to the Agency under such an agreement are limited. The *Model Additional Protocol*¹², approved by the Board of Governors in 1997, equips the Agency with important additional tools that provide broader access to information and locations. The measures provided for under an additional protocol thus significantly increase the Agency's ability to verify the peaceful use of all nuclear material in a State with a comprehensive safeguards agreement.

¹⁰ GOV/INF/276/Annex B.

¹¹ GOV/INF/276/Mod.1 and Corr.1.

¹² INFCIRC/540 (Corrected), *Model Protocol Additional to the Agreement(s) between State(s) and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards*.

B.1.1.1. States with both comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols in force⁵

Status of implementation

8. As of 31 December 2019, 131 (129)¹³ States had both comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols in force⁵.

9. Safeguards implementation involved, as appropriate, activities carried out in the field, at regional offices and at Agency Headquarters in Vienna. The activities at Headquarters included the evaluation of States' accounting reports and other information required under comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols and the evaluation of safeguards relevant information from other sources.

Deriving conclusions

10. A safeguards conclusion that all nuclear material has remained in peaceful activities in a State is based on the Agency's finding that there are no indications of diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful nuclear activities and no indications of undeclared nuclear material or activities in the State as a whole. The Agency draws such a conclusion only where a State has both a comprehensive safeguards agreement and an additional protocol in force and the evaluations described below have been completed.

11. To ascertain that there are no indications of diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful nuclear activities in a State, the Agency needs to carry out a comprehensive evaluation of all safeguards relevant information available to it, which includes information provided by the State with regard to the design and operation of nuclear facilities and LOFs, the State's nuclear material accounting reports, the State's declarations submitted under the additional protocol and the results of the Agency's in-field activities carried out to verify the State's declarations.

12. To ascertain that there are no indications of undeclared nuclear material or activities in a State, the Agency needs to carry out an evaluation of the consistency of the State's declared nuclear programme with the results of the Agency's verification activities under the relevant safeguards agreements and additional protocols and with all other safeguards relevant information available to the Agency. In particular, the Agency needs to have:

- Conducted a comprehensive State evaluation based on all safeguards relevant information available to the Agency about the State's nuclear and nuclear-related activities (including design information on facilities and information on LOFs, declarations submitted under additional protocols, and information collected by the Agency through its verification activities and from other sources);
- Performed complementary access, as necessary, in accordance with the State's additional protocol;
- Addressed all anomalies, discrepancies and inconsistencies identified in the course of its evaluation and verification activities.

13. When the evaluations described in paragraphs 11 and 12 above have been completed and no indication has been found by the Agency that, in its judgement, would give rise to a proliferation concern, the Secretariat can draw the broader conclusion that all nuclear material in a State remained

¹³ The numbers in parentheses provide the respective data for 2018.

in peaceful activities. Subsequently, the Agency implements integrated safeguards — an optimized combination of safeguards measures available under comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols — for that State. Due to increased assurance of the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities for the State as a whole, the intensity of inspection activities at declared facilities and LOFs can be reduced. Integrated safeguards were implemented for the whole 2019 or part thereof for 67 (67) States.^{4, 14}

Overall conclusions for 2019

14. On the basis of the evaluations described in paragraphs 11 and 12, the Secretariat drew the conclusions referred to in paragraph 1(a) of the *Safeguards Statement* for 69 (70) States⁴ — Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark¹⁵, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands¹⁶, New Zealand¹⁷, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam.

15. Because the evaluation process described in paragraph 12 had not yet been completed for 62 (59) States, the conclusion drawn for these States relates only to declared nuclear material in peaceful activities. The conclusion in paragraph 1(b) of the *Safeguards Statement* was drawn for Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Serbia, Thailand, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates and Vanuatu.

¹⁴ Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam.

¹⁵ This conclusion is drawn with regard to that part of Denmark which is covered by INFCIRC/193 and INFCIRC/193/Add.8, i.e. Denmark and the Faroe Islands, and to Greenland for which Denmark has concluded a separate comprehensive safeguards agreement and an additional protocol thereto (INFCIRC/176 and INFCIRC/176/Add.1, respectively).

¹⁶ This conclusion is drawn with regard only to that part of the Netherlands which is covered by INFCIRC/193 and INFCIRC/193/Add.8, i.e. the Netherlands in Europe, which excludes the Caribbean part of the Netherlands (the islands of Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba), Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten. The Netherlands has concluded a separate comprehensive safeguards agreement that applies to its constituent parts mentioned above (INFCIRC/229), but has not yet concluded an additional protocol thereto.

