



GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/OR.92

12 November 1993

International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL Distr.

GENERAL CONFERENCE

ENGLISH

Original: FRENCH

THIRTY-SEVENTH (1993) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE NINETY-SECOND MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna,
on Thursday, 30 September 1993, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. PEREZ-MARTIN (Cuba)Later: Mr. POSTA (Hungary)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
15 Practical utilization of food irradiation in developing countries	1 - 40
14 Measures to strengthen international co-operation in matters relating to nuclear safety and radiological protection	
(a) Implementation of resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/582	
(iv) The preparation of a nuclear safety convention (paragraph 5) (resumed from meeting 91)	41 - 46
16 Plan for producing potable water economically	47 - 72
17 Strengthening of the Agency's main activities	73 - 111

[*] GC(XXXVII)/1085.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XXXVII)/INF/328/Rev.2.

93-3823 (III)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, in a memorandum and/or incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent to the Division of Languages, International Atomic Energy Agency, Wagramerstrasse 5, P.O. Box 100, A-1400 Vienna, Austria. Corrections should be submitted within three working days of the receipt of the record.

Abbreviations used in this record

ASSET	Analysis of Safety Significant Events Team
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IPERS	International Peer Review Service
NPT	Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
NUSS	Nuclear Safety Standards
OSART	Operational Safety Review Team
R&D	Research and development
RADWASS	Radioactive Waste Safety Standards
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

**PRACTICAL UTILIZATION OF FOOD IRRADIATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
(GC(XXXVI)/RES/588, GC(XXXVII)/1068, GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/125)**

1. Mr. CHO (Republic of Korea), introducing draft resolution GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/125 on behalf of the Group of 77, stressed that the sponsors of the draft had wanted to ensure that the approved action plan contained in document GC(XXXVII)/1068 would be implemented. From the outset, members of the Group of 77 had attached great importance to that project and wanted to indicate just how pleased they were with that document and with the work done by the Secretariat to implement resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/588. They hoped that the programme would continue to be supported by the Agency and all interested Member States so that further progress could be made in the field of food irradiation in order to provide maximum benefit to populations in developing countries. He hoped that other States would come forward as co-sponsors of the draft resolution and that it would be adopted by consensus.

2. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) considered that the contents of the draft resolution provided yet another example of wastage of Agency resources. The Agency had been doing excellent work in the field of food irradiation for the past 30 years or so. It would therefore suffice for the General Conference to commend the work done and leave it up to the Secretariat to continue its task within the framework of its technical assistance activities. He therefore had some reservations about operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, which would only serve to keep the issue needlessly on the General Conference's agenda and require the preparation of an additional report.

3. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America) welcomed the information provided by the Secretariat on the action taken to implement resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/588. His delegation had supported the project proposal developed by the Secretariat and the United States had already provided assistance for fellowship training in that area. He was satisfied with the prudent approach taken by the Secretariat and was mindful of the commercial orientation of the projects planned for specific countries. It was a good idea for the responsibilities of the parties concerned to be clearly identified and understood at the outset.

4. His country shared the wish to secure wholesome food supplies for populations throughout the world and wanted to be added as a co-sponsor to the draft resolution. With regard to the reservations expressed by the representative of Italy on operative paragraph 5, he said he would support any solution that the Committee found acceptable.

5. Mr. ARBOR GONZALEZ (Argentina) had taken note with satisfaction of the action plan presented in document GC(XXXVII)/1068. His delegation had, on numerous occasions, stressed the importance it attached to the promotion of food irradiation, which was an effective and proven method of combating food shortages, food-transmitted diseases and the problems associated with the commercialization of food products.

6. He reiterated his country's support for the Secretariat in that matter and said that Argentina was prepared to co-operate in the implementation of the action plan by placing its irradiation facilities and cobalt-60 sources at the Agency's disposal.

7. Mr. TABET (Algeria) recalled that, with respect to the promotion of food irradiation in developing countries, his country had been among those which had urged the Secretariat to take a global approach when determining which States were interested in food irradiation and in establishing their existing capabilities. A high-quality project had been submitted for consideration by the Board of Governors in June 1993 and had been reproduced again in document GC(XXXVII)/1068. Algeria naturally supported that project and would monitor closely its implementation and gradual extension to developing countries which were interested and which satisfied the criteria and modalities set out in that document.

8. Algeria had not only R&D laboratories, but also a demonstration facility. Experimental programmes, including programmes for potatoes and onions, had been implemented with the Agency's co-operation. In addition, construction of a commercial facility was well under way in spite of delays due to overestimation of costs. Algeria was hoping to receive additional support from the Agency to assist with the management and operation of the commercial irradiation facility, radiation protection and safety aspects associated with the facility and specialized expertise in regulatory matters, including acceptability of the irradiated products and their commercialization. Finally, his Government was planning to request Agency technical assistance, as outlined in paragraph 6 of the

introduction to document GC(XXXVII)/1068, in procuring additional equipment for dose measurement.

9. Mr. OUVRY (Belgium) supported the main objectives and the spirit of the proposed project. He much appreciated the work done by the Secretariat to date and felt that food irradiation should continue to play an important role in the Agency's activities. Belgium therefore wished to add its name as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution. Concerning the objection raised with respect to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, he shared the concern expressed by the representative of Italy that the Agency's work should be rationalized, but was prepared to accept any solution which met with general agreement.

