



MS
GC

International Atomic Energy Agency
GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(39)/COM.5/OR.2
4 October 1995
GENERAL Distr.
Original: ENGLISH

THIRTY-NINTH (1995) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna
on Tuesday, 19 September 1995, at 3.10 p.m.

Chairman: Ms. LAJOUS VARGAS (Mexico)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
-	Organization of business	1 - 2
16	Strengthening of the Agency's technical co-operation activities	3 - 49
17	Plan for producing potable water economically	50 - 69
18	Extensive use of isotope hydrology for water resources management	70 - 78
21	Personnel questions	79 - 80
22	Amendment of Article VI of the Statute	81 - 93

[*] GC(39)/27.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(39)/INF/21/Rev.1.

95-04285 (XIV)

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 weeks of the receipt of the record.

Abbreviations used in this record

GRULAC	Latin American and Caribbean Group
SAGTAC	Standing Advisory Group on Technical Assistance and Co-operation
TCF	Technical Co-operation Fund

ORGANIZATION OF BUSINESS

1. The CHAIRMAN proposed that discussion of items 15, 19 and 20 be postponed to allow time for consideration of the draft resolutions from the European Union on those items.

2. It was so agreed.

STRENGTHENING OF THE AGENCY'S TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES (GC(39)/13 and GC(39)/COM.5/1)

3. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document GOV/2821-GC(39)/13 on the present item and document GC(39)/COM.5/1, which contained a draft resolution submitted by Sudan on behalf of the Group of 77.

4. Mr. DOSHI (India) expressed support for the draft resolution, but suggested a rewording of the end of operative paragraph 2 to include a specific reference to the production of electric power. The amended text would read "peaceful applications of nuclear energy, including for the production of electric power, and achieving sustainable developments". Furthermore, in line with his delegations's proposal that a master plan be drawn up to make the technical co-operation programme more focused, he suggested inserting the words "a master plan on" in the second line of operative paragraph 2, between the words "through" and "the development".

5. Mr. OKONKWO (Nigeria) welcomed the initiatives taken by the Director General since the previous session of the General Conference. Those initiatives had been wisely focused on some important areas such as radiation protection and radioactive waste management, country programme frameworks, the model project concept, the concept of the Agency as a partner in development, the new special training programme and the establishment of the Standing Advisory Group on Technical Assistance and Co-operation.

6. The model project concept would serve as an important link between Member States and the Agency in the transfer and use of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. The initiatives aimed at strengthening human resources in the developing countries in the area of the peaceful applications of nuclear energy constituted a step in the right direction. That programme was vital to enhance Member States' co-operation with the Agency. In that

connection, he welcomed the proposed visit of an Agency team to Nigeria in the near future, which would enable Nigeria and the Agency to address many important matters. His delegation also looked forward to the first meeting of SAGTAC and remained confident that the Group's recommendations would satisfactorily address the pressing needs of developing countries, provided that sufficient resources were made available by Member States faithfully pledging and paying in a timely manner their assessed voluntary contributions to the TCF.

7. In conclusion, he expressed his full support for the draft resolution on the present item submitted by the Group of 77, which was timely and well focused.

8. Mr. ARGUELLO HURTADO (Nicaragua), having expressed support for the draft resolution, requested clarification from the representative of India regarding his proposal for a master plan. It was not clear whether his suggested amendment implied an appeal to the Agency to help countries to work out a master plan, or whether it implied the Agency's involvement to work on existing master plans, which would be a disadvantage for those countries which did not have one.

9. Mr. DOSHI (India) said that the idea of a master plan was not intended to be in conflict with existing concepts, but rather to build on existing experience and make use of new inputs, such as advice from SAGTAC. Experience had already been acquired through model projects and country programmes and the Agency now had the necessary expertise to produce a global plan that would be more than just a model project or a country-specific project. The Agency could, for example, evolve a master plan for food preservation around the world. The master plan would enable activities to be better integrated and focused.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that her understanding of the Indian proposal was that the Agency, rather than individual Member States, would develop a master plan, although States could of course develop their own master plans for their national needs as well.

11. Mr. DUERDEN (Australia) commended the Secretariat's efforts over the past year to strengthen technical co-operation activities and welcomed its work on the model project concept, the partnership in development approach, the preparation of the radiation

protection and waste management projects and its activities on the country programme framework.