¹⁷ This conclusion is drawn with regard only to New Zealand which is covered by INFCIRC/185 and INFCIRC/185/Add.1; it is not drawn for the Cook Islands and Niue, which are also covered by INFCIRC/185, but not by INFCIRC/185/Add.1.

B.1.1.2. States with comprehensive safeguards agreements in force but no additional protocols in force

Status of implementation

16. As of 31 December 2019, safeguards were implemented for 44 (45) States in this category. Safeguards implementation involved activities in the field and at Headquarters, including the evaluation of States' accounting reports and other information required under comprehensive safeguards agreements and the evaluation of safeguards relevant information from other sources.

Deriving conclusions

17. For a State with a comprehensive safeguards agreement, the Agency's right and obligation are as described in paragraph 3 above. Although the implementation of safeguards strengthening measures¹⁸ under such an agreement have increased the Agency's ability to detect undeclared nuclear material and activities, the activities that the Agency may conduct in this regard are limited for a State without an additional protocol. Thus, the conclusion in the *Safeguards Statement* for a State with a comprehensive safeguards agreement alone relates only to the non-diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful activities.

18. In the course of its evaluation, the Agency also seeks to determine whether there is any indication of undeclared nuclear material or activities in the State which would need to be reflected in the *Safeguards Statement*. However, without the measures provided for in the *Model Additional Protocol* being implemented, the Agency is not able to provide credible assurance of the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities for the State as a whole.

Syrian Arab Republic

19. In August 2019, the Acting Director General submitted a report to the Board of Governors entitled *Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Syrian Arab Republic* (GOV/2019/34) covering relevant developments since the previous report in August 2018 (GOV/2018/35). The Acting Director General informed the Board of Governors that no new information had come to the knowledge of the Agency that would have an impact on the Agency's assessment that it was very likely that a building destroyed at the Dair Alzour site was a nuclear reactor that should have been declared to the Agency by Syria.¹⁹ In 2019, the Director General and Acting Director General renewed calls on Syria to cooperate fully with the Agency in connection with unresolved issues related to the Dair Alzour site and other locations. Syria has yet to respond to these calls.

20. In 2019, inspections were carried out at the Miniature Neutron Source Reactor facility near Damascus and a LOF in Damascus.

21. On the basis of the evaluation of information provided by Syria, and all other safeguards relevant information available to it, the Agency found no indication of diversion of declared nuclear material from peaceful activities. For 2019, the Agency concluded for Syria that declared nuclear material remained in peaceful activities.

¹⁸ Such measures include the early provision of design information, environmental sampling and the use of satellite imagery.

¹⁹ The Board of Governors, in its resolution GOV/2011/41 of June 2011 (adopted by a vote), had, inter alia, called on Syria to urgently remedy its non-compliance with its NPT Safeguards Agreement and, in particular, to provide the Agency with updated reporting under its Safeguards Agreement and access to all information, sites, material and persons necessary for the Agency to verify such reporting and resolve all outstanding questions so that the Agency could provide the necessary assurance as to the exclusively peaceful nature of Syria's nuclear programme.

Overall conclusions for 2019

22. On the basis of the evaluation performed and as reflected in paragraph 2 of the *Safeguards Statement*, the Secretariat concluded that for the 44 (45) States²⁰, declared nuclear material remained in peaceful activities. This conclusion was drawn for Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Dominica, Egypt, Grenada, Guyana, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

B.1.2. States Parties to the NPT without comprehensive safeguards agreements in force

23. As of 31 December 2019, 10 (11) States Parties to the NPT had yet to bring comprehensive safeguards agreements into force pursuant to Article III of the Treaty.

Overall conclusions for 2019

24. As indicated in paragraph 3 of the *Safeguards Statement*, the Secretariat could not draw any safeguards conclusions for Cabo Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Federated States of Micronesia, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, State of Palestine²¹ and Timor-Leste.

B.1.3. States with safeguards agreements based on INFCIRC/66/Rev.2 in force

25. Under safeguards agreements based on INFCIRC/66/Rev.2, the Agency applies safeguards in order to ensure that nuclear material, facilities and other items specified under the safeguards agreement are not used for the manufacture of any nuclear weapon or to further any military purpose, and that such items are used exclusively for peaceful purposes and are not used for the manufacture of any nuclear explosive device.

Status of implementation

26. As of 31 December 2019, safeguards were implemented at facilities in India, Israel and Pakistan pursuant to safeguards agreements based on INFCIRC/66/Rev.2. India has an additional protocol to its INFCIRC/754 safeguards agreement in force.