10. Mr. LIU (China) noted that, in implementing resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/588, the Secretariat had prepared a very comprehensive, specific and realistic report on the practical utilization of food irradiation in developing countries and that the report contained an excellent analysis of the current situation and the future outlook.

11. In order to derive the maximum economic benefit from food irradiation in the Beijing region and to promote the technology at national level, the Chinese authorities had allocated funds for the establishment of a food irradiation centre at the Institute of Atomic Energy in Beijing. That Institute met all the criteria laid down in document GOV/2669 for the introduction of food irradiation technology. His Government therefore supported the Institute's request for the establishment of a model technical assistance project which would enable the Beijing food irradiation centre to acquire a demonstration facility and become a training centre for irradiation techniques.

12. China appreciated the work done by the Secretariat to promote the practical utilization of food irradiation in developing countries and hoped that its efforts would result in the provision of specific technical assistance; it intended to co-operate closely with the Agency in that matter.

13. Mr. McRAE (Canada) said that his country was in favour of the implementation of projects in the four countries selected and wanted to have its name added as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution. Having said that, he drew attention to one vital point, namely, the need to make provision for the disposal of radioactive waste. It was an

extremely important element from the safety point of view and should be incorporated in each of the projects envisaged.

14. Mr. JAMEEL (Pakistan) commended the Secretariat on the work it had done over the past year. His country was very interested in food irradiation technology and had done a lot of work in that area. Commercial studies which had been carried out recently in Pakistan had yielded very positive results and he hoped therefore that commercial-scale food irradiation could be introduced in the near future. Pakistan trusted that the Secretariat would continue its activities in that field in view of the fact that they were of interest to a large number of Member States.

15. Mr. RAOUAN (Tunisia) welcomed the work the Agency had done in an area which was of great interest to Member States. Since Tunisia planned to construct a pilot food irradiation plant, it attached great importance to the draft resolution.

16. Mr. OKONKWO (Nigeria), noting that the developing countries were having to feed ever-increasing populations, commended the Secretariat on the efforts it had made to implement resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/588. He was pleased that, according to the report under examination, 36 developing countries - including Nigeria - were deemed to have the necessary potential for the introduction of commercial-scale food irradiation and hoped that closer collaboration could be established, not only with the Agency, but also with other developing countries.

17. His delegation commended the Agency's efforts to enhance food safety. In the medium or long term, restrictions on international trade in irradiated foodstuffs would have to be relaxed in the interests of the populations of the world. Nigeria had established the necessary mechanisms to encourage enterprises to benefit from what had already been done and intended to start discussions with the Secretariat in the near future with a view to obtaining assistance. In conclusion, he hoped that the draft resolution would receive the support it deserved.

18. Mr. MOHAN (India) welcomed the efforts made by the Secretariat in preparing the proposal submitted in document GC(XXXVII)/1068 to the General Conference for its consideration. The Group of 77 had tabled the draft resolution to record its

appreciation and to encourage the Agency to give assistance not only to the four countries identified in the proposed project, but also to other Member States which were interested in that technology and which wished to benefit from it. There was still considerable work to be done in order to implement resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/588 fully and the Secretariat was urged in the draft resolution not to relax its efforts in the coming year.

19. He was of the opinion that operative paragraph 5 should be retained since the preparation of a report was still necessary, at least for the following year. Eventually, it was to be hoped that that programme would be fully integrated into the Agency's activities so that there would be no further need for a report.

20. Mr. BILBAO ALFONSO (Cuba) also commended the Secretariat for the work it had done in promoting the practical utilization of food irradiation in developing countries. His country had, with Agency support, acquired a semi-commercial food irradiation facility, which had enabled it to gain experience of food storage, operation of the facility, control of the process and other aspects. Cuba was willing to share that experience with other countries at regional level by, for example, training staff.

21. Mr. GIOVANSILY (France) thanked the Secretariat for its efforts in implementing irradiation techniques. France supported Agency initiatives in that area and had collaborated in many ways in the programmes undertaken by sending experts, granting extrabudgetary resources, hosting fellowship training, and so on. It intended to develop that type of co-operation because irradiation technology was vital for many countries where food problems were not necessarily associated with production, but rather with distribution and acceptable preservation periods. France therefore supported the draft resolution, which it would like to co-sponsor.

22. Mr. RAZAK (Indonesia) said that his country was very interested in food irradiation technology and irradiation of various products (spices, potatoes, onions, etc.) had been approved in 1987. Two irradiators had been installed in Indonesia for research purposes twenty years previously and, in December 1992, a cobalt-60 irradiator was inaugurated. The major outstanding problem was public acceptance and special attention needed to be given to the legal aspects and to ways of winning public support.

23. Mr. WOJCIK (Poland) also felt that the practical utilization of irradiation should be encouraged, particularly in developing countries. He commended the Secretariat on its work, which was a remarkable example of collaboration between Agency and FAO experts. Document GC(XXXVII)/1068 made a valuable contribution to the very desirable objective of setting up model projects within the framework of technical co-operation.