12. The Indian proposal to develop a master plan was perhaps rather premature and it would be better to receive SAGTAC's recommendations first and then reconsider the idea of a master plan at the 1996 session of the General Conference.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that her understanding of India's proposed reference to a master plan was that it would be for SAGTAC to decide on the nature of such a master plan, but that the General Conference should indicate to SAGTAC its interest in such a plan, without making any commitment as to the direction of the master plan.

14. Mr. DUERDEN (Australia) said that his delegation could accept the wording of the Indian proposal with that understanding. His delegation was concerned that many proposals were made which requested the Secretariat to produce more reports. It would therefore be preferable for SAGTAC to take on that work and offer a draft to the Secretariat which could be further developed at a later stage.

15. Mr. DOSHI (India) emphasized that there was no intention of burdening the Secretariat with additional responsibility or of decreasing SAGTAC's very important role. The fact was that the Agency had considerable experience and had been very successful in the field of technical co-operation. The Agency would naturally consult and interact with SAGTAC and then reach a conclusion as to what steps could be made in a specific direction to produce some kind of global result in a particular field.

16. Mr. WÓJCIK (Poland) pointed out that there was already a programme to upgrade by the year 2000 the radiation protection and radioactive waste management infrastructure in those Member States where minimum standards had not yet been reached in those areas. That programme was in essence a master plan. The Agency was therefore already producing master plans in areas where there was a justification for them. He accordingly proposed that the Indian proposal should be forwarded to SAGTAC for further consideration of which other areas would be appropriate for such master plans.

17. Mr. AGRELL (United Kingdom) said that his delegation could support the resolution as presented by Sudan on behalf of the Group of 77 and noted that the Department

of Technical Co-operation was moving steadily towards a more impact-oriented approach to development. In view of his delegation's satisfaction with the new direction in which technical co-operation was moving, he had some hesitation as to the amendments proposed by the Ambassador of India. The key to the success and greater effectiveness of technical co-operation had been the insistence on building the programme on the basis of the individual development plans and requirements of each country, and on the basis of each country's requests for assistance. Both amendments seem to imply a wish to move away from that approach to a more central direction.

18. With respect to the proposed amendment to include a reference to the production of electrical power, he noted that the statistics in the report on technical co-operation activities indicated that requests in that area occupied a rather modest place, while greater interest was shown in the fields of agriculture, medicine and nuclear safety. He hoped that the specific reference to nuclear power was not intended to privilege one set of applications in a field that was not favoured by a majority of Member States.

19. With respect to the proposed reference to the possible development of a master plan, he found it difficult to reconcile a proposal which would entail the Agency deciding what was best for the world in several fields, with the increasing success of the approach whereby the Agency primarily responded to requests from individual Member States with due consideration of the relevance of those requests to national development plans.

20. While his delegation would not object to a discussion of those points by SAGTAC, it felt that it might be premature to include a reference to them in a resolution at the present time.

21. Mr. WEBB (Canada) welcomed the establishment of SAGTAC and was pleased that a member of the Canadian International Development Agency had been chosen to participate. Canada looked forward to contributing to SAGTAC's important mandate.

22. With regard to the draft resolution, he supported the views expressed by the Australian and United Kingdom delegations. The Agency's current initiatives should be allowed to proceed over the next 12 months before including the words "master plan" in a resolution.

23. Mr. LI Changhe (China) said that at the time of the Agency's foundation, its Statute had clearly defined its purpose to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The Secretariat and Member States had since then made untiring efforts to achieve those two objectives and progress had been made in both areas. However, as a result of the uncertainties affecting financial resources for technical assistance activities, those activities had been subject to increasing limitations in recent years and their development had not been as effective as that of safeguards activities.

24. Since China had joined the Agency in 1984, it had actively supported the joint development of the Agency's two main activities and the efforts to maintain a balance between them. Its active participation had included providing advice and recommendations, as well as making practical efforts to contribute to the strengthening of technical co-operation activities.

25. The Agency had begun its model projects the previous year and that approach had brought new vitality to technical co-operation activities. In support of the new measures, the Chinese Government had made an additional US \$1 million available to finance two model projects in Africa - the tsetse fly project in Tanzania and the radiotherapy and nuclear medicine project in Ghana. It was gratifying that the joint efforts of recipient countries, the Secretariat and donor countries had resulted in very good progress in both projects. The Chinese Government was providing an additional \$200 000 to the Agency in 1996 to support the project in Tanzania.

26. His delegation welcomed the draft resolution for strengthening the Agency's technical co-operation activities and appreciated the recommendations made by the Ambassador of India. He hoped that the suggestions made would be further developed by SAGTAC.

