

The U.S.-Iran deal is a broad interim framework that combines an immediate ceasefire, naval and trade de-escalation in the Strait of Hormuz, nuclear restraints, sanctions relief, and a promise to negotiate a fuller final agreement within 60 days. It also appears to leave major political and security questions unresolved, especially around missiles, proxy forces, Gaza, and how enforcement would work in practice.

## What the deal covers

At its core, the agreement is a staged peace and de-escalation package, not a final settlement. Reported text says the United States and Iran, along with allied forces in the conflict, commit to an immediate and lasting cessation of military activity across all fronts, including Lebanon. It also says the U.S. will begin removing its naval blockade, with a complete end expected within 30 days, while Iran guarantees safe passage for commercial vessels in the Strait of Hormuz and adjacent waters.

The nuclear section is another major pillar. Iran reportedly reaffirms that it will not acquire or develop nuclear weapons, and both sides agree to determine the fate of enriched material through a mutually agreed process, with the minimum step being down-blending under IAEA supervision. Reporting also says the U.S. will issue waivers for Iranian crude exports and related banking and transport services until sanctions are fully lifted.

A third pillar is economic normalization. The deal reportedly envisions a large reconstruction and development package for Iran, with regional partners helping assemble a fund of at least \$300 billion. In parallel, sanctions relief is described as broad, including U.S. sanctions and even measures associated with the UN Security Council and the IAEA, though the exact sequencing is to be worked out.

## What has been addressed

The agreement does address several of the issues that typically make U.S.-Iran diplomacy collapse. First, it directly tackles military escalation by freezing hostilities and creating a timeline for a wider settlement. Second, it addresses the strategic maritime issue of the Strait of Hormuz, which matters because disruptions there can affect global energy flows and shipping insurance costs.

It also addresses nuclear breakout risk, at least in principle, by putting a non-nuclear commitment on the table and linking enriched material to an IAEA-supervised mechanism. That is significant because earlier Iran nuclear diplomacy focused on verified limits and inspections as a way to buy time and increase transparency. The inclusion of sanctions relief and export waivers is also important because Iran has long insisted that any restraint must be matched by real economic benefit.

The deal even extends to Lebanon, which is notable because the text reportedly includes territorial integrity and sovereignty language for Lebanon and says military activity there should stop too. In other words, this is not framed as only a bilateral U.S.-Iran nuclear understanding; it is written as a wider regional stabilization package.

## What is not covered

The biggest omission is the issue of Iran's regional proxy networks and allied militias. BBC reporting says the memorandum does not mention Iran's connections to regional proxy groups, despite earlier U.S. rhetoric about preventing Iran from arming and funding forces outside its borders. That matters because proxy activity has historically been one of Washington's central concerns, and leaving it out creates a major gap between the deal's ambition and its actual scope.

Another major omission is ballistic missiles and broader military capabilities. The reported text focuses on nuclear weapons, shipping, sanctions, and ceasefire terms, but does not appear to set limits on missile development or procurement. That is a familiar pattern in arms diplomacy: the narrowest workable deal often excludes the most contentious weapons systems, because including everything can make a deal impossible to close.

Gaza is also notably absent from the framework, according to expert commentary cited by the Middle East Institute. That omission is important because Gaza has become a central part of the broader regional conflict environment, and leaving it out may weaken the credibility of any claim that the agreement is a complete regional peace plan. The same criticism applies to broader questions of Israeli-Iranian confrontation, which are not obviously resolved by the memorandum's language alone.

## Why the gaps matter

The missing pieces are not minor technicalities; they go to the heart of whether the deal can last. If the agreement stops war today but does not constrain proxy groups, missile programs, or regional flashpoints, then it may only pause conflict rather than end it. That helps explain why analysts say the text looks stronger on immediate de-escalation than on long-term security architecture.

There is also an enforcement problem. The deal reportedly relies on future negotiations, mutual consent, and phased lifting of restrictions, which means a great deal depends on trust and follow-through. That is a familiar weakness in interim agreements: the easier part is getting both sides to announce principles, while the hard part is verifying compliance and punishing violations.

The economic provisions raise their own questions. A reconstruction fund sounds ambitious,

but it is unclear how binding the financing is, who controls disbursement, and what conditions would trigger payments or pauses. Likewise, broad sanctions relief is politically risky in the U.S. because it can face pushback from Congress, allies, and domestic critics who see it as giving away leverage too early.

## How to read it

The best way to understand the deal is as a ceasefire-plus roadmap, not a comprehensive peace treaty. It addresses the most immediate dangers: shooting, blockade, shipping, and nuclear escalation. But it leaves the most politically explosive issues either vague or untouched: proxies, missiles, Gaza, and the broader balance of power in the region.

That split is likely intentional. Historically, nuclear and security deals with Iran have often focused on a narrow set of verifiable commitments because broader regional questions are harder to settle and easier to sabotage. The present framework appears to follow that logic in reverse: it is broader than a pure nuclear deal, but still not broad enough to settle the full regional conflict.

## Bottom line

The U.S.-Iran deal appears to trade immediate de-escalation and sanctions relief for nuclear restraint, maritime access, and a promise of follow-up negotiations. What it does not yet do is settle the proxy wars, missile issue, Gaza, or the long-term security order of the Middle East. In practice, that means the agreement is significant, but fragile: it may stop a war without fully ending the rivalry that caused it.