24. With respect to the final paragraph of the draft resolution, he, like the representative of India, felt that there should be no need in future years to follow progress by adopting specific resolutions, since the project would be integrated into the Agency's activities.

25. Mr. NORDIN (Malaysia) thanked the Secretariat for the work it had done in the area of irradiation - a subject of interest to a large number of developing Member States. That technology had now reached the commercial phase, it having been established that irradiated products were not harmful. The Agency should consult other organizations, including organizations involved in commercialization, with a view to ensuring the transfer of know-how and technology to the industries concerned. Finally, he said that he did not want the draft resolution to be modified.

26. Mr. DUERDEN (Australia) said that, in view of the moratorium on the consumption of irradiated food products in his country, he could not support the proposed programme. He would not, however, oppose adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, on the understanding that those activities were subject to the Agency's normal programme and budgeting procedures. He endorsed the point of view expressed by the representative of Italy; the programme was, after all, well established and, rather than appearing on the agenda for the following session, should be examined by the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Committee.

27. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico) commended the Secretariat on the work it had done and on the document presented, and also thanked it for having sent an expert mission to his country. The conclusions reached by that mission had been very satisfactory, confirming that the outlook for food irradiation in Mexico was favourable, both from the point of view of food preservation at a national level and from the point of view of export.

He therefore supported unreservedly the statement made by the representative of the Republic of Korea on behalf of the Group of 77.

28. Mr. EKECRANTZ (Sweden) said that food irradiation and the import of irradiated foodstuffs was forbidden under Swedish law. He could not therefore support the draft resolution, but he would not oppose its adoption by consensus. He nevertheless joined others, particularly the representative of Canada, who had stressed the importance of aspects related to safety and waste management. In future, any food irradiation project should encompass provisions to cover such aspects.

29. Mr. OMRAN (Syrian Arab Republic) underlined the importance of food irradiation, particularly for the developing countries which suffered, or were liable to suffer, from food shortages. The utilization of irradiation to preserve foodstuffs would help to ensure a certain security of food supply for those countries. The Secretariat had done a good job and should continue its efforts, while taking into account technological advances and while co-operating with other international organizations.

30. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) pointed out that, as in other countries, legislation in his country did not authorize food irradiation and so he was unable to support the draft resolution. He did not however wish to oppose consensus, provided the programme was implemented in accordance with the Agency's normal budgetary procedures.

31. Mr. BANDA (Zambia) said that his country was benefiting from a pilot-scale gamma irradiation facility within the framework of the Agency's technical co-operation programme. The draft resolution was therefore of direct interest to Zambia, which supported the efforts to promote the practical utilization of food irradiation in developing countries.

32. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece) thanked the Group of 77 for submitting the draft resolution. Greece was participating in European Community activities in the field of food irradiation regulations. It was also taking part in an international advisory group on food irradiation, whose work it would like to have referred to in the draft resolution.

33. Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation) had no difficulty in associating himself with a consensus whereby the Committee of the Whole recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution submitted.

34. Mr. FARAHAT (Egypt) thanked the Secretariat for its efforts to implement resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/588. He was grateful to those countries which had supported the draft resolution, as well as those which had declared they would not oppose it although their legislation did not authorize the utilization of irradiation.

35. Egypt had made considerable progress with regard to food irradiation. The authorization process was well under way and the initial results of the feasibility study had demonstrated the economic advantages and benefits to health of that technology, introduction of which would start in 1994.

36. Food irradiation had been examined in detail at two meetings held in Cairo in spring 1993. Representatives from 14 countries had attended the first meeting, which had been organized in collaboration with the FAO, for countries in the Middle East. The second meeting, for African countries, had been organized in co-operation with the Agency and representatives of 12 countries had attended. All the participants had acknowledged the importance of food irradiation for Africa and the Middle East.

37. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) said that his country attached great importance to food irradiation and hoped that it would very soon be able to benefit from that technology. He commended the Agency's efforts in that field and urged it to continue along the same path. Furthermore, he hoped that the food irradiation programmes, now involving four countries, would be extended to others. In conclusion, his delegation wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

38. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) said that his delegation could accept the draft resolution particularly if, as the representative of India had said, the item would probably not be included on the General Conference's agenda in future. He associated himself with the comments made by the representative of Canada relating to the safety of irradiators and the disposal of waste products.

39. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/125.

40. It was so decided.

Mr. Posta (Hungary) took the Chair.

MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN MATTERS
RELATING TO NUCLEAR SAFETY AND RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION GC(XXXVI)/RES/582

(iv) The preparation of a nuclear safety convention (paragraph 5) (GC(XXXVII)/1066, GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/130 and Add.1 and 2) (resumed from meeting 91)

41. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee resume its consideration of the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/130. A consensus had been reached during the informal consultations which had been held and he invited Mr. Schmidt, one of the Vice-Chairmen, to report on the outcome.

42. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) said that all the participants in the informal consultations had accepted the proposal made by Italy for the following wording to be included at the end of preambular paragraph (b): "including where appropriate through technical co-operation,".

43. Mr. NOGUEIRA VIANA (Brazil) said that his delegation wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution as amended.

44. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/130 as amended.

45. It was so decided.

46. Mr. BILBAO ALFONSO (Cuba) said that he had not wanted to prevent a consensus on the draft resolution, but he would have preferred the term "nuclear installations" in paragraph 8 to have been replaced by the term "civil nuclear power plants",

as in paragraph 2. He would also have liked the full title of the convention to appear in the wording of paragraph 8.

PLAN FOR PRODUCING POTABLE WATER ECONOMICALLY
(GC(XXXVI)/RES/592, GC(XXXVII)/INF/323, GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/126)

47. Mr. LIU (China) paid tribute to the Secretariat for its efforts and achievements in the one year since the adoption of resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/592. The documents which had been prepared showed the considerable results that had been achieved in the area of potable water production using nuclear energy.

48. The worldwide demand for potable water and the need to find new sources of supply meant that in future support from other United Nations organizations would be essential. In China, the shortage of potable water was reaching alarming proportions in the north of the country and certain coastal towns. The competent authorities had already carried out studies of water demand and resources. Certain municipal services in coastal regions were planning to use the Chinese-manufactured HR-200 thermal reactor to desalinate sea water.

49. His delegation welcomed the Secretariat's policy of performing research only in certain areas where water shortages were particularly acute and also endorsed the choice of small- and medium-sized reactors for sea-water desalination.

50. In conclusion, he said that China would be making available the services of one cost-free expert, and invited other countries to provide financial assistance or experts in order to promote the use of nuclear energy for potable water production.

51. MR. TITKOV (Russian Federation) praised the quality of the Agency's work under the research programme for producing potable water economically through the desalination of sea water using nuclear energy. It was an extremely important activity in view of the growing need for potable water in many countries. The Agency's idea of establishing a pilot desalination plant therefore merited further consideration. For its part, his delegation could confirm its proposal to make available KLT-40 reactors, which had been used on ships for a number of years, and was willing to take all the necessary steps to implement that unique project. In conclusion, his delegation could support the draft resolution.

52. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece) said that, in view of its geographical situation, his country could not but endorse a draft resolution intended to promote the economic production of potable water. His delegation, however, would like preambular paragraph (d) to be deleted, since the fact that a comprehensive report was about to be published on the matter meant that the paragraph was no longer relevant.

53. Mr. ARBOR GONZALEZ (Argentina) said that the Director General's report provided a satisfactory response to resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/592. Argentina had no need to use sea-water desalination to supply the needs of its population, but was quite willing to make a technical contribution to help resolve a problem which occurred in many countries. His country was therefore prepared to provide expert services, and had recently offered to contribute to the financing of research in that area. His delegation could approve the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/126.

54. Mr. WOJCIK (Poland) welcomed the initiative taken by a group of countries at the thirty-third session of the General Conference to evaluate the potential offered by nuclear energy for the desalination of sea water. The problems of potable water shortages in various parts of the world were becoming more and more acute. Sea-water desalination to ensure a supply of potable water was thus becoming an increasingly urgent issue and his delegation fully supported the draft resolution. However, his delegation wondered whether the issue did not already occupy a large enough part of the Agency's programme, if only because of the fact that it had featured on the General Conference's agenda for three years. He therefore proposed the addition of the following wording after operative paragraph 2:

"Requests the Director General to prepare in the framework of the elaboration of the 1995-96 programme, a comprehensive action plan for the Agency's work in this area, taking also into account expected extrabudgetary contributions by Member States and other international organizations."

Thus, there would no longer be a need to include the issue on the General Conference's agenda and operative paragraphs 3 and 4 could be deleted.

55. Mr. MANNINEN (Finland) recalled that, during the discussions on the issue the previous year, it had been reported that a nuclear reactor could be used in principle to provide energy for desalination plants. However, as in any instance where a facility used

nuclear energy, the feasibility of such a project could only be determined in the final analysis by assessing a specific case. The Agency could probably not do much more than it already had, except perhaps through a technical co-operation project. Nevertheless, the Secretariat indicated that other organizations, including the United Nations regional commissions, would probably co-operate with it. Such co-operation would certainly enable the problem to be studied in a wider context and that was the solution which Finland had proposed on a number of occasions in order to solve various issues. The problem of an adequate supply of potable water was a global one, and it was proper that the Agency should participate in the efforts to find a solution. His delegation hoped that the final outcome of the Agency's activities in that area would be presented at the next session of the General Conference. In conclusion, he said that his delegation endorsed the draft resolution under discussion and he had no firm views on the amendment proposed by the representative of Poland.

56. Mr. OKONKWO (Nigeria) said that, in its resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/592, the General Conference had stressed the importance of adequate potable water supplies for mankind and of regional and international co-operation in solving problems of potable water shortages in Member States, and the interest for potential beneficiaries and technology holders in providing low-cost potable water. If the plan to produce potable water economically was successful, Nigeria would be one of the countries which would benefit.

57. The shortage of potable water in the developing countries, including Nigeria, was extremely acute. His delegation, therefore, once more appealed to all Member States to provide strong support to the Agency so that the project to solve the problem of water shortages through the desalination of sea water using nuclear energy would be given the attention it deserved. In that regard, his delegation could approve the draft resolution put forward by the Group of 77, but would not oppose any amendments that certain Member States might find necessary.

58. Mr. KUPITZ (Representative of the Secretariat) pointed out that, in the resolution it had adopted in 1992 on the issue, the General Conference had not requested a comprehensive document from the Secretariat, but simply a document which could serve as a basis for discussion. Referring to the proposal made by the Greek delegation, he said that a regional study for the North African countries was expected to be completed by the end

of 1994, but it was uncertain whether the Secretariat would be able to submit to the next General Conference the comprehensive document mentioned in preambular paragraph (d) of the draft resolution. Activities related to the subject under discussion were incorporated into the Agency's regular programme and a report on them would naturally be provided to the next session of the General Conference.

59. Mr. DICKSON (United Kingdom) recalled his delegation's view that the Agency should strictly observe the priorities set for projects. However, since the activity in question would be funded by extrabudgetary resources, he could join the consensus on the draft resolution and approve the amendment submitted by the representative of Poland.

60. Mr. FARAHAT (Egypt) said it was important that the issue should continue to be discussed at the General Conference and, in order to do so, there had to be a report on the activities carried out. He was therefore against the Polish delegation's proposal to delete paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution. However, in order to encourage a consensus, his delegation would not oppose the amendment submitted by the representative of Greece.

61. Mr. GIOVANSILY (France) said his delegation was well aware of the serious problem which shortages of potable water created for many countries. Among the possible solutions, desalination of sea water and brackish water was certainly one of the most important.

62. All desalination techniques required a supply of energy, either thermal or electric. It was therefore an understandable and quite tempting idea to consider nuclear energy. However, due consideration should be given to the problems, particularly the economic and technical ones, which the use of that technology might present. The preliminary report presented the previous year had shown that the use of nuclear energy could be economically viable provided that the installed capacities were large enough, in other words in the order of at least 400 MW, and that interest rates were very low. That conclusion was in line with the results of studies conducted in France. At the present time, although interest rates were on the decline, they were still too high for the economies of countries which were in great need of potable water and which had no conventional energy sources available to bear the

costs of the necessary investment. Similarly, in many cases, industrial development had not yet resulted in evenly distributed and adequate energy consumption, which would be necessary to enable the grids to accommodate the introduction of reactors of such capacity without serious disruption.

63. The techniques were commercially available and it was a question of handling problems on a case by case basis at the industrial level. The Agency could only play an effective role by providing advice on the preparation and the assessment of the feasibility of pre-projects within the framework of technical co-operation projects. All those points needed to be carefully examined before such projects were initiated.

64. Subject to those comments, his delegation would not oppose any consensus which might emerge on the draft resolution and on the amendment submitted by the representative of Poland.

65. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) emphasized the importance of the issue and said that Italy was one of the countries which had problems with supplies of potable water. Nevertheless, as the representative of France had noted, there was some doubt as to the most suitable technology for solving such problems. He had been ready to support the amendment submitted by the representative of Poland, but had been convinced by the arguments put forward by the representative of Egypt against the amendment.

66. Mr. RAOUAN (Tunisia) said that his country was short of water and that sea-water desalination presented a possible solution. The Agency had been conducting studies in Tunisia for two years and the experts had concluded that the use of nuclear energy produced by small- and medium-sized reactors was a viable option. He therefore urged the Agency to continue and extend its research on the use of nuclear energy for sea-water desalination.

67. An expert meeting had recently been held in Tunisia on the design of small- and medium-sized reactors. Tunisia hoped that the Agency would support the research under way, since such reactors were capable of meeting the developing countries' needs for water and electricity, and for energy in general.

68. In conclusion, his delegation could support the draft resolution.

69. Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation) proposed that, in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the phrase "implementation of" be amended to read "implementation of demonstration facilities and".

70. Mr. FARAHAT (Egypt) said he would not oppose the amendment proposed by the Russian Federation.

71. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Polish delegation, in view of the sponsors' wish to retain operative paragraphs 3 and 4, would not insist on its amendment, and that no delegation was opposed to the Greek delegation's amendment to delete preambular paragraph (d) of the draft resolution. In the absence of any objections, he took it that the Committee of the Whole wished to adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/126 as amended by the representatives of Greece and the Russian Federation.

72. It was so decided.

**STRENGTHENING OF THE AGENCY'S MAIN ACTIVITIES (GC(XXXVI)/RES/587,
GC(XXXVII)/1074, GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/127)**

73. Mr. CHO (Republic of Korea) introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/127 on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the draft resolution reflected the importance attached by the Group to the Agency's main activities. Its general conciseness more or less matched that of the resolution adopted the previous year on the issue (GC(XXXVI)/RES/587). Nevertheless, modifications had been made to operative paragraphs 4 and 5. Those changes were motivated by the Group's desire to encourage the Secretariat to take additional specific steps to reinforce still further the Agency's technical assistance and co-operation activities. The Group of 77 hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus without further modification.

74. Mr. RESHETNYAK (Ukraine) said that his country had always favoured an adequate balance between the Agency's main activities, and considered that document GC(XXXVII)/1074 submitted by the Secretariat showed very clearly how the Agency was trying to achieve such a balance, in particular between safeguards and non-safeguards activities. It was important to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of technical

assistance and co-operation activities. In that context, Ukraine favoured a permanent dialogue among Member States, and between them and the Secretariat.

75. Noting that paragraph 41 of document GC(XXXVII)/1074 mentioned the United Nations Chernobyl Project, which was being implemented by the UNDP, he said that that project was linked to the Agency's activities to mitigate the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster. Those activities naturally had high priority, and his delegation observed with regret that the international community's interest in the matter was diminishing. His delegation therefore urged the Secretariat to maintain its interest in the Chernobyl problem.

76. In his statement, the Director General had described a project which would have considerable impact on activities being carried out in that area and which was a good example of the practical implementation of the recommendations arising from the International Chernobyl Project. The dramatic consequences of the Chernobyl disaster were now clear. Among the affected population, the number of people suffering from cancer had reached 22% and was continuing to rise. Other figures could be quoted to show that effects of the disaster still remained and were presenting a great number of diverse problems which merited the Agency's attention in the form, for example, of specific programmes to mitigate the consequences of the disaster.

77. Ms. CZOCH (Hungary) noted that the Annual Report for 1992 described the Agency's efforts to strengthen its main activities and showed that it had been able to maintain a balance between the main areas of safeguards, nuclear safety and technical co-operation.

78. Much was expected of the Agency's safeguards system, particularly in view of the Iraqi experience and the proximity of the next NPT Review Conference in 1995, and Member States wanted a satisfactory assurance that nuclear energy would be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. They also wished to have efficient and cost-effective safeguards, which could only be achieved by strengthening the efficiency and effectiveness of the system.

79. Like a number of other countries whose delegations had emphasized in the plenary meetings the importance of the Agency's technical co-operation activities, Hungary highly appreciated the services provided by the Agency. In particular, the OSART, ASSET and IPERS missions had helped to enhance nuclear safety in Hungary. The standards developed

by the Agency and published in the Safety Series, the NUSS standards and the newly elaborated RADWASS standards had been or would be incorporated in Hungarian legal instruments, codes and guides.

80. It was to be hoped that the Secretariat's work to improve its programme evaluation procedures and the preparation of the Medium-Term Plan would provide a better basis for the formulation of the Agency's main activities. In that regard, her delegation trusted that the Agency would in future continue to respond to emerging priorities as it had done with the management of radioactive waste and spent fuel. Her delegation was convinced that a reduction in the number of technical co-operation projects and their concentration, together with the model project approach, would result in a more effective use of the available resources. That area was, however, one in which Member States could also enhance their contribution by preparing and administering their programmes more carefully so as to ensure their success.

81. Mr. McRAE (Canada) recalled that the resolution adopted by the General Conference the previous year, while calling for balance among the Agency's activities, had focused in particular on the technical assistance programme and the need to strengthen its efficiency. That emphasis was appropriate, particularly in the current climate of financial difficulties. While there were always concerns about the adequate funding of that programme and others, greater efforts to improve effectiveness and efficiency were more likely to result in improved implementation.

82. His delegation believed that the effective transfer of technology and technical assistance were dependent on the Agency's other two major programmes, namely safeguards and safety. The absence of credible safeguards and an effective programme to promote safety would hamper the efforts of nations which possessed nuclear technologies to transfer those technologies. As the Governor from Canada had stated in a plenary meeting, his country was opposed to any attempt to set the major programmes against each other or to regard each programme as isolated from the others. The Agency could only be truly effective if it functioned in an integrated fashion, and his delegation would therefore have preferred all the Agency's main activities, including safeguards, to be included in a single

draft resolution so that the title of the agenda item being discussed would accurately reflect its contents.

83. When considering the overall question of the strengthening of the Agency's main activities, the recommendations contained in the External Auditor's report on the Agency's accounts for 1992 should be borne in mind. In the case of the technical assistance programme, for example, the External Auditor had listed a number of objectives which, if achieved, would truly strengthen implementation of the Agency's activities in that area. In particular, he had emphasized the need to establish country programme plans, to define more specific factors for assessing projects, and to improve project implementation and the evaluation system. His delegation considered that those measures should be more closely integrated into the technical assistance programme, although they were equally applicable to all the other programmes.

84. Such an approach to the Agency's responsibilities could also be taken within the context of the development of the Medium-Term Plan and within the framework of the Department of Technical Co-operation's initiation of the model project approach, which should be encouraged and supported. His delegation was pleased that operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution referred to the Medium-Term Plan, which it regarded as particularly important.

85. As to document GC(XXXVII)/1074, he recalled that his delegation had already presented detailed comments to the Board of Governors the previous week. Nevertheless, he emphasized the need for future reports to focus on the integrated and mutually complementary nature of the main activities he had mentioned.

86. In conclusion, although his delegation had reservations about the lack of balance in some of the provisions of the draft resolution, it would not oppose its adoption, bearing in mind the views he had expressed.

87. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation naturally welcomed the draft resolution submitted by the Group of 77. Greece had always supported technical co-operation activities and advocated a balance between the Agency's different activities. Nevertheless, his country considered that in view of the circumstances, and global

developments in particular, the time had come to stop putting forward concurrent draft resolutions on safeguards and the Agency's other main activities. Like the representative of Canada, his delegation would like to see the two issues dealt with in a single resolution in future.

88. With regard to the draft resolution under discussion, he felt that operative paragraph 3, which differed from that in resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/587 adopted the previous year, placed a negative emphasis on safeguards activities. For the sake of balance, he would prefer to see the wording from resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/587 restored.

89. Mr. MANNINEN (Finland) said that the strengthening of the Agency's main activities was undoubtedly in the interest of all Member States. The fact that the current budgetary constraints seemed set to continue meant that productivity gains would have to be made and that the efficiency and effectiveness of activities would have to increase, while respecting the Agency's mandate, as laid down in its Statute.

90. Efforts had already been made to that effect in the area of safeguards, and some results had already been achieved. It would be logical for similar efforts to be undertaken in respect of the other programmes. In that context, he recalled the proposal submitted by Australia to the last meeting of the Administrative and Budgetary Committee, which Finland and several other countries had supported. The document prepared by the Secretariat in response to that proposal (GOV/INF/710) had just been received. The document was interesting and offered a good basis on which to continue the discussions between the Secretariat and Member States. It presented a procedure for programme assessment and evaluation, but did not describe clearly what type of mechanism would be set up to implement the procedure.

91. The Agency's area of competence was confined to nuclear technology, which could be used to solve various common problems. However, those problems also often fell within the competence of other organizations. In order to strengthen the Agency's activities, it would be necessary to identify the global programmes or projects to which the Agency could make a useful contribution in co-operation with those organizations. That would certainly be more cost-effective than undertaking a large number of small isolated projects. All those

issues would need to be examined in the context of the discussions on the Medium-Term Plan and the 1995-96 programme and budget, in which his country was prepared to play an active part.

92. Mr. FITZGERALD (Ireland) said that many of the comments he had intended to make were in agreement with those already made, in particular by the representative of Canada. His delegation would like to see a draft resolution on technical co-operation adopted, as well as other resolutions on issues affecting an even larger number of Member States. Document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/127 showed a certain lack of balance by comparison with the resolution adopted the previous year, in that it gave the impression of establishing a hierarchy among the Agency's various activities. That fact might make it difficult to achieve a consensus. In his opinion, the process of elaborating the Agency's programme and budget and the Medium-Term Plan was the appropriate framework in which to establish priorities, and they should not therefore be prejudged in the draft resolution. In particular, operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution gave the impression that technical co-operation should be encouraged to the detriment of safeguards. His delegation would therefore prefer the wording from the previous year to be used, as it spelled out the priorities clearly.

93. Operative paragraph 3 also requested the Director General to hold consultations with Member States, while in operative paragraph 4 he was requested to take account of the view of the General Conference. Since the General Conference was made up of Member States, and they would be expressing their views by adopting the draft resolution, it was those views which the Director General would have to take into account, and not what was said in other discussions. Consequently, in operative paragraph 3 it would be better to delete the reference to safeguards and the reference to consultations with Member States, so as to retain more or less the wording adopted the previous year.

94. Mr. OKONKWO (Nigeria) thanked the Secretariat for having prepared document CG(XXXVII)/1074 and said that it was quite clear that in order to attain the Agency's objectives an adequate balance between its main activities was necessary. It was thus essential to maintain and strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of the Agency's technical assistance and co-operation activities in accordance with the Statute.

95. In its resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/587, the General Conference had, *inter alia*, requested the Director General to enhance technical co-operation activities through the development of effective programmes aimed at improving the scientific and technological capabilities of developing countries in the fields of peaceful applications of nuclear energy and achieving sustainable development. Consequently, as at the last meeting of the Board of Governors, his delegation welcomed the action taken by the Secretariat to initiate model projects. The Secretariat should present further specific proposals to encourage research and development on the practical applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Only thus could the Agency enhance the scientific and technological capability of the developing countries and thereby promote their industrial development.

96. In conclusion, his delegation requested the Committee to give its full support to the draft resolution so that it could be adopted as it stood or with only minor amendments, but his delegation would join any consensus that did not run counter to the interests of one particular group.

97. Mr. NOGUEIRA VIANA (Brazil), like the representative of Canada, felt that it was important to ensure that a balance was maintained between the Agency's different activities and that it would perhaps be preferable to have only one draft resolution. Such an idea would be a good starting-point for deliberations at the 1994 session. However, since for the moment two draft resolutions had been submitted, he urged the members of the Committee to bear in mind not only the draft resolution currently being discussed, but also the one which would be submitted later on safeguards, and he encouraged them to try to maintain an appropriate balance between the two. He was sure that the Secretariat attached all the required importance to that point, as the presence of the Deputy Director General for Administration at the current discussion seemed to demonstrate. The essential question to be considered was how much money to allocate to each activity in the budget.

98. Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation) felt that it was not appropriate to compare the safeguards programme with the technical assistance and co-operation programme, since without an effective safeguards system, there would be no technical co-operation in the field of peaceful applications of nuclear energy, and no technical assistance for developing countries in the nuclear field. Endorsing the opinions expressed by the representatives of

Canada and Greece, he said that his delegation hoped that the text adopted the previous year would be retained.

99. Mr. GIOVANSILY (France) pointed out that, as his delegation had recalled in previous meetings, the Secretariat was still confronted by the same challenge - to make the most of limited resources in order to cope as well as possible with the growing demands of the promotional and verification activities the Agency was called upon to perform. The Secretariat had taken a number of steps in the right direction, and his delegation encouraged it to pursue those in order to reduce cumbersome procedures to the minimum. However, the Secretariat was not alone, particularly as far as technical assistance activities were concerned, and countries providing and those receiving assistance should also try to make improvements. The results achieved in other areas, in particular in the area of safeguards, could serve as a model.

100. France had high expectations of the Medium-Term Plan which was being prepared and the 1994 seminar on the review of technical co-operation policy, although it realized that the long-term action taken following the new proposals would not bring immediate results. The considerable contribution that co-operation with other international organizations could bring should also be taken into account. His delegation looked forward keenly to the next meeting of the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Committee, which would provide a clearer idea of the Secretariat's proposals for improvement.

101. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America) said that his Government took note of and thanked the Secretariat for document GC(XXXVII)/1074, and was particularly interested by the model project approach to strengthen the Agency's technical assistance and co-operation activities. His Government also noted that the document referred to the Medium-Term Plan, which was far more comprehensive and constituted the Agency's principal planning tool. As indicated in paragraph 43 of document GC(XXXVII)/1074, the Medium-Term Plan would take express account of resolutions GC(XXXVI)/RES/587 and GC(XXXVI)/RES/596 and other relevant resolutions of the General Conference. Therefore, his country reserved its comments on the implications of document GC(XXXVII)/1074 with respect to the Medium-Term Plan.

102. As for the draft resolution before the Committee, his delegation also considered that operative paragraph 3 made an unnecessary comparison between safeguards and technical co-operation activities. It therefore strongly advocated that the wording adopted the previous year for that paragraph be retained. With that modification, his delegation would be in a position to approve the draft resolution.

103. Mr. MOHAN (India) noted that, as the representative of the Republic of Korea had indicated, the Group of 77, in preparing the draft resolution, had endeavoured to make as few changes as possible to the resolution adopted the previous year. Those efforts had apparently been successful, since very few amendments had been proposed during the discussions.

104. The changes made to the previous year's resolution were intended to take account of the fact that a report had been submitted as a follow up to that resolution and that opinions had been expressed on that report. It was those opinions, to which the Group of 77 attached great importance, which had been taken into account in operative paragraph 3. Nevertheless, the Group had always been aware that its proposals should be as flexible as possible. The impression which had emerged from the Group's discussions was that while no one intended to weaken one of the Agency's main activities, there was a wish simply to define which of those activities should be strengthened. In view of the fact that the proposed amendments to the text were relatively minor, he suggested that consultations be held, perhaps in a small contact group.

105. With regard to one of the ideas put forward by the representative of Canada, he felt that many delegations shared that point of view and that everyone should work towards that objective.

106. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) thanked the representative of India for his explanations on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. The text as it stood raised problems for his delegation too, even though it understood the underlying intention. His delegation would definitely prefer to keep the wording adopted the previous year, as it expressed far more clearly the concern to maintain an appropriate balance between the

Agency's main activities and did not have the drawback of placing negative emphasis on one activity, namely safeguards.

107. Mr. XU (China) said that his delegation considered that the Agency's technical assistance and co-operation activities played a very important role in expediting the contribution of nuclear energy to the peace, health and prosperity of mankind, which was one of the Agency's two basic objectives as laid down in the Statute. Those activities made it possible to promote technology transfer to developing countries and strengthen their capabilities in the field of nuclear science and technology. Consequently, those activities should be funded by adequate and assured resources. Maintaining an appropriate balance between safeguards and other activities should be a basic objective in the preparation of the Agency's programme and budget, since that would to a large extent ensure that the objectives laid down in the Statute were met. His delegation hoped that the Agency would pursue its efforts and continue to take new initiatives to strengthen its main activities. His delegation could thus support the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Republic of Korea on behalf of the Group of 77.

108. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria), emphasizing that he shared the opinion of the representative of China that adequate resources should be provided for technical assistance, recalled that his Government had for a long time attached the greatest importance to the technical assistance provided by the Agency. With regard to the balance between safeguards and the other main activities, his delegation reaffirmed that one should not forget that safeguards were a means of enhancing international security, and were accordingly of benefit to all mankind. They should not therefore be weighed against anything else. Their objective was one which enjoyed high priority in the context of the international community's work in general and that of the Agency in particular.

109. Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution also posed problems for his delegation, since it seemed to set the "main activities" against safeguards, although safeguards constituted one of the main activities. His delegation would therefore definitely prefer the text of the resolution adopted on the issue the previous year to be restored.

110. Mr. DICKSON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation also attached great importance to technical co-operation and sympathized with many of the opinions expressed during the discussion. His delegation supported all measures taken to ensure that each of the Agency's projects responded explicitly to the needs of Member States and made the best use of the limited resources available. The Medium-Term Plan had an essential role to play in that connection. Like the representative of Finland, he wished to draw attention to the proposal made at the meeting of the Administrative and Budgetary Committee by the delegation of Australia that measures be taken to improve the formulation and assessment of projects included in the Agency's programme and budget.

111. With regard to the draft resolution under discussion, he could understand the sponsors' concerns, but, like the delegations of the Russian Federation, the United States and other countries, felt that it would be better to retain the wording used the previous year. The current text of operative paragraph 3 appeared to place rather negative emphasis on one of the Agency's main activities.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.