27. Mr. FITZGERALD (Ireland) expressed support for the draft resolution, but had some difficulty with the amendments suggested by the Ambassador of India. The first amendment proposed a specific reference to the use of nuclear power, whereas his delegation believed that the scope of technical assistance should be kept as wide as possible, rather than highlighting particular aspects or forms of assistance. The wide scope of requirements and requests reflected in the programme should be kept as it was rather than introducing

priorities. His delegation would therefore prefer to keep the original language of the resolution.

28. Mr. ACUÑA-PIMENTEL (Chile) noted that his country had recently sent to the Secretariat its national plan for nuclear development, which complied with the Agency's aspirations to improve the organization of technical assistance. His delegation recognized the efforts made by the Department of Technical Co-operation, which had resulted in the establishment of SAGTAC, a body to which a Chilean expert had been appointed and which enjoyed the enthusiastic support of the Chilean Government.

29. His delegation was concerned, however, at the possibility of a decline in resources for technical co-operation activities, which were indispensable for development. Any such decline would also cause an undesirable imbalance among the Agency's activities. It was also important to note that assistance might be necessary in some countries at the stage of project planning, as well as subsequent project management.

30. Mr. SÖLENDİL (Turkey) welcomed the balanced draft resolution that had been prepared on behalf of the Group of 77, but noted that, in seeking to strengthen the Agency's technical co-operation activities, it was important to take into account the infrastructure and technological capabilities of the recipient countries, especially with regard to the procurement of sophisticated equipment. He therefore proposed that line 4 of operative paragraph 2 be amended by inserting, after the words "developing countries", the phrase "by taking into account the infrastructure and the level of technology of those countries concerned ..."

31. While his delegation appreciated the proposals made by the representative of India, it considered that a master plan of the type suggested might be better discussed and developed by SAGTAC.

32. Mr. JAMEEL (Pakistan), after commending the Department of Technical Co-operation for its many initiatives to strengthen technical co-operation activities, as outlined in document GC(39)/13, said that the more efforts the Secretariat made in that area, the closer the Agency came to fulfilling its primary mandate of promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

33. His delegation supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(39)/COM.5/1 and felt that it would be improved by the Indian proposal to include a reference to the production of electric power.

34. However, it was not clear to his delegation whether the proposed amendment on the development of a master plan was addressed to SAGTAC or to the Secretariat. On the one hand, as far as SAGTAC was concerned, his delegation considered that it would be better to allow SAGTAC to begin its work with a clean slate before reporting back to the General Conference. On the other hand, if the Secretariat were to deal with such a request, it might be diverted from tackling its main objective of programme delivery.

35. Mr. MANNINEN (Finland) expressed broad support for the draft resolution as it stood. His delegation was however sceptical about the amendments proposed by the representative of India, for the reasons given by the representative of the United Kingdom. Moreover, it considered that the proposed amendment to include a reference to the production of electric power could be covered by the amendment to line 4 of operative paragraph 2 proposed by Turkey.

36. Mr. DOSHI (India) pointed out that, in proposing a master plan, his delegation had merely wished to apply all the Agency's experience of technical co-operation to the preparation of a plan which would have global applicability within that field. Since members of the Committee seemed to regard the proposal as premature, his delegation was ready to withdraw it, but hoped that SAGTAC would examine at least the feasibility of preparing such a plan for submission to the 1996 session of the General Conference.

37. His delegation's proposed reference to the production of electric power had been put forward in the light of the Director General's very strong endorsement of nuclear power in his opening statement to the General Conference. Moreover, against a background of a global energy crisis brought on both by the lack and the misuse of energy, the nuclear option represented not only the best means of achieving sustainable development, but also the energy alternative that was least harmful to the environment. Other potential sources such as solar energy were not yet available in sufficient quantity. It was time to rectify the bad reputation of nuclear power that had been caused by certain events in recent history despite

the highly successful use of nuclear power for peaceful purposes in a number of countries. In order to deal with the rapidly growing problem of the hole in the earth's ozone layer, it would be necessary to change the consumption patterns in developed countries, which were also being imitated by developing countries. However, there seemed to be a widespread unwillingness to act. The developing countries' need for electrical power was certain to increase considerably. Unless the nuclear option could be developed to meet that need, the global environment would continue to suffer - desertification was already no longer confined to Africa, but had occurred in parts of Europe and Asia. The Director General's visionary introductory remarks had demonstrated his awareness of the urgent need to resolve such major problems, and of the fact that the Agency was one organization with the capacity to do so.

