

## PREFACE

In developing *Universal Compliance* the authors started from the premise that the United States cannot solve the nuclear proliferation challenge alone. The strategy that will stand the greatest chance of success is one that enjoys the greatest possible degree of international support. And the way to get that support, we believed, was not to tell others what we think are the best policies and urge them to support them, but rather to ask how they would define the challenges, what policies they think would be most effective, and how they would improve upon suggestions we were making. In the end, we, as authors of this document, would have to weigh these inputs and decide what we think are most effective policies, but we wanted to see the problems and solutions from as many angles as possible before we did.

Thus, we designed a demanding four-stage, eighteen-month process to produce this strategy. First, we sketched an initial draft that emphasized premises that should guide a more effective global nuclear nonproliferation strategy, and tentative policy ideas. We set out some of these themes and began consultations at Carnegie's second Moscow International Non-Proliferation Conference in September 2003. We then sent the rough draft to several dozen leading U.S. and international experts and obtained extremely helpful, detailed feedback, plenty of which was critical.

Second, we assimilated these reactions and published a fully designed and bound version of *Universal Compliance*, which had all the markings of a finished product, except the word DRAFT was displayed prominently on the cover. This version of the strategy was released at the Carnegie Endowment's June 2004 International Non-Proliferation

Conference attended by 721 participants from over twenty countries. Over 9,000 copies of the draft report were distributed, with the authors inviting readers to critique the work to help improve the final strategy.

To help ensure consideration and comment on the draft strategy, the authors traveled to China, Egypt, France, Germany, India, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russia, South Korea, Sweden, and Switzerland to brief key officials, think tanks, and larger public audiences. In some of these countries we enjoyed unprecedented access to key officials for sustained discussion and debate of our recommendations. We consulted with nuclear industry representatives in the U.S. and abroad, with International Atomic Energy Agency and UN Conference on Disarmament officials, and with U.S. policy makers. We received numerous important suggestions and more than thirty lengthy, written critiques.

Finally, we reflected on all of this feedback and ensuing international developments and rewrote the strategy document. The significant differences between the draft version and the final product show that the comments received during more than half a year of consultations went far beyond factual corrections. The final report reflects a much deeper understanding of the vital interests that drive various governments' nonproliferation policies—knowledge that is critical if the U.S. is to develop a strategy that commands wide international support. We believe that the process described here represents a valuable model for productive cross-border problem solving. In tenor, presentation, and substance, the final report conveys a level of depth and nuance that would have been difficult, if not impossible, to achieve using a more conventional approach. The document you now hold

represents our best sense of a strategy and related policies that would heed President George W. Bush's injunction that "the nations of the world must do all we can to secure and eliminate nuclear...materials."