Deriving conclusions

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

²⁰ In addition, this conclusion is drawn for those territories of the Netherlands referred to in footnote 16 for which the broader conclusion is not drawn – i.e. the Caribbean part of the Netherlands (the islands of Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba), Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten; and the Cook Islands and Niue, which are covered by New Zealand's comprehensive safeguards agreement but not by its additional protocol – see footnote 17. It is also drawn for France's territories covered by the safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/718 between France, EURATOM and the Agency pursuant to Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco; and for the United States of America's territories covered by the safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/366 between the United States of America and the Agency pursuant to Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

²¹ The designation employed does not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever concerning the legal status of any country or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

Overall conclusions for 2019

28. On the basis of the results of its verification and evaluation activities, the Secretariat concluded that the nuclear material, facilities or other items to which safeguards were applied in India, Israel and Pakistan remained in peaceful activities.

B.1.4. States with both voluntary offer agreements and additional protocols in force

29. Under a voluntary offer agreement, the Agency applies safeguards to nuclear material in those facilities that have been selected by the Agency from the State's list of eligible facilities in order to verify that the material is not withdrawn from peaceful activities except as provided for in the agreement. In selecting facilities under voluntary offer agreements for the application of safeguards, the Agency takes such factors into consideration as: (i) whether the selection of a facility would satisfy legal obligations arising from other agreements concluded by the State; (ii) whether useful experience may be gained in implementing new safeguards approaches or in using advanced equipment and technology; and (iii) whether the cost efficiency of Agency safeguards may be enhanced by applying safeguards, in the exporting State, to nuclear material being shipped to States with comprehensive safeguards agreements in force. By implementing measures under the additional protocol in these five States with voluntary offer agreements, the Agency also seeks to obtain and verify information that could enhance the safeguards conclusions for States with comprehensive safeguards agreements in force.

Status of implementation

30. During 2019, safeguards were implemented at facilities selected by the Agency in the five States with voluntary offer agreements in force: China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (United Kingdom) and the United States of America.

Deriving conclusions

31. The conclusion contained in paragraph 5 of the *Safeguards Statement* is reported for the five States with voluntary offer agreements in force in which safeguards were applied to nuclear material in selected facilities. To draw the safeguards conclusion, the Agency evaluates all safeguards relevant information available to it, including verification results and information about facility design features and operations.

Overall conclusions for 2019

32. On the basis of the results of its verification and evaluation activities, the Secretariat concluded for China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States of America that nuclear material to which safeguards had been applied in selected facilities remained in peaceful activities or had been withdrawn as provided for in the agreements. There were no such withdrawals from the selected facilities in France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

B.2. Verification and Monitoring in the Islamic Republic of Iran in light of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015)

33. The Agency continued to verify and monitor the nuclear-related commitments of the Islamic Republic of Iran (Iran) under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). Iran continued to provisionally apply the additional protocol to its safeguards agreement in accordance with Article 17(b) of the Additional Protocol, pending its entry into force. During the year, four quarterly reports and six reports providing updates on developments in between the issuance of quarterly reports were

submitted to the Board of Governors and in parallel to the United Nations Security Council entitled *Verification and monitoring in the Islamic Republic of Iran in light of United Nations Security Council resolution 2231 (2015)* (GOV/2019/10, GOV/2019/21, GOV/2019/32 and GOV/2019/55; and GOV/INF/2019/8, GOV/INF/2019/9, GOV/INF/2019/10, GOV/INF/2019/12, GOV/INF/2019/16 and GOV/INF/2019/17).

B.3. Democratic People's Republic of Korea

34. In August 2019, the Acting Director General submitted a report to the Board of Governors and General Conference entitled *Application of Safeguards in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea* (GOV/2019/33–GC(63)/20), which provided an update of developments since the Director General's report of August 2018 (GOV/2018/34–GC(62)/12).

35. Since 1994, the Agency has not been able to conduct all necessary safeguards activities provided for in the DPRK's NPT Safeguards Agreement. From the end of 2002 until July 2007, the Agency was not able — and, since April 2009, has not been able — to implement any verification measures in the DPRK, and, therefore, the Agency could not draw any safeguards conclusion regarding the DPRK.

36. In 2019, no verification activities were implemented in the field but the Agency continued to monitor developments in the DPRK's nuclear programme and to evaluate all safeguards relevant information available to it, including open source information and satellite imagery.