38. With those remarks, he said his delegation wished to see the emphasis of its proposed first amendment to the draft resolution retained.

39. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee whether it could accept the following amended wording for operative paragraph 2:

"Requests the Director General to pursue, in consultation with Member States, efforts to strengthen the technical co-operation activities of the Agency through the development of effective programmes aimed at improving the scientific and technological capabilities of developing countries, account being taken of the infrastructure and level of technology of those countries concerned, in the fields of peaceful applications of nuclear energy, including the production of electrical power, and achieving sustainable development;"

40. Mr. FITZGERALD (Ireland) said it was his impression that the Director General in his opening statement had been talking about electrical power in general terms, rather than in the context of the Agency's technical co-operation programme. Given the wide-ranging nature of that programme, he reiterated his delegation's view that the operative paragraph in question should not place emphasis on electrical power alone, the more so as countries seeking assistance might gain the misleading impression that one particular aspect of the Agency's technical co-operation had priority over the others.

41. Mr. OKONKWO (Nigeria) said that the manner in which the Director General had described electrical power in his opening statement was not relevant to the Committee's

current task and that his delegation supported the amended version that had been read out by the Chairman.

42. Mr. ARGUELLO HURTADO (Nicaragua) pointed out that the proposed Indian amendment regarding a master plan, now withdrawn, would have had the advantage of raising awareness of technical co-operation activities in countries which otherwise would not have the resources to gain access to nuclear energy applications. As such, the amendment had represented an attempt to enhance the Agency's promotional activities. With those comments, his delegation could support the amended text read out by the Chairman.

43. Mr. JAMEEL (Pakistan) also supported the version of operative paragraph 2 read out by the Chairman, noting that the reference to the production of electrical power was relevant as the Agency was the only international body charged with the development of energy resources.

44. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) stressed the importance of including a reference to electricity production because it was a significant area of nuclear activities which addressed a vital need of the developing countries. The absence of electricity production from the list of applications covered by current model projects in document GC(39)/13 was one indication that electrical power had not attracted sufficient attention.

45. Mr. WÓJCIK (Poland) suggested that, in order to reflect the fact that the production of electricity was one among many nuclear applications and techniques included in the Agency's technical co-operation programme, the phrase "including the production of electrical power" be replaced by the words "including both the applications of nuclear methods and techniques and the production of electricity".

46. Mr. OKONKWO (Nigeria) said his delegation felt strongly that the Committee was unlikely to produce a more effective version of operative paragraph 2 than that which the Chairman had read out. Electricity production seemed to be taken for granted by some members of the Committee, whereas the proposed inclusion of a reference to it in the draft resolution gave due prominence to its importance for the developing countries.

47. Mr. AGRELL (United Kingdom) stressed that his delegation did not disagree with the undoubted importance of electrical power for developing countries, it had simply

wished to avoid creating the impression that the Agency was dictating the development preferences of individual Member States. Accordingly, his delegation could support the amendment proposed by the representative of Poland.

48. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(39)/COM.5/1, with the amended version of operative paragraph 2 read out by her and further amended by the representative of Poland.

49. It was so agreed.

PLAN FOR PRODUCING POTABLE WATER ECONOMICALLY (GC(39)/12 and GC(39)/COM.5/2)

50. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to document GC(39)/12 and to the draft resolution submitted by Sudan on behalf of the Group of 77 contained in document GC(39)/COM.5/2.

51. Mr. EL HUSSEIN (Sudan), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77, pointed out that it addressed an issue of crucial concern to the developing countries. The preambular paragraph of the draft resolution cited the relevant decisions and resolutions and summarized the studies and constructive work already carried out on the issue under discussion, while the operative paragraphs proposed means of enlisting regional and international co-operation in order to help solve the problem of potable water shortages worldwide. He therefore hoped that the draft resolution would attract a consensus in the Committee.

52. Ms. EDDIB (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that many African countries which had long suffered from acute shortages of potable water looked forward to benefiting from the results of the studies on desalination described in the draft resolution. It was essential that the desalination of sea water should be given priority in future programmes of the Agency in the African region. With regard to the Advisory Group on Demonstration Facilities, her delegation would like to have more information about it in order to help her country decide how best to deploy the human and material resources it could contribute to

that programme in the future. In conclusion, she hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

53. Mr. JAMEEL (Pakistan), having joined the previous speaker in expressing the hope that the Committee would approve the draft resolution by consensus, said that the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution by the Group of 77 was a reflection of the need in many developing countries for an assured supply of clean drinking water.

54. Mr. NG'ANG'A (Kenya) supported the draft resolution and said that his country's Ministry of Water was very interested in obtaining more information about the new developments described in the draft resolution.

55. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico) expressed his satisfaction with the progress of the programme to use nuclear energy to supply water economically, which was particularly important for several countries including his own, and fully supported the draft resolution.

56. Mr. WEBB (Canada) pointed out that the work to date had clearly indicated that significant benefits were to be derived from potable water production using desalination technology and nuclear power reactor technology. Canada supported the Agency's nuclear desalination programme and had actively participated in that programme. His delegation noted that the programme was giving the necessary emphasis to issues such as those associated with infrastructure development and those related to the technical aspects of nuclear desalination and that the Agency was providing a forum for information exchange and offering advice to Member States on a range of issues relating to desalination.

57. Turning to the draft resolution, he noted that operative paragraph 5 requested the Director General to include desalination of sea water as one of the high-priority activities. Canada appreciated the importance of priority setting in the Agency, but did not feel that it was appropriate to bypass the Agency's priority-setting process and the Programme Performance Assessment System through such a draft resolution. He therefore recommended that operative paragraph 5 be reworded to read:

"Further requests the Director General to include the nuclear desalination of sea water in future programmes of the Agency, with appropriate priority, in the process of preparing the Agency's programme and budget;"

58. Mr. MOHAN (India), expressing his delegation's full support for the draft resolution, said that he would prefer the original wording to be retained, particularly as it was for the General Conference to determine priorities or at least give guidance.

59. While progress had been made on the issue of producing potable water economically, further progress was necessary. The international working groups and expert groups involved in nuclear power could perhaps be asked to provide some input in that area.

60. Mr. KUPITZ (Head, Nuclear Power Technology Development Section) noted that whenever input on reactor technology was required, the standing international working groups dealing with specific reactor technologies had been used to provide that input. However, if necessary, such advice could be increased in the future.

61. Mr. ZHANG Jing (China), expressing his support for the draft resolution, said that China would continue to support and participate in activities related to the nuclear desalination of sea water.

62. Mr. DUERDEN (Australia), welcoming the fact that the text of the draft resolution referred to the involvement of organizations of the United Nations system and other relevant intergovernmental organizations, expressed his support for the amendment proposed by the representative of Canada. Although he understood the observation made by the representative of India that it was for the General Conference to give guidance, the General Conference should not overturn the recently introduced performance assessment procedures.

63. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) observed that priorities within the Agency's programme should be set in accordance with the established procedure, particularly as there were many high-priority issues. As no impression should be given that those procedures were being bypassed, he supported the Canadian proposal to reword operative paragraph 5.

64. Mr. EKECRANTZ (Sweden) agreed that, although the situation regarding potable water was particularly delicate, it was rather premature to assign it the highest

priority within the Agency's programme, since demonstrations concerning the feasibility and practical implementation of a nuclear desalination system for sea water had yet to be carried out.

65. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco), supported by Ms. EDDIB (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), pointed out that compliance with existing procedures did not prevent the General Conference from recommending a given priority, particularly if it was a cause for concern among delegations, and he would therefore prefer operative paragraph 5 to remain as it stood.

66. Ms. PARZER (Netherlands) and Mr. FISENKA (Belarus) endorsed the amendment proposed by the representative of Canada.

67. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico) emphasized that the General Conference was a governmental organ through which guidelines could be given regarding the Agency's priorities. However, in order to reach a consensus, he suggested operative paragraph 5 be reworded to read:

"5. Stresses the vital importance of producing potable water and further requests the Director General to include the nuclear desalination of sea water in future programmes of the Agency, with appropriate priority, in the process of preparing the Agency's programme and budget;".

68. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(39)/COM.5/2, as amended by the representative of Mexico.

69. It was so decided.

EXTENSIVE USE OF ISOTOPE HYDROLOGY FOR WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (GC(39)/2 and Corr.1 and GC(39)/COM.5/3)

70. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to document GOV/2805-GC(39)/2 and Corr.1 and also to the draft resolution submitted by Sudan on behalf of the Group of 77 in document GC(39)/COM.5/3.

71. Mr. EL HUSSEIN (Sudan), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77, pointed out that the operative paragraphs emphasized the importance of the

Agency's continued efforts to examine the viability of isotope hydrology techniques to improve the availability of water.

