



GC

International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(41)/COM.5/OR.2
14 October 1997
GENERAL Distr.

Original: ENGLISH

FORTY-FIRST (1997) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Held at Austria Center Vienna
on Tuesday, 30 September 1997, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
14	Strengthening of the Agency's technical co-operation activities	1 - 53
22	International initiative for the Chernobyl sarcophagus	54 - 81
15	Plan for producing potable water economically	82 - 97

[*] GC(41)/28.

Abbreviations used in this record

EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
INDAG	International Desalination Advisory Group
IPF	indicative planning figures
NPT	Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
NPT Review and Extension Conference	Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
SIP	Shelter Implementation Project (Chernobyl)
WANO	World Association of Nuclear Operators

STRENGTHENING OF THE AGENCY'S TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES
(GC(41)/4 and GC(41)/COM.5/3)

1. Mr. COLE (United Kingdom) said that his country attached great importance to the Agency's technical co-operation activities and paid its Technical Co-operation Fund target shares in full.
2. Referring to the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/3, he suggested that, in the light of previous resolutions on the subject under consideration adopted by the General Conference and of the Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament adopted by the NPT Review and Extension Conference, the words "appropriately enhanced" in preambular paragraph (g) be replaced by "sufficient". In his view, if that change were made there would be no need for preambular paragraph (h).
3. Mr. BOUZOUITA (Tunisia), responding to the suggestion made by the United Kingdom representative, said that the Group of 77 had opted for the words "appropriately enhanced" in the light of concerns expressed by the Director General in the recent past regarding the level of the Agency's resources for technical co-operation activities.
4. Mr. RAGHURAMAN (India), expressing support for the statement made by the representative of Tunisia, urged that preambular paragraph (h) not to be deleted.
5. Turning to paragraph 2, he pointed out a typographical error: "Indicative Planning Futures" should in fact be "Indicative Planning Figures". Also, he suggested that "(IPFs)" be inserted after "Indicative Planning Figures".
6. Commenting on document GC(41)/4, he said that his delegation was pleased with the focus on Model Projects and with the way in which the Secretariat was using Country Programme Frameworks and the Integrated Evaluation Framework.
7. Mr. EL GHERNOUGUI (Morocco) expressed support for the statement made by the representative of Tunisia.

8. Mr. GONZALES (Chile), urging that preambular paragraph (g) of the draft resolution not be changed and that preambular paragraph (h) be retained, said that his delegation attached particular importance to operative paragraph 4, with its focus on sustainable development.

9. Mr. SNYDER (United States of America) said that the United States, which traditionally paid its Technical Co-operation Fund target shares in full, had in 1997 contributed US \$17 million to the Fund, made \$1.7 million available in support of footnote-a/ projects, provided \$230 000 for technical co-operation projects relating to nuclear safety, awarded Type-2 fellowships to a value of \$1.2 million and financed training courses and similar activities to a value of \$2 million.

10. Endorsing the statement made by the United Kingdom representative, he said that, although in the United States Government's view there was a need to maintain a balance between the Agency's promotional and safeguards activities, resolution GC(40)/RES/13 adopted in 1996 had not contained a paragraph comparable to preambular paragraph (h) of the draft resolution under consideration. He felt that it would be unwise to retain preambular paragraph (h).

11. Mr. HERRERA ANDRADE (Mexico) said that, although his country was not a member of the Group of 77, his delegation wholeheartedly supported the draft resolution under consideration.

12. With regard to preambular paragraph (h), it should be borne in mind that developing countries were now expected to conclude with the Agency protocols additional to their safeguards agreements and thereby assume additional safeguards obligations. Should they have to assume such additional obligations at a time when, according to the Director General, the resources for Agency technical co-operation were declining?

13. Mr. CASTERTON (Canada), expressing appreciation of the Secretariat's efforts in the technical co-operation area, said that his delegation attached particular importance to the concept of Partnership in Development and was looking forward to

examining the Secretariat's proposals relating to technical co-operation strategy at the forthcoming session of the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Committee.

14. With regard to the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/3, he endorsed the comments made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States and suggested that operative paragraph 5 be amended to read something like "... requesting Member States to pay their respective shares of the Technical Co-operation Fund targets in a timely manner".

15. Mr. EL GHERNOUGUI (Morocco), commenting on the statement made by the United Kingdom representative, said that in his view preambular paragraph (h) of the draft resolution before the Committee reflected rather well the intention underlying Article II of the Agency's Statute and should therefore be retained. In that connection, he recalled the linkage which had been established in 1995 between the financing of technical assistance and the financing of safeguards.

16. As regards preambular paragraph (g) of the draft resolution, the experience of the past 40 years had surely demonstrated that the Agency's resources for technical co-operation activities needed to be "appropriately enhanced".

17. Mr. RIPLEY (Australia), having endorsed the comments made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada, said that in his view operative paragraph 6 should be expanded so as to make the underlying ideas clearer.

18. Mr. SARWAT (Egypt) said he would like to see preambular paragraphs (g) and (h) of the draft resolution retained in their existing form.

19. With regard to operative paragraph 6, he said that, although Egypt - as a member of the Group of 77 - could obviously accept that paragraph as it stood, he felt that the word "Regional" was unnecessarily restrictive and should be deleted.

20. Mr. XU Naicheng (China), having expressed support for the Group of 77's draft resolution (and particularly for operative paragraph 6), said that his country appreciated the efforts of the Secretariat in the technical co-operation area but was

concerned about the decline in Agency resources for technical co-operation activities. His country would like to see Member States paying their full Technical Co-operation Fund target shares.

21. Mr. JAMEEL (Pakistan) said that, as representative of a country belonging to the Group of 77, he was opposed to the suggested replacement of “appropriately enhanced” by “sufficient” in preambular paragraph (g) of the draft resolution under consideration, which after all had the title “Strengthening of the Agency’s technical co-operation activities”. With the adverb “appropriately” before “enhanced”, preambular paragraph (g) should surely be unobjectionable as it stood.

22. With regard to preambular paragraph (h), he said that in his view the fact that 1996 resolution GC(40)/RES/13 had not contained a comparable paragraph was not a valid argument against its retention.

23. Mr. KHALILIPOUR (Islamic Republic of Iran), having associated himself with the comments made by the representatives of India, Morocco and Pakistan, thanked the Department of Technical Co-operation for the assistance which had been provided to his country - especially assistance with applications of nuclear energy in agriculture and medicine and with nuclear safety.

24. Mr. YAMANAKA (Japan) said that his country, which considered technical co-operation to be a very important Agency activity, took pride in paying its full Technical Co-operation Fund target share in time every year and would like to see all other Member States contributing to the Fund in that manner. The difficulties encountered in the technical co-operation field were due essentially to the fact that some Member States did not pay their full target shares.

25. Turning to preambular paragraph (g) of the draft resolution before the Committee, he recalled that preambular paragraph (g) of resolution GC(40)/RES/13 had read “... assured and sufficient” and said that in his view the formulation “... assured and appropriately enhanced” did not constitute an improvement.

26. With regard to preambular paragraph (h), in his view it suggested that there should be some kind of automatic balance between the promotional and the safeguards activities of the Agency - something which his country could not accept. He therefore felt that it should be deleted.

27. Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation) called for the replacement of “appropriately enhanced” by “sufficient” in preambular paragraph (g) and for the deletion of preambular paragraph (h).

28. Mr. WÓJCIK (Poland), advocating deletion of preambular paragraph (h) of the draft resolution, said that lengthy discussions in the past had led to the conclusion that the promotional activities and the safeguards activities of the Agency should be considered separately - each group of activities on its own merits.

29. Mr. TAHER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), commending the past efforts of the Department of Technical Co-operation, called for an expansion of Agency technical co-operation to additional fields of interest to developing countries.

30. Ms. MXAKATO-DISEKO (South Africa) said that in her view it should be possible to reach agreement on preambular paragraphs (g) and (h) through informal consultations.

31. Turning to operative paragraph 5, she said that in her view there was no need to replace “pledge” by “pay” as the paragraph ended with the words “and to make timely payments to the Fund”.

32. She would not like to see operative paragraph 6 deleted as regional co-operation was an important aspect of development.

33. Mr. QAHTAN (Yemen), associating himself with the comments made by the representatives of India, Morocco, Pakistan and Egypt, said that an increase in the Agency’s resources for technical co-operation activities should be clearly provided for in the draft resolution.

34. Mr. POSTA (Hungary) said that his country had benefited greatly from Agency technical assistance and his delegation therefore sympathized with the aspirations underlying the draft resolution before the Committee. Also, it could go along with preambular paragraph (g), although the words “appropriately enhanced” were open to a range of interpretations

35. Turning to preambular paragraph (h), he associated himself with what had been said by the representatives of Japan and Poland.

36. As regards operative paragraph 6, he felt that it should be expanded and its meaning thereby clarified.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that it was not for the Secretariat to initiate negotiations on technical co-operation funding among Member States and suggested that “Secretariat” therefore be replaced by “Board of Governors” in operative paragraph 2.

38. For operative paragraph 6 he suggested wording on the lines of “Requests the Director General, in consultation with Member States, to prepare a report on regional centres of excellence to serve as a basis for further consideration and possible action.”

39. With regard to preambular paragraph (g), he suggested that “sufficient” be substituted for “appropriately enhanced” as those words might be deemed to prejudge the outcome of the discussions which would no doubt soon start on new IPFs.

40. With regard to preambular paragraph (h), he felt that, if “sufficient” was substituted for “appropriately enhanced” it might be possible to agree on a formulation something like “Emphasizing the need to maintain an appropriate balance among all statutory activities of the Agency.”

41. Mr. de OURO-PRETO (Brazil) said that, as President of the Group of 77, he wished to emphasize the significance which the Group attached to the wording of the draft resolution as submitted by it. The Director General elect had underlined the importance of technical co-operation in his address to the Plenary, and one purpose of the draft resolution

submitted by the Group of 77 was to remind everyone that Agency technical co-operation deserved as much attention and effort as Agency safeguards.

42. Mr. GONZALES (Chile), associating himself with the comments just made by the delegate of Brazil, said that in his view the draft resolution was carefully balanced.

43. With regard to the Chairman's suggestion regarding operative paragraph 6, he felt that a time limit should be set for the submission of the envisaged report by the Director General.

44. Ms. MXAKATO-DISEKO (South Africa), thanking the Chairman for his suggestions, said that she had misgivings about his suggestion regarding operative paragraph 6.

45. Mr. RAGHURAMAN (India) said that he had misgivings about some of the suggestions made by the Chairman.

46. Mr. EL GHERNOUGUI (Morocco) said he was surprised that anyone should have problems with the Group of 77's draft resolution, which he had thought would attract a consensus.

47. Mr. COLE (United Kingdom) said that he appreciated the importance which the Group of 77 attached to Agency technical co-operation activities, which his country also considered to be very important.

48. In his view, the Chairman's suggestions might well pave the way to a consensus on the draft resolution before the Committee, but he would first like to see them in writing.

49. Mr. POSTA (Hungary), expressing appreciation of the Chairman's suggestions, said that in his view the suggestion regarding operative paragraph 6 was a good basis for further discussion on that paragraph.

50. Ms. OK (Turkey), referring to operative paragraph 6, said that the concept of "regional centres of excellence" was used in other international organizations and that, if clarification of the concept was needed, perhaps one could add a phrase on the lines of

“that have accumulated experience and expertise which could be drawn upon for the benefit of other countries in the region”.

51. Mr. SHOAIB (Pakistan) said that, while appreciating the Chairman’s suggestions, he would like the Group of 77’s draft resolution - which had been the fruit of careful deliberations - to be left essentially unchanged. In particular, he felt that the words “appropriately enhanced” should be retained in preambular paragraph (g).

52. The CHAIRMAN proposed that discussion of the item be suspended until delegations had had time to give more thought to his suggestions, which would soon be circulated in writing.

53. It was so agreed.

The meeting was suspended at 4.45 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m.

INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR THE CHERNOBYL SARCOPHAGUS¹ (GC(41)/COM.5/6)

54. Mr. LASH (United States of America), introducing the draft resolution submitted by the Group of 7 and Ukraine in document GC(41)/COM.5/6, recalled that in 1986 the world’s worst nuclear accident had occurred at Unit 4 of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant and said that in recent years the leaders of the nuclear community had been assisting Ukraine in its efforts to deal with the aftermath of that devastating event.

55. In December 1995, the Group of 7, the European Union and Ukraine had signed a Memorandum of Understanding regarding closure of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant by the year 2000. In addition to focusing on Ukraine’s long-term energy security, the Memorandum of Understanding called for the development of a plan for responding in a cost-effective and environmentally sound manner to the deteriorating condition of the sarcophagus entombing Unit 4.

¹ The Chairman announced that the United States delegation had asked him whether the Committee would advance its consideration of agenda item 22, “International initiative for the Chernobyl sarcophagus”. At the Chairman’s request the Committee agreed to take up the item at this point.

56. Constructed under incredibly adverse conditions, the sarcophagus had not been intended as a long-term solution to the problems posed by the radioactive remains within the destroyed reactor. Owing to the haste of its construction, the sarcophagus was now displaying many signs of increasing instability. If nothing was done, it might collapse, releasing radioactive materials and exposing the large remaining inventory of radioactive wastes. Such an event could lead to further contamination of the local environment and to substantial exposures of persons involved in managing it. It must therefore not be allowed to occur; the continued use and growth of nuclear power could not withstand another serious accident at Chernobyl.

57. The Group of 7 and Ukraine had, pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding, launched a major nuclear safety initiative to deal with the deteriorating sarcophagus - the Shelter Implementation Project (SIP). The purpose of the SIP, which had been designed by an international group of experts, was to: reduce the threat and the consequences of a collapse of the sarcophagus; increase nuclear safety and radioactive waste controls inside the sarcophagus; improve worker safety at the site; and create a better understanding of the contents of the sarcophagus pending final disposal of its radioactive inventory. The SIP, involving over 200 activities, was expected to take about eight years to complete, at a cost of approximately US \$750 million.

58. As its economy was in a state of transition, Ukraine could not on its own resolve the problems which it had inherited from the former Soviet Union. Currently, it was spending nearly 12% of its annual budget on dealing with the consequences of the Chernobyl accident. To assist in that monumental effort, the Group of 7 and the European Union had pledged \$300 million at the Denver Summit in support of the SIP. Ukraine would also be mobilizing resources, but the amount pledged by the Group of 7 and the European Union would not be enough. The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) was therefore endeavouring, together with the Group of 7 and Ukraine, to mobilize additional support. All the money collected would be placed in a special account managed by the EBRD, the Chernobyl Shelter Fund, from which grants would be made for specific SIP activities.

59. The first major effort to obtain contributions from both the public and the private sector would take place in November in New York, on the margins of the United Nations General Assembly. Vice-President Gore of the United States and President Kuchma of Ukraine had agreed to be honorary co-chairmen of a pledging conference for the Chernobyl Shelter Fund. Urging Member States to participate in the conference and pledge contributions, he said that contributions would help to ensure that the SIP was implemented as envisioned and that all contributing governments would become members of an "Assembly of Contributors" responsible for supervising SIP implementation.

60. Mr. POLUREZ (Ukraine) said that, although only a small part of the radioactive contents of Unit 4 of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant had been released into the environment, more than 25 000 km² of territory in Russia, Belarus and Ukraine had been contaminated and made unfit for living and economic use.

61. More than 90% of the radioactive contents of the reactor core remained inside the sarcophagus, which had not been designed for the safe long-term isolation of radioactive substances. The design lifetime of the sarcophagus was 30 years, but as the sarcophagus had been constructed under extreme circumstances it might not last that long in a safe condition. Scientific studies had resulted in a positive forecast for several years, but only on the assumption that no abnormal natural phenomena occurred.

62. The second - and main - danger, however, related to the damaged nuclear fuel inside the sarcophagus. Events in 1989 and 1996 pointed to the risk of a self-sustaining nuclear reaction occurring - a risk which could be fully eliminated only if the damaged nuclear fuel was withdrawn from the sarcophagus.

63. The Government of Ukraine was fully aware of its responsibility vis-à-vis Ukraine's population and the world at large. Since gaining independence, Ukraine had therefore been paying great attention to the sarcophagus safety issues. In 1991 his Government had announced an international competition for a project aimed at transforming the sarcophagus into an environmentally safe system.

64. Hundreds of experts and organizations from all over the world had taken part in that competition, and technical proposals were still being received. The technical proposals were very varied and, in some cases, mutually exclusive. There were proposals for launching the radioactive contents of the sarcophagus into space and for burying them in the depths of the earth, which testified to the extraordinarily complex nature of the sarcophagus problem.

65. In 1995, experts from Ukraine, the European Commission and elsewhere had decided to adopt a step-by-step approach to the problem and launched a Shelter Implementation Project (SIP) consisting of 22 tasks and costing about \$750 million. Implementation of the SIP would involve stabilization of existing structures, the creation of new systems for monitoring and managing masses of nuclear material, emergency planning, an in-depth study of the physical processes taking place in the sarcophagus and the surrounding area, and the development of technologies and equipment for the disposal of damaged nuclear fuel and other radioactive materials from the sarcophagus. If necessary, a light containment might be built over the sarcophagus. The project was a complex one, but its implementation would allow Ukraine to begin with the withdrawal and reliable long-term isolation of high-level wastes from the sarcophagus as part of the general process of decommissioning the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant. In that connection, it should be noted that Unit 1 had been completely shut down and that the Ukrainian Government had decided to decommission it.

66. A recent inspection of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant by WANO experts and a subsequent one by members of Ukraine's nuclear regulatory authority had led to the identification of a number of management, safety culture and personnel discipline problems. Those problems, which required immediate solution, confirmed the correctness of the approach underlying the Memorandum of Understanding. Delays in implementing the SIP or failure to carry out any one of its component tasks would inevitably have adverse safety and energy security consequences for Ukraine.

67. The Government of Ukraine was mobilizing resources in order to translate the SIP into reality, but, given the conditions of economic crisis in the country and with the enormous annual payments (approximately \$1 billion) being made to minimize the consequences of the Chernobyl accident, Ukraine's capabilities were very limited. The country was in no position to cope alone with the problems inherited from the former Soviet Union.

68. The President and the Government of Ukraine, in confirming their commitment to the Memorandum of Understanding, hoped that many governments and international commercial bodies would join in the efforts of Ukraine, the Group of 7 and the European Commission to carry out the Shelter Implementation Project, whose aim was to protect populations and the environment from the consequences of the most serious nuclear accident in human history.

69. Mr. TOWLER (United Kingdom) said that one of the most important challenges facing the international community was the transformation of the site of the Chernobyl accident into an environmentally safe condition. It was now generally accepted that the Unit 4 sarcophagus was deteriorating seriously and that remedial action was urgent. That did not imply any criticism of the truly heroic efforts of those who had been responsible for building the sarcophagus - only that, given the circumstances prevailing in 1986, further work was essential.

70. A scheme had therefore been devised to provide a long-term solution to the problem - the Shelter Implementation Project (SIP), which was the product of an agreement between Ukrainian and Western technical experts.

71. On the whole, the SIP provided a firm basis for completion of the work necessary for making the sarcophagus environmentally safe and, thus, finally laying the ghost of Chernobyl to rest. Implementation of the SIP represented a major challenge for nuclear technicians and civil engineers, but also for donor countries, since the estimated \$750 million cost of the proposed work was far more than Ukraine could afford. Indeed,

the scale of the venture was such that only a commitment from the global community could ensure its success.

72. The Group of 7 and the European Commission had started the ball rolling by pledging \$300 million at the Denver Summit in June. The United Kingdom would, of course, be making its contribution towards that total.

73. He very much hoped that the resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/6 would be adopted by consensus. More particularly, he hoped that many Member States of the Agency would participate in the November pledging conference.

74. Mr. YAMANAKA (Japan) said that, given the significance of the international initiative for the Chernobyl sarcophagus, he too hoped that many Member States of the Agency would participate in the conference.

75. Mr. HERTTRICH (Germany), confirming his country's support for the international initiative, said that the envisaged project had to be seen in the context of the present situation at the Chernobyl site. There was now only one of the original four units operating - Unit 2 had been severely damaged by fire in 1992 and Unit 1 had been shut down in 1996. Even when all the units had been shut down, however, a great deal of decommissioning work would still be necessary in order to make the site safe. The effort would be far beyond the resources of Ukraine, and there would be social consequences for those working at the site. It was a tremendous challenge for the international community, and his country hoped that many Member States would make pledges in support of the project in November.

76. Mr. SHALADONAU (Belarus), expressing support for the draft resolution, said that his country was grateful for the initiative taken by the Group of 7. Safety at the Chernobyl site was important not only for Ukraine, and the international community should take the measures necessary for avoiding a repetition of the Chernobyl catastrophe.

77. Mr. ARAR (Turkey) said that his country welcomed the international initiative launched by the Group of 7 and Ukraine and hoped that the November pledging conference would be a success.

78. Mr. CASTERTON (Canada) said that as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution, his country hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

79. Mr. BELLELLI (Italy), emphasizing the importance which his country attached to the international initiative for the Chernobyl sarcophagus, said that the pledge made by the Group of 7 at the Denver Summit had been intended to - inter alia - demonstrate to the international community the urgency of the sarcophagus problem. His country too hoped that the pledging conference would be a success.

80. Mr. KAYSER (Luxembourg) said that he would like the factual accuracy of preambular paragraph (d) of the draft resolution to be checked before the Committee took a decision on the draft resolution.

81. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee defer further consideration of agenda item 22 and of the draft resolution.

PLAN FOR PRODUCING POTABLE WATER ECONOMICALLY
(GOV/2936-GC(41)/12 and GC(41)/COM.5/4)

82. Mr. RAGHURAMAN (India), introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/4, said that the topic was one of great concern to the Group of 77, which, although generally satisfied with the progress made within the framework of the Agency, would like the focus on that topic to continue. He hoped that the Committee would unanimously recommend adoption of the draft resolution.

83. His country, which appreciated the efforts undertaken by the Secretariat with the support of 17 Member States since the General Conference's previous session, was planning to establish a nuclear desalination demonstration plant at the Madras Atomic Power Station and would be happy to share its expertise.

84. Mr. XU Naicheng (China), expressing support for the draft resolution, said that Chinese experts had contributed to a number of Agency activities relating to nuclear desalination and that, with the Secretariat's encouragement, China and Morocco had - as indicated in paragraph 15 of document GC(41)/12 - started a joint pre-demonstration study.

85. Mr. TAHER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his country, which was very concerned about the problem of potable water shortages, especially in Africa and the Middle East, had for a long time been in favour of the establishment of an International Nuclear Desalination Advisory Group.

86. Mr. CASTERTON (Canada), expressing satisfaction with the scope and focus of the Agency's activities relating to nuclear desalination, said that Canada was pleased to be a member of the International Nuclear Desalination Advisory Group (INDAG) and looked forward to participating in INDAG reviews of Agency activities.

87. He thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea and the Korean Atomic Energy Research Institute for hosting the Symposium on Desalination of Seawater with Nuclear Energy held in Taejon in May. The symposium had provided a very useful forum for exchanging technical and economic information.

88. Turning to the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/4, he proposed that the establishment of INDAG be referred to in an operative paragraph rather than in preambular paragraph (j). He also proposed that the phrase "provide the required assistance to Member States" in operative paragraph 2 be replaced by "take the appropriate measures to assist Member States".

89. Mr. LEDERMAN (Israel) said that for the past eight years his country had been wholeheartedly supporting the Secretariat's efforts to help resolve the problem of water shortages in arid areas such as the Middle East through the use of desalination integrated with nuclear power generation. Those efforts had resulted in technical documents and recommendations, but much remained to be done, particularly with regard to - inter alia - the economics of nuclear desalination, public acceptance and infrastructure

development. In that connection, the recent establishment of INDAG had been a promising step.

90. Mr. COLE (United Kingdom), having welcomed the proposals made by the representative of Canada for amending the draft resolution, said that in his view the words “and concrete actions” following “appropriate measures” in operative paragraph 4 were superfluous and should be deleted.

91. Mr. BOUZOUITA (Tunisia), having also welcomed the amendment proposals made by the representative of Canada, said that in his view there was a difference between “appropriate measures” and “concrete actions”; the former related to the programming stage and the latter to the operational stage. He would like operative paragraph 4 to be retained as it stood.

92. Mr. ŠTULLER (Czech Republic) said that in his view the budgetary implications of operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 were unclear. In particular, he did not know what was meant by “concrete actions”.

93. Mr. SNYDER (United States of America) said that the production of potable water economically was a worthy cause, but one which should be approached cautiously. The draft resolution contained a number of changes relative to resolution GC(40)/RES/14 adopted in 1996 which could lead to the Agency’s having to take on too many new tasks. For that reason, he supported the amendment proposals made by the representatives of Canada and the United Kingdom.

94. Mr. BOUZOUITA (Tunisia) said that, as representative of a sponsor of the draft resolution, he could not agree to the deletion of the phrase “and concrete actions” in operative paragraph 4.

95. Mr. COLE (United Kingdom) said that he would not press for its deletion.

96. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/4 with preambular paragraph (j) ending “... in document GC(41)/12”, with

a new operative paragraph 1 reading “1. Welcomes the establishment of an International Nuclear Desalination Advisory Group (INDAG);” and consequential renumbering of operative paragraphs 1-6, and with the words “provide the required assistance to “in original operative paragraph 2 replaced by “take the appropriate measures to assist”.

97. It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.