For at least eighteen months, experts and pundits have focused on the forthcoming Iran nuclear deal in endless detail. Since Iran’s nuclear activities have been the subject of debate for more than a decade, there is certainly no shortage of views on how to resolve the nuclear issue. These have often focused on specific technical or legal details rather than broader security considerations. But it is becoming increasingly obvious that the views of Iran’s neighbors, and regional security considerations, could influence the long-term success of the deal.

The PIR Center’s recently published report, “Iran in the Regional and Global Perspective” offers a fresh twist on advice for negotiators as they continue their work on an agreement. As a compilation of articles by experts who met in Bangkok, Moscow and Washington, D.C. in 2014 to explore prerequisites for longer term solutions for strengthening nonproliferation in the Middle East, this new report provides insights from an often overlooked regional perspective. In addition to individual analyses (from, for example, Turkish, UAE, Azerbaijani, and Egyptian experts), the report contains findings from a U.S.-Russian working group on Iran. Particularly highlights include a very useful analysis of EU sanctions that will help even experienced sanctions watchers understand how European sanctions might be lifted and Pakistani and Indian views on the role of confidence-building measures. The conclusions highlight the need for long-term measures on Iran’s nuclear program: adherence by states in the Middle East to the comprehensive test ban treaty (CTBT), a regional nuclear fuel cycle use for Iran’s enrichment capability, and a regional agreement banning the use or threat of force (including cyberattacks) on nuclear facilities. In addition, military and non-military confidence-building measures (CBMs) should be developed.

The authors of the report stress that it would be counterproductive to have regional powers at the negotiating table now but that a long-term solution will certainly have to take regional security considerations into account. While the diversity of views in this report will surprise some, the opportunity to reflect on these differences moving forward is a vital contribution to a debate that doubtlessly will continue for some time.