37. In 2019, the Secretariat intensified efforts to enhance the Agency's readiness to play its essential role in verifying the DPRK's nuclear programme. The Secretariat has further increased the frequency of collection of satellite imagery, procured equipment and supplies, updated verification approaches and procedures, conducted specialized training, commenced new knowledge management activities, and ensured the availability of appropriate verification technologies and equipment. Once a political agreement has been reached among the countries concerned, the Agency is ready to return to the DPRK in a timely manner, if requested to do so by the DPRK and subject to approval by the Board of Governors.

38. In 2019, the Agency continued to monitor the Yongbyon site. During 2019, there were no indications of the operation of the Yongbyon Experimental Nuclear Power Plant (5MW(e)) reactor, nor any indications of reprocessing activities at the Radiochemical Laboratory. At the Yongbyon Nuclear Fuel Rod Fabrication Plant, there were indications consistent with the use of the reported centrifuge enrichment facility located within the plant. The Agency did not observe any further activities consistent with the fabrication of major reactor components in the light water reactor (LWR) construction yard. Movements of construction vehicles near the reactor containment building, turbine hall and electrical switchyard continued to be observed. The Agency has not observed any indications of operation of the reactor, although there was an indication of a test of parts of the cooling infrastructure in March 2019.

39. At the group of buildings within a security perimeter in the vicinity of Pyongyang,²² there were indications of ongoing activities.

40. The Agency has not had access to the Yongbyon site or to other locations in the DPRK. Without such access, the Agency cannot confirm either the operational status or configuration/design features of the facilities or locations, or the nature and purpose of the activities conducted therein.

²² GOV/2019/33–GC(63)/20, para. 18.

41. In 2019, some of the DPRK's nuclear facilities appeared not to be operating, while activities at some other facilities continued or developed further. The DPRK's nuclear activities remain a cause for serious concern. The continuation of the DPRK's nuclear programme is a clear violation of relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions and is deeply regrettable.

B.4. Areas of difficulty in safeguards implementation

42. The performance and the effectiveness of State and regional authorities responsible for safeguards implementation (SRA) and of their respective systems of accounting for and control of nuclear material (SSACs/RSACs) have a significant impact upon the effectiveness and efficiency of Agency safeguards implementation.

43. The effectiveness of some SRAs is affected by issues identified by the Agency in one or more of the following areas: provision of safeguards information to the Agency; provision of access to the Agency to conduct in-field verification activities; technical effectiveness of SSACs; and States' cooperation and logistical support related to the Agency's verification activities in the field or at Headquarters. Addressing these issues lead to additional costs, effort and resources for the Agency and, in many cases, also for the SRAs and nuclear facility operators.

44. In 2019, despite the above-mentioned issues, the Agency — based on the evaluation of all safeguards relevant information available to it — did not find any indication that, in its judgement, gave rise to proliferation concern.

45. The Agency continues to address these issues to resolve them through cooperation and engagement with the States concerned. There are different causes of these issues. Some States have still not established SSACs, which are required under comprehensive safeguards agreements. Moreover, not all SRAs have the necessary legal authority, independence from nuclear facility or LOF operators, resources or technical capabilities to implement the requirements of safeguards agreements and additional protocols.

46. In 2019, the Agency developed a new initiative to assist States to strengthen the effectiveness of SSAC/SRAs. The initiative focussed on 19 States that were yet to provide their initial inventory report on nuclear material or their initial additional protocol declarations. For these States, the Agency identified the main causes of their reporting issues and developed a plan to assist the respective SRAs based on their specific needs and to monitor progress.

47. In accordance with the decision of the Board of Governors in September 2005, States which have not amended or rescinded their SQPs should do so as soon as possible. At the end of 2019, 32 (35) States²³ had operative SQPs that had yet to be amended.

B.5. Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of safeguards

48. The Agency has continued to improve the efficiency of safeguards implementation while maintaining or strengthening its effectiveness. This improvement has been essential since the number of safeguards agreements and additional protocols in force⁵, the quantities of nuclear material and

²³ The States with SQPs based on the original standard text are: Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Dominica, Fiji, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Oman, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Yemen and Zambia. In addition, there is an SQP based on the original standard text to the safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/229 between the Netherlands and the Agency pursuant to the NPT and Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

other items under safeguards and the number of facilities under safeguards have all increased in recent years. In contrast, the Agency's financial resources have not risen commensurately. It should be noted that while a number of facilities are being retired from service, this will not immediately reduce verification effort as safeguards continue to be applied to those facilities until their status is confirmed by the Agency as decommissioned for safeguards purposes.

49. Some of the factors contributing to strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of safeguards are shown in Fact box 2.

50. As a result of these improvements, safeguards have been implemented more effectively in the field and have been complemented by enhanced and improved activities at Headquarters.

51. During 2019, the Agency developed a State-level safeguards approach (SLA) for one State with a comprehensive safeguards agreement. This brings the total number of States with a comprehensive safeguards agreement for which an SLA has been developed to 131. These 131 States hold 97% of all nuclear material (by significant quantity) under Agency safeguards in States with a comprehensive safeguards agreement. These 131 States comprise 67 States¹⁴ with a comprehensive safeguards agreement and an additional protocol in force for which the broader conclusion has been drawn (of which 17 are States with an SQP); 37 States²⁴ with a comprehensive safeguards agreement and an additional protocol in force for which the broader conclusion was not drawn for 2019 (of which 25 are States with an SQP); and 27 States²⁵ with a comprehensive safeguards agreement with an SQP in force but no additional protocol in force. Previously, an SLA was developed for one State²⁶ with a voluntary offer agreement and an additional protocol in force.

52. After completing the modernization of safeguards information technology under the MOSAIC project in 2018, the Agency focused on enhancing existing and developing new safeguards software capabilities in line with the departmental strategic priorities.

53. Under the departmental quality management system (QMS), regular oversight of the key safeguards processes and their results is provided through different activities, including internal audits, process analysis and improvement activities, to ensure impartiality, effectiveness and efficiency of safeguards implementation.

54. Internal evaluation of the effectiveness of safeguards implementation was performed through peer reviews of annual implementation plans and State evaluation reports. In 2019, 21 annual implementation plans were reviewed. In addition, the State evaluation of five States was peer reviewed by ad-hoc departmental teams. In the second part of the year, preparatory work commenced on expanding the scope of the reviews of annual implementation plans in 2020.


55. Member State Support Programmes (MSSPs) and the Standing Advisory Group on Safeguards Implementation (SAGSI) continued to make substantial contributions to Agency safeguards through the provision of assistance and advice, respectively.

²⁴ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Guatemala, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Thailand, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda and Vanuatu.

²⁵ Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

²⁶ United Kingdom.

Fact box 2. Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of safeguards



B.6. Safeguards expenditures and resources

56. During 2019, the activities of Major Programme 4 — Nuclear Verification — were funded from various sources — primarily through the Regular Budget and extrabudgetary contributions. The Regular Budget appropriation of €145.3 (€142.0) million²⁸ for 2019 was adjusted to €142.9 (€138.7) million at the United Nations operational average rate of exchange for the year. Figure 1 presents the nominal budget growth²⁹ for the period 2015–2019 by comparing the growth of the final budget³⁰ to the growth of the approved budget³¹.

²⁷ The States with SQPs in force based on the revised standard text are: Afghanistan, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Guatemala, Holy See, Honduras, Iceland, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Togo, Tonga, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu and Zimbabwe. In addition, the SQP to the safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/366 between the United States of America and the Agency pursuant to Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco and the SQP to the safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/718 between France, EURATOM and the Agency pursuant to Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco were amended.

²⁸ At an exchange rate €1=\$1, excluding Major Capital Investment Fund.

²⁹ As per GC(60)/2, it includes the gradual integration in the Regular Budget of €5.2 million allocated during the period 2017–2019 for the Agency's verification and monitoring of Iran's nuclear-related commitments under the JCPOA, in light of the United Nations Security Council resolution 2231 (2015).

³⁰ Represents the operational portion of the Regular Budget appropriation as represented in the annual Agency's Financial Statements, including the effects of the price adjustment and the recalculation of the Regular Budget portion of US dollars at the United Nations operational average rate of exchange for the year.

³¹ Represents the Regular Budget approved by the Agency's policy-making organs excluding the effects of price adjustment and currency revaluation.




Figure 1. Nominal budget growth of the Regular Budget, 2015–2019 (base 2015=0%)

57. The expenditures for Major Programme 4 were €142.9 (€138.6) million from the Regular Budget, an increase of 3.1%, compared with 2018. The Regular Budget utilization rate for 2019 was 100% (100%) with an unspent balance of €20 thousand at the end of the year. Figure 2 shows the utilization trend of Major Programme 4 for the period 2015–2019.




Figure 2. Major Programme 4 — Nuclear Verification — budget and expenditures, 2015–2019

58. The expenditures³² from the extrabudgetary contributions were €20.2 (€18.9) million, an increase of 7% compared with 2018. This increase resulted mainly from the upgrade and maintenance activities of the safeguards information technology system.

B.7. Status of safeguards agreements (as of 31 December 2019)

59. This section contains information — presented in the five tables below — on safeguards agreements that provide the basis for the Agency's implementation of safeguards in 2019. It does not include agreements under which the application of safeguards has been suspended in the light of implementation of safeguards pursuant to another agreement. For full details, see the Agency's website: <http://www.iaea.org>.

³² Including Programme Support Costs.

Table 1 – States with comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols in force

State	SQP	INFCIRC	Additional protocol (date of entry into force)
Afghanistan	X(A)	257	19 July 2005
Albania		359	03 November 2010
Andorra	X(A)	808	19 December 2011
Angola	X(A)	800	28 April 2010
Antigua and Barbuda	X(A)	528	15 November 2013
Armenia		455	28 June 2004
Australia		217	12 December 1997
Austria		193	30 April 2004
Azerbaijan		580	29 November 2000
Bahrain	X(A)	767	20 July 2011
Bangladesh		301	30 March 2001
Belgium		193	30 April 2004
Benin	X(A)	930	17 September 2019
Bosnia and Herzegovina		851	03 July 2013
Botswana		694	24 August 2006
Bulgaria⁽¹⁾		193	01 May 2009
Burkina Faso	X(A)	618	17 April 2003
Burundi	X(A)	719	27 September 2007
Cambodia	X(A)	586	24 April 2015
Cameroon	X(A)	641	29 September 2016
Canada		164	08 September 2000
Central African Republic	X(A)	777	07 September 2009
Chad	X(A)	802	13 May 2010
Chile		476	03 November 2003
Colombia		306	05 March 2009
Comoros	X(A)	752	20 January 2009
Congo	X(A)	831	28 October 2011
Costa Rica	X(A)	278	17 June 2011
Côte d'Ivoire		309	05 May 2016
Croatia⁽¹⁾		193	01 April 2017
Cuba		633	03 June 2004
Cyprus⁽¹⁾		193	01 May 2008
Czech Republic⁽¹⁾		193	01 October 2009
Democratic Republic of the Congo		183	09 April 2003
Denmark⁽²⁾		193 176	30 April 2004 22 March 2013
Djibouti	X(A)	884	26 May 2015
Dominican Republic	X(A)	201	05 May 2010
Ecuador	X(A)	231	24 October 2001
El Salvador	X(A)	232	24 May 2004
Estonia⁽¹⁾		193	01 December 2005
Eswatini	X(A)	227	08 September 2010

State	SQP	INFCIRC	Additional protocol (date of entry into force)
Ethiopia	X(A)	261	18 September 2019
Fiji	X	192	14 July 2006
Finland		193	30 April 2004
Gabon	X(A)	792	25 March 2010
Gambia	X(A)	277	18 October 2011
Georgia		617	03 June 2003
Germany		193	30 April 2004
Ghana		226	11 June 2004
Greece		193	30 April 2004
Guatemala	X(A)	299	28 May 2008
Haiti	X	681	09 March 2006
Holy See	X(A)	187	24 September 1998
Honduras	X(A)	235	17 November 2017
Hungary⁽¹⁾		193	01 July 2007
Iceland	X(A)	215	12 September 2003
Indonesia		283	29 September 1999
Iraq		172	10 October 2012
Ireland		193	30 April 2004
Italy		193	30 April 2004
Jamaica		265	19 March 2003
Japan		255	16 December 1999
Jordan		258	28 July 1998
Kazakhstan		504	09 May 2007
Kenya	X(A)	778	18 September 2009
Korea, Republic of		236	19 February 2004
Kuwait	X(A)	607	02 June 2003
Kyrgyzstan	X	629	10 November 2011
Latvia⁽¹⁾		193	01 October 2008
Lesotho	X(A)	199	26 April 2010
Liberia	X(A)	927	10 December 2018
Libya		282	11 August 2006
Liechtenstein		275	25 November 2015
Lithuania⁽¹⁾		193	01 January 2008
Luxembourg		193	30 April 2004
Madagascar	X(A)	200	18 September 2003
Malawi	X(A)	409	26 July 2007
Mali	X(A)	615	12 September 2002
Malta⁽¹⁾		193	01 July 2007
Marshall Islands		653	03 May 2005
Mauritania	X(A)	788	10 December 2009
Mauritius	X(A)	190	17 December 2007
Mexico		197	04 March 2011

State	SQP	INFCIRC	Additional protocol (date of entry into force)
Monaco	X(A)	524	30 September 1999
Mongolia	X	188	12 May 2003
Montenegro	X(A)	814	04 March 2011
Morocco		228	21 April 2011
Mozambique	X(A)	813	01 March 2011
Namibia	X	551	20 February 2012
Netherlands⁽³⁾		193	30 April 2004
New Zealand⁽⁴⁾	X(A)	185	24 September 1998
Nicaragua	X(A)	246	18 February 2005
Niger		664	02 May 2007
Nigeria		358	04 April 2007
North Macedonia	X(A)	610	11 May 2007
Norway		177	16 May 2000
Palau	X(A)	650	13 May 2005
Panama	X(A)	316	11 December 2001
Paraguay	X(A)	279	15 September 2004
Peru		273	23 July 2001
Philippines		216	26 February 2010
Poland⁽¹⁾		193	01 March 2007
Portugal		193	30 April 2004
Republic of Moldova	X(A)	690	01 June 2012
Romania⁽¹⁾		193	01 May 2010
Rwanda	X(A)	801	17 May 2010
Saint Kitts and Nevis	X(A)	514	19 May 2014
Senegal	X(A)	276	24 July 2017
Serbia		204	17 September 2018
Seychelles	X(A)	635	13 October 2004
Singapore	X(A)	259	31 March 2008
Slovakia⁽¹⁾		193	01 December 2005
Slovenia⁽¹⁾		193	01 September 2006
South Africa		394	13 September 2002
Spain		193	30 April 2004
Sweden		193	30 April 2004
Switzerland		264	01 February 2005
Tajikistan		639	14 December 2004
Thailand		241	17 November 2017
Togo	X(A)	840	18 July 2012
Turkey		295	17 July 2001
Turkmenistan		673	03 January 2006
Uganda	X(A)	674	14 February 2006
Ukraine		550	24 January 2006
United Arab Emirates		622	20 December 2010

State	SQP	INFCIRC	Additional protocol (date of entry into force)
United Republic of Tanzania	X(A)	643	07 February 2005
Uruguay		157	30 April 2004
Uzbekistan		508	21 December 1998
Vanuatu	X(A)	852	21 May 2013
Viet Nam		376	17 September 2012
<p>General Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In addition, safeguards, including the measures of the Model Additional Protocol, were applied for Taiwan, China. ▪ The safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/193 is that concluded between the non-nuclear-weapon States of the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM), EURATOM and the Agency. ▪ ‘X’ in the ‘SQP’ column indicates that the State has an operative SQP. ‘X(A)’ indicates that the SQP in force is based on the revised SQP standard text (see Section B, paragraph 6). <p>Table Notes:</p> <p>(1) The date refers to accession to INFCIRC/193 and INFCIRC/193/Add.8.</p> <p>(2) The application of safeguards in Denmark under the bilateral NPT safeguards agreement (INFCIRC/176), in force since 1 March 1972, was suspended on 21 February 1977, on which date the safeguards agreement between the non-nuclear-weapon States of EURATOM, EURATOM and the Agency (INFCIRC/193) entered into force for Denmark. Since 21 February 1977, INFCIRC/193 also applies to the Faroe Islands. Upon Greenland’s secession from EURATOM as of 31 January 1985, the agreement between the Agency and Denmark (INFCIRC/176) re-entered into force for Greenland. The additional protocol to this agreement entered into force on 22 March 2013 (INFCIRC/176/Add.1).</p> <p>(3) The safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/229 with regard to the Caribbean part of the Netherlands (the islands of Bonaire, Sint Eustatius, and Saba), Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten is pursuant to the NPT and Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. There is an SQP to this agreement. No additional protocol is in force for that agreement.</p> <p>(4) The safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/185 is also applicable to the Cook Islands and Niue. The amended SQP reproduced in INFCIRC/185/Mod.1 and the additional protocol reproduced in INFCIRC/185/Add.1, however, are not applicable to the Cook Islands and Niue.</p>			

Table 2 – States with comprehensive safeguards agreements but no additional protocols in force

State	SQP	INFCIRC	Additional protocol
Algeria		531	Signed: 16 February 2018
Argentina		435	
Bahamas	X(A)	544	
Barbados	X	527	
Belarus		495	Signed: 15 November 2005
Belize	X	532	
Bhutan	X	371	
Bolivia, Plurinational State of	X	465	Signed: 18 September 2019
Brazil		435	
Brunei Darussalam	X	365	
Democratic People’s Republic of Korea⁽¹⁾		403	
Dominica	X	513	
Egypt		302	
Grenada	X	525	
Guyana	X	543	

State	SQP	INFCIRC	Additional protocol
Iran, Islamic Republic of⁽²⁾		214	Signed: 18 December 2003
Kiribati	X	390	Signed: 09 November 2004
Lao People's Democratic Republic	X	599	Signed: 05 November 2014
Lebanon	X(A)	191	
Malaysia		182	Signed: 22 November 2005
Maldives	X	253	
Myanmar	X	477	Signed: 17 September 2013
Nauru	X	317	
Nepal	X	186	
Oman	X	691	
Papua New Guinea	X(A)	312	
Qatar	X(A)	747	
Saint Lucia	X	379	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	X	400	
Samoa	X	268	
San Marino	X(A)	575	
Saudi Arabia	X	746	
Sierra Leone	X	787	
Solomon Islands	X	420	
Sri Lanka		320	Approved: 12 September 2018
Sudan	X	245	
Suriname	X	269	
Syrian Arab Republic		407	
Tonga	X(A)	426	
Trinidad and Tobago	X	414	
Tunisia		381	Signed: 24 May 2005
Tuvalu	X	391	
Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of		300	
Yemen	X	614	
Zambia	X	456	Signed: 13 May 2009
Zimbabwe	X(A)	483	

General Notes:

- The safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/435 is that concluded between Argentina, Brazil, the Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Material (ABACC) and the Agency.
- 'X' in the 'SQP' column indicates that the State has an operative SQP. 'X(A)' indicates that the SQP in force is based on the revised SQP standard text (see Section B, paragraph 6).

Table Notes:

- (1) In a letter to the Director General dated 10 January 2003, the DPRK stated that the Government had "decided to lift the moratorium on the effectiveness of its withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" and that "its decision to withdraw from the Treaty will come into effect from 11 January 2003 onwards."
- (2) On 16 January 2016, as notified in its letter to the Director General of 7 January 2016, Iran began to provisionally apply its additional protocol in accordance with Article 17(b) of the Additional Protocol, pending its entry into force.

Table 3 – States Parties to the NPT without comprehensive safeguards agreements in force

States Parties to the NPT	SQP	Safeguards agreement	Additional protocol
Cabo Verde	X(A)	Signed: 28 June 2005	Signed: 28 June 2005
Equatorial Guinea	X	Approved: 13 June 1986	
Eritrea			
Guinea	X(A)	Signed: 13 December 2011	Signed: 13 December 2011
Guinea-Bissau	X(A)	Signed: 21 June 2013	Signed: 21 June 2013
Micronesia, Federated States of	X(A)	Signed: 01 June 2015	
Sao Tome and Principe	X(A)	Approved: 21 November 2019	Approved: 21 November 2019
Somalia			
State of Palestine⁽¹⁾	X(A)	Signed: 14 June 2019	
Timor-Leste	X(A)	Signed: 06 October 2009	Signed: 06 October 2009
<p>General Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ‘X’ in the ‘SQP’ column indicates that the State has an SQP. ‘X(A)’ indicates that the SQP is based on the revised SQP standard text (see Section B, paragraph 6). In both cases, the SQP will come into force at the same time as the safeguards agreement. <p>Table Note:</p> <p>(1) The designation employed does not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever concerning the legal status of any country or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.</p>			

Table 4 – States with safeguards agreements based on INFCIRC/66/Rev.2 in force

State	INFCIRC	Additional protocol
India	754	In force: 25 July 2014
Israel	249/Add.1	
Pakistan	34	
	116	
	135	
	239	
	248	
	393	
	418	
	705	
	816	
	920	

Table 5 – States with voluntary offer agreements and additional protocols in force

State	INFCIRC	Additional protocol
China	369	In force: 28 March 2002
France⁽¹⁾	290	In force: 30 April 2004
Russian Federation	327	In force: 16 October 2007
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland^{(2), (3), (4)}	263	In force: 30 April 2004
United States of America⁽⁵⁾	288	In force: 06 January 2009

Table Notes:

- (1) The safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/718 between France, EURATOM and the Agency is pursuant to Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. There is an SQP to this agreement. The SQP was amended. No additional protocol to that agreement has been concluded.
- (2) The safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/175, which remains in force, is an INFCIRC/66/Rev.2-type safeguards agreement, concluded between the United Kingdom and the Agency.
- (3) The safeguards agreement between the United Kingdom, EURATOM and the Agency pursuant to Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco was signed but has not entered into force. There is an SQP to this agreement. No additional protocol to that agreement has been concluded.
- (4) The safeguards agreement between the United Kingdom and the Agency for the applications of safeguards in the United Kingdom in connection with the NPT and the additional protocol thereto were signed but have not entered into force.
- (5) The safeguards agreement reproduced in INFCIRC/366 between the United States of America and the Agency is pursuant to Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. There is an SQP to this agreement. The SQP was amended. No additional protocol to that agreement has been concluded.