72. Mr. BENTANCOUR (Uruguay), speaking on behalf of GRULAC, expressed the Group's full support for the draft resolution. The Group approved the extensive use of isotope hydrology to improve the management of water resources, which were becoming increasingly scarce in the GRULAC region. The Group recognized the work that the Agency had undertaken in that area and called upon it to continue its efforts.

73. Mr. DUERDEN (Australia) noting that, like many countries of the Group of 77, Australia suffered problems associated with inadequate water supplies, expressed broad support for the draft resolution.

74. With reference to preambular paragraph (e), he suggested that the language of resolution GC(XXXVIII)/RES/9 submitted the previous year should be retained and the last phrase "can very usefully complement conventional techniques" be replaced by "that their use should be integrated with conventional techniques".

75. He further suggested that in operative paragraph 1, the word "actually" be deleted and that the words "the quality and" be inserted after "improving".

76. Mr. MOHAN (India) expressed his support for the amendments proposed by the representative of Australia.

77. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(39)/COM.5/3, as amended by the representative of Australia.

78. It was so decided.

PERSONNEL QUESTIONS

79. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, as draft resolutions were being prepared on the two sub-items, discussion of the matter be postponed until later.

80. It was so agreed.

AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE VI OF THE STATUTE (GC(39)/21 and Add.1)

81. The CHAIRMAN, having drawn the Committee's attention to a report by the Chairperson of the Open-ended Consultative Group on Article VI of the Statute (GC(39)/21) and the summary record of the Board's discussion on 11 September 1995 under the agenda sub-item "Amendment of Article VI of the Statute" (GC(39)/21/Add.1), said that the delegation of Morocco and the delegation of Israel would each be submitting a draft resolution for consideration under the present item.

82. Ms. OK (Turkey), speaking as the Chairperson of the Open-ended Consultative Group, said that the various proposals which had been considered by the Group were contained in Annexes to her report. The Director General had communicated to all Member States certified copies of the text of the proposal made by Morocco (Annex 8), which should therefore perhaps be considered by the Committee first. After consideration of that proposal, it might be best if the Committee postponed further discussion under the present agenda item until the Moroccan delegation had submitted the draft resolution to which the Chairman of the Committee had referred.

83. Mr. EL HUSSEIN (Sudan) said that, in his view, the Committee should feel free to discuss all the proposals and other material contained in the Annexes to the report of the Chairperson of the Open-ended Consultative Group (including Annex 5, "African position on the amendment of Article VI of the Statute") - not just the proposal of Morocco (Annex 8).

84. Mr. OKONKWO (Nigeria) said he felt that there was little point in embarking on the present agenda item until the draft resolution being prepared by the Moroccan delegation was before the Committee.

85. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) said that the text of his delegation's draft resolution would shortly be handed to the Secretariat. It was in keeping with paragraph 23 of Ambassador Ok's report.

86. As far as his delegation was concerned, although the Moroccan proposal communicated by the Director General to all Member States was the only formal proposal "on the table", the Committee should feel free to consider other proposals as well.

87. Mr. de YTURRIAGA (Spain), supported by Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil), said that, in his view, the Committee should first examine the amendment to Article VI which had been formally proposed by Morocco. If the Committee did not agree to recommend that the Conference approve it, thought would have to be given to the question of the procedure to be followed after the current session of the Conference.

88. Mr. EL HUSSEIN (Sudan) said that several proposals had been put forward in the Open-ended Consultative Group and that the formal Moroccan proposal should not be given priority simply because it was formal.

89. Ms. OK (Turkey) said that the Committee would have to deal in some way with a proposal which had been submitted formally, even if it discussed other proposals as well. The Committee had an obligation to discuss the formal Moroccan proposal and make a recommendation regarding it to the General Conference.

90. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) said that paragraph 23 of Ambassador Ok's report indicated why the Committee should examine the Moroccan proposal - the one proposal which during the past year had been submitted in due and proper form. That did not mean that other proposals would have to be ignored.

91. It was over-optimistic to think that an amendment to Article VI would be adopted at the Conference's current session. Morocco was consequently proposing, in the draft resolution soon to be handed to the Secretariat, a continuation of consultations in the Open-ended Consultative Group, with a view to the achievement of a consensus either on Morocco's formal proposal or on some other proposal.

92. The CHAIRMAN suggested that further discussion under the present item be postponed until later in the week.

93. It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.