

# General Conference

**GC(52)/COM.5/OR.6**

Issued: December 2008

**General Distribution**

Original: English

---

**Fifty-second regular session**

## Committee of the Whole

### Record of the Sixth Meeting

*Held at the Austria Center, Vienna on Friday, 3 October 2008, at 3.15 p.m.*

**Chairman:** Mr. MONAWAR (Afghanistan)

**Later:** Mr. NIEWODNICZANSKI (Poland)

---

**Contents**

Item of the agenda <sup>1</sup>		Paragraphs
16	Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications ( <i>continued</i> )	1–55
15	Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities ( <i>resumed</i> )	56–85

---

<sup>1</sup> GC(52)/COM.5/1.

**Abbreviations used in this record:**

FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
TCF	Technical Cooperation Fund

## **16. Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications (continued)**

(GC(52)/COM.5/L.11 and Add. 1, L.7 and Add. 2, L.5, L.3/Rev.1 and L.9/Rev.2 and Add. 1)

1. The representative of INDIA, introducing the draft resolution entitled “Nuclear power applications” in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.11, said that the text was largely based on resolution GC(51)/RES/14.B.1 adopted in 2007. The main changes relative to that resolution reflected Agency programme developments since the 2007 session of the General Conference or were factual updates. Like resolution GC(51)/RES/14.B.1, the text highlighted the Agency’s support for Member States interested in benefiting from nuclear power.
2. Having pointed out some small editorial corrections that needed to be made, he said that in paragraph 11 the word “interested” should be inserted before “developing countries”.
3. The representative of AUSTRIA, speaking on behalf of his own country and also of Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, New Zealand and Norway, said that the position of the six countries on nuclear power was well known. While they recognized the right of every Member State to decide on its own energy mix, they did not consider that nuclear power was a sustainable energy source, given the very serious safety and waste management issues associated with nuclear power. Also, they were concerned about the possible proliferation risks that the increase in the number of nuclear power plants might entail. The international community should allocate more resources to the development of safe, renewable energy sources.
4. As was recognized in a number of draft resolutions before the Committee, any responsible discussion on nuclear power needed to take account of the serious safety and security issues associated with existing and future nuclear power generation, including the high risks — besides the high costs — associated with transport, waste disposal and reprocessing.
5. Despite their concerns, however, Austria, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, New Zealand and Norway would not block adoption of the draft resolution contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.11.
6. The representative of MALAYSIA said that her delegation could support the draft resolution as it stood.
7. The representative of FRANCE said that the draft resolution had eight sponsors and more than 40 co-sponsors, which showed that it related to a core Agency programme. Despite differing national policies, there was broad agreement regarding nuclear power development and the Agency’s role in it.
8. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA said that his delegation was in full support of the draft resolution with the inclusion of “interested” in paragraph 11.
9. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, having expressed support for the draft resolution with “interested” inserted in paragraph 11, suggested the insertion of the words “and relative priority” in operative paragraph 3 between “availability” and “of resources”.
10. The representative of JAPAN, having thanked the delegations of India and France for their efforts in preparing the draft resolution, said that all nuclear power programmes must be conducted in such a way as to ensure safety, security and non-proliferation.

11. The representative of INDIA said that the suggestion made by the representative of the United Kingdom was acceptable to his delegation.

12. The representative of AUSTRALIA, welcoming the draft resolution, said that the end of paragraph 3 should perhaps read “subject to the relative priority and availability of resources”.

13. The representative of AUSTRIA said that his delegation could not support either suggestion regarding paragraph 3. In many resolutions the Secretariat had been requested to undertake actions “subject to the availability of resources”, but there had never been any reference to “relative priorities”. His delegation was strongly in favour of leaving paragraph 3 as it stood.

14. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that, having listened to the comments of the representative of Austria, he withdrew his proposal.

15. The CHAIRMAN, noting that no other Committee members had requested the floor, took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.11 with the insertion of “interested” before “developing countries” in paragraph 11.

16. It was so agreed.

17. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to revert to the draft resolution entitled “Approaches to supporting nuclear power infrastructure development”, which was contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.7 and had been introduced by Canada during the Committee’s fourth meeting.

18. The representative of CANADA said that, following consