

REQ MUN 2025 EDITION 2.0

DISEC

AGENDA-Strengthening the Enforcement
Mechanisms of Non-Proliferation Regimes in the
Context of Contemporary Geopolitical
Developments

Letter from the Executive Board

Dear Delegates! We are very pleased to welcome you to the simulation of the UNGA: DISEC at REQ MUN 2025. It will be an honour to serve as your Executive Board for the duration of the conference. This Background Guide is designed to give you an insight into the case at hand. Please refer to it carefully. Remember, a thorough understanding of the problem is the first step to solving it.

However, bear in mind that this Background Guide is in no way exhaustive and is only meant to provide you with enough background information to establish a platform for beginning the research. Delegates are highly recommended to do a good amount of research beyond what is covered in the Guide. The guide cannot be used as proof during the committee proceedings under any circumstances.

Finally, we would like to wish you luck in your preparation. In case you have any questions, procedural or otherwise, please feel free to direct them to any member of the Executive Board and we will get back to you as soon as possible. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any queries or concerns. We expect all delegates to be well-versed with the various nuances of the agenda and geared up for an intense debate, deliberations, and great fun.

Looking forward to meeting you at the conference!

Regards

CHAIR- SUHAS ITHA

VICE CHAIR- T Navneet Reddy

RAPPO- Banda Sai Karthik

Important Points to Remember

A few aspects that delegates should keep in mind while preparing:

Procedure:

The purpose of putting in procedural rules in any committee is to ensure a more organized and efficient debate. The committee will follow the UNA USA Rules of Procedure. Although the Executive Board shall be fairly strict with the Rules of Procedure, the discussion of the agenda will be the main priority. So, delegates are advised not to restrict their statements due to hesitation regarding the procedure. Foreign Policy: Following the foreign policy of one's country is the most important aspect of a Model UN Conference. This is what essentially differentiates a Model UN from other debating formats. To violate one's foreign policy without adequate reason is one of the worst mistakes a delegate can make.

Role of the Executive Board:

The Executive Board is appointed to facilitate debate. The committee shall decide the direction and flow of the debate. The delegates are the ones who constitute the committee and hence must be uninhibited while presenting their opinions/stances on any issue. However, the Executive Board may put forward questions and/or ask for clarifications at all points in time to further debate and test participants.

Nature of Source/Evidence:

This Background Guide is meant solely for research purposes and must not be cited as evidence to substantiate statements made during the conference. Evidence or proof for substantiating statements made during formal debate is acceptable from the following sources:

- a. United Nations: Documents and findings by the United Nations or any related UN body are held as credible proof to support a claim or argument. Multilateral Organizations: Documents from international organizations like OIC, NAFTA, SAARC, BRICS, EU, ASEAN, the International Court of Justice, etc. may also be presented as credible sources of information.
- b. Government Reports: These reports can be used in a similar way as the State Operated News Agencies reports and can, in all circumstances, be denied by another country.
- c. News Sources:
 1. Reuters: Any Reuters article that makes mention of the fact or is in contradiction of the fact being stated by a delegate in the council.

2. State-operated News Agencies: These reports can be used in support of or against the State that owns the News Agency. These reports, if credible or substantial enough, can be used in support of or against any country as such but in that situation, may be denied by any other country in the council. Some examples are – RIA Novosti (Russian Federation), Xinhua News Agency (People’s Republic of China), etc.

***Please Note: Reports from NGOs working with UNESCO, UNICEF and other UN bodies will be accepted. Under no circumstances will sources like Wikipedia, or newspapers like the Guardian, Times of India, etc. be accepted. However, notwithstanding the criteria for acceptance of sources and evidence, delegates are still free to quote/cite from any source as they deem fit as a part of their statements.

Introduction to the Committee

The United Nations General Assembly is one of the six important organs of the United Nations (UN), and the primary deliberative, strategy making and representative organ of the UN. The first committee of the General Assembly is the Disarmament and International Security Committee. It deals with disarmament, global challenges and threats to peace that affect the international community and seeks out solutions to the challenges in the international security regime.

The Mandate of DISEC

The committee considers all disarmament and international security matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any other organ of the United Nations; the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, as well as principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments; promotion of cooperative arrangements and measures aimed at strengthening stability through lower levels of armaments. The Committee works in close cooperation with the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament. It is the only Main Committee of the General Assembly entitled to verbatim records coverage.

Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) :

Just after world war two and the devastating impacts humanity has faced due to the war were evident in many countries across the globe. But one particular aspect was horrific enough that it reshaped the views that people had on modern military technology. The nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was a live example of this particular military advancement. This incident was enough for countries to go on high alert to moderate these potential “threat to humanity weapons”.

The P5 countries were the 1st to take initiative to do the same. On July 1 1968 NPT was open for signatures and entered into force on March 5 1970. As of today 191 states are parties of the NPT.

NPT is based on 3 key principles : prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, pursue nuclear disarmament and enable peaceful uses of nuclear energy under safeguards.

It is designed in a particular “ Nuclear weapon states “(NWS) and “ Non Nuclear weapon states ” manner(NNWS) . NWS are the p5 countries which will be in possession of all the nuclear weapons according to NPT and NNWS do not get to hold nuclear weapons or disarm their nuclear arsenal by either giving them to NWS or using the nuclear energy in peaceful methods. This part of the NPT was criticized by many countries and leaders as it gives unfair advantage and power to NWS and makes NNWS incapable of self defence in a critical scenarios. Which is why only 191 countries are part of it and 4 never agreed and one backed out.

India, Pakistan, Israel, South Sudan are non members of NPT and have always expressed their disagreement with the terms of the treaty. North Korea however backed out in 2003 as article 10 of NPT states that member countries can withdraw from the treaty under specific conditions.

NPT also has regular periodic check systems in place in the form of preparatory committees and review conferences which play a vital role in ensuring accountability and defining new military advancements making moderation more convenient.

Although the treaty lacks direct enforcement mechanisms when Parties violate terms and can not ban nuclear weapons outright it encourages denuclearisation and peace. It also strongly believes in peaceful utilisation of nuclear energy and also allows peaceful IAEA cooperation to achieve the goal of non Violent nuclear trade and monitoring misuse.

Arms Trade Treaty-

This ATT Issue Brief outlines the different ways in which ineffective end-use/r controls – in particular, the use of documentation – facilitates the diversion of conventional arms. It identifies ways in which states may seek to strengthen existing systems in order to implement the ATT's diversion-prevention and related provisions more effectively. Specifically, this brief is intended to inform discussions within the ATT WGETI's Sub-Working Group on Exchange of National

Implementation Practices, given its ongoing work on national import controls, and future deliberations on intersecting issues. This is the sixth ATT Issue Brief prepared by the research consortium of UNIDIR, Conflict Armament Research (CAR) and the Stimson Center. It is part of a series that seeks to strengthen shared understanding on the impact of the ATT in addressing diversion and to identify effective measures and options to further promote effective policies and practices under the Treaty.

This ATT Issue Brief draws on extensive previous research by the consortium; relevant documents developed by ATT states parties to support effective treaty implementation; instruments and guidance documents developed by states at the regional level; and relevant publications by international, regional and nongovernmental organizations. It includes an analysis of relevant information contained in publicly available initial reports on ATT implementation from 70 states parties.

Small Arms and Light Weapons Convention

In light of growing awareness that the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of and the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons (SALW) was undermining human security and development around the world, the United Nations convened a Conference on the Illicit Trade of Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects in July 2001 to consider steps that could be taken to address the issue.

The result of this conference was the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (PoA), through which UN Member States agree to a series of politically binding commitments at the national, the regional and the global level to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in SALW in all its aspects as a contribution to international peace and security. As part of the follow up contemplated in the PoA, a feasibility study was conducted by a Group of Governmental Experts on Tracing Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons to examine the feasibility of developing an international instrument to enable states to identify and trace in a timely and reliable manner illicit SALW. The Group met three times, between July 2002 and June 2003, before issuing its report in July 2003 concluding that it was both desirable and feasible to develop an international tracing instrument to be negotiated under UN auspices.

This ultimately led to the adoption of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons in December 2005. The International Tracing Instrument (ITI) was negotiated within the framework of the PoA and contains politically binding commitments that build on the marking, record-keeping and tracing provisions in the PoA. Its provisions also consolidate and reinforce key international standards in the areas of marking and record-keeping, and enhance existing norms in the area of tracing cooperation.

Under the ITI, states have agreed to meet on a biennial basis within the framework of biennial meetings convened for the PoA, and to review implementation and future development of the Instrument within the framework of PoA review conferences.⁶ Accordingly, the two instruments and the processes governing their review and development are closely linked.

Conflicts that have put proliferation at risk:-

CASE STUDIES

WARNING: It is to be noted that these case studies merely serve as a reading to understand the global standing of these conflicts and do not intend to convey that the Disec has the power to look over some of these issues

Israel Palestine conflict-

The Palestinian militant group Hamas launched an unprecedented assault on Israel on 7 October, with hundreds of gunmen infiltrating communities near the Gaza Strip. About 1,200 people were killed, while the Israeli military says more than 200 soldiers and civilians, including women and children, were taken to Gaza as hostages. More than 14,000 Palestinians in Gaza have been killed in air and artillery strikes carried out by the Israeli military in response, according to the Hamas-run health ministry in Gaza. The Israel-Palestine conflict has been a longstanding and deeply entrenched issue, fueled by historical, political, ethnic, and religious factors. In 2023, the conflict continued to escalate with both sides engaging in violent acts and retaliations. The year 2023 saw an increase in tensions and violence between Israelis and Palestinians in the ongoing conflict. According to reports, there were multiple incidents of violence throughout the year, which further exacerbated the already strained relationship between the two sides. These incidents included clashes between Israeli security forces and Palestinian protesters, as well as retaliatory attacks from both sides.

The conflict in 2023 was marked by a series of suicide bombings and rocket attacks carried out by Palestinian militants targeting Israeli civilians. These attacks led to loss of life and heightened fear and insecurity among the Israeli population. On the Jewish sabbath day, the conclusion of the week-long Sukkot festival, and the day following the 50th anniversary of the Yom Kippur War. It saw the launch of Operation al Aqsa Flood by Hamas and other Palestinian armed groups. This concerted attack involved air and ground strikes against several Israeli border areas. A major rocket-based air assault was launched at 6 a.m. against the coastal towns of Ashdod and Ashkelon, as well as as far north as Tel Aviv, which is situated around 70 km north of Gaza. Three to five thousand rockets are thought to have been launched on that first day.

The international community continued to closely monitor the situation and urged both parties to engage in peaceful dialogue and find a lasting solution. While efforts were made by international actors to facilitate peace talks, the deep-rooted grievances and mistrust between Israelis and Palestinians hindered progress toward a resolution. Furthermore, the conflict in 2023 also saw an

increase in incursions, settlement expansions, and border breaches. An estimated 1,000 Hamas terrorists were involved in such breaches. Israel launched a surprise invasion on October 8, 2023, declaring war, bombarding Gaza, and fighting to drive out Hamas troops.

Just three of the seven designated border crossings in Gaza are now in use. According to reports, Hamas had first broken through the boundaries by sending special fighters in through hang gliders. Once inside, the militants demolished the walls and electric gates with explosives. Then, according to reports, bulldozers were employed in a few locations to make room for more fighters to enter Israel. After the entry attack, terrorists stormed the southern Gaza headquarters of the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) and took control of several military and police buildings. The IDF was caught by surprise by Hamas, allowing its forces to swiftly cross the border and advance up to 14 miles beyond it. Hundreds of Israeli policemen and civilians were killed and abducted by other terrorists who targeted towns, kibbutzim, and roadways.

Near Re'im, at the location of a music event, Israeli authorities found at least 260 dead near the spot where Hamas terrorists had broken through the security wire. There were reportedly 130 hostages transferred to Gaza. It has been over 50 days since the abrupt escalation of attacks. Israel has placed a total siege on the region, cutting off water and electricity, and food and medication supplies are rapidly running out. Meanwhile, Gaza's lone power plant has shut down due to a lack of fuel. Desalination and waste-water treatment facilities have been forced to close because to the blackout, further jeopardizing the availability of clean drinking water. Although the Israeli military has claimed that it is solely targeting weapons storage facilities and infrastructure utilized or seized by Hamas fighters, Israeli airstrikes have destroyed homes, schools, and mosques.

Nonetheless, a large number of civilian casualties have been caused by Israeli airstrikes that target residential buildings and medical facilities. UN Secretary-General António Guterres declared that the situation in Gaza has descended into a "catastrophe" following Hamas's onslaught. As of November 10, Israel's reprisal has killed at least 11,070 individuals, two-thirds of them women and children, and about 2,650 more have been reported missing, according to the Hamas-controlled Gaza Health Ministry. Although these estimates could not be independently confirmed, other sources have also reported thousands of deaths. In addition, over a hundred UN staff members have been slain, along with at least forty journalists and media personnel.

Approximately 1,200 Israelis were murdered in the Hamas attack, with 70% of them being civilians. In conclusion, the Israel-Palestine conflict remains an enduring and multifaceted struggle, marked by deep-seated historical grievances, territorial disputes, and competing national aspirations. Decades of intermittent violence failed peace initiatives, and unresolved core issues continue to perpetuate the cycle of suffering for both Israelis and Palestinians.

Achieving a lasting and just resolution demands concerted efforts, genuine dialogue, and a commitment from all parties involved, considering the complexities of the conflict's humanitarian, political, and territorial dimensions. The pursuit of peace, mutual recognition, respect for human rights, and a shared vision for coexistence remain imperative for a sustainable and peaceful future for both nations.

Iran and the JCPOA

JCPOA Timeline

Before the JCPOA (Pre-2015)

- 2006-2013: Early Negotiations & Rising Tensions
 - Iran's nuclear program raises international concerns, leading to UN sanctions starting in 2006
 - Diplomatic talks between Iran and the P5+1 (U.S., UK, France, Russia, China, Germany) begin, but no significant progress
 - In 2013, Iranian President Hassan Rouhani was elected, signaling a shift towards diplomacy
- November 24, 2013: Geneva Interim Agreement (JPA)
 - The Joint Plan of Action (JPA) is signed, temporarily freezing certain aspects of Iran's nuclear program in exchange for some sanctions relief. This agreement buys time for further negotiations

2015: The JCPOA Agreement

- April 2, 2015: Framework Agreement
 - The framework agreement is reached, outlining the broad terms of a potential nuclear deal. Iran agrees to limit its nuclear activities, and the P5+1 agrees to lift nuclear-related sanctions
- July 14, 2015: Final JCPOA Agreement Signed
 - The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) is officially signed. The deal:
 - Limits Iran's nuclear program (uranium enrichment, centrifuges, etc.).
 - Lifts nuclear-related sanctions on Iran
 - Subjects Iran's nuclear facilities to rigorous monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

- October 18, 2015: Implementation Day
 - Iran meets key conditions (e.g., reducing uranium stockpiles), and the IAEA verifies compliance. This marks the formal start of sanctions relief under the JCPOA

Post-JCPOA (2016-2018)

- January 16, 2016: Sanctions Relief
 - Following Iran's compliance, the U.S. and EU begin lifting major sanctions, allowing Iran to re-enter the global economy
- 2017: Iran's Continued Compliance
 - The IAEA verifies that Iran continues to abide by the nuclear restrictions set by the JCPOA

2018: U.S. Withdrawal

- May 8, 2018: U.S. Withdraws from the JCPOA
 - President Donald Trump announces that the U.S. is unilaterally withdrawing from the JCPOA, citing Iran's missile development and regional activities as violations of the agreement's broader spirit
 - The U.S. reinstates nuclear-related sanctions on Iran, including secondary sanctions on companies and countries dealing with Iran
- May 2018-May 2019: Iran Reduces Its Commitments
 - In response to the U.S. withdrawal, Iran begins gradually scaling back its nuclear commitments, exceeding limits on uranium enrichment and stockpiles

2019-2020: Rising Tensions

- January 2020: Tensions Escalate
 - A U.S. drone strike kills Qasem Soleimani, a top Iranian general, escalating tensions between the two countries.
 - Iran further reduces its JCPOA commitments, including enriching uranium beyond the agreed limits

2021: Attempt to Revive the JCPOA

- January 20, 2021: Biden Takes Office
 - U.S. President Joe Biden signals a willingness to return to the JCPOA if Iran also complies with its terms. The Biden administration seeks a diplomatic solution to rejoin the deal
- April 2021: Vienna Talks Begin
 - Negotiations between the U.S., Iran, and the remaining JCPOA parties (P5+1) start in Vienna to revive the deal. These talks focus on how to reinstate U.S. participation and lift sanctions

2022-Present: Stalled Negotiations and Nuclear Progress

- 2022: Stalled Negotiations
 - Talks to revive the JCPOA stall, with significant differences between Iran and the U.S. over the terms of a new agreement. Iran continues its nuclear advancements, enriching uranium to higher levels
- 2023-2024: Ongoing Tensions

The JCPOA is effectively in a suspended state, with limited progress in negotiations. Both sides are engaged in diplomatic efforts, but challenges persist, including Iran's regional activities and missile program.

The Red Sea-

Current Situation in Red Sea

The Red Sea has recently experienced a huge surge in regional tensions due to increased attacks by pirates on many commercial ships/vessels. The attacks are mostly concentrated near the Bab Al-Mandab strait causing significant losses to both time and money due to rerouting of ships. These attacks are a part of larger geopolitical conflicts affecting this vital route. According to analysts the commercial fleet movement through the Suez Canal into the Red Sea fell by more than 60% from December 18th to January 7th compared to the same period last year.

The number of TEU's or twenty-foot equivalent units fell from 3.3 million to just under 1.3 million in the matter of 3 weeks as the shipping vessels have opted for a safe passage by circling around Africa to get to Asia. The passage while safer is very long and costly leading to more fuel bills and ultimately the increased price of goods.

Houthi rebels, an Iran backed group operating in Yemen are said to be behind the ongoing crisis in the Red Sea. The Houthis are said to be launching missiles randomly in the Red Sea at commercial vessels as a response to Israel's war in Gaza, as their way to “alert” or remind the world about Israel’s war crimes in Gaza.

The United States and the United Kingdom have also conducted strikes on the group aimed at degrading their military capabilities but it had virtually no impact as the rebel group conducted more strikes on the commercial vessels soon after. In addition to all these, piracy has once again increased in the Red Sea and horn of Africa region from late 2023, as Somali pirates have been hijacking vessels at a scale never seen before, though the swift action by the Indian Navy has resulted in the capturing of pirates and freeing the fisherman.

The Red Sea connects the Mediterranean Sea to the Arabian Sea and Indian Ocean through the Suez Canal and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait. This route is vital for shipping, including oil and goods traveling between Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. Because of this, whoever controls parts of the Red Sea can influence global trade and make a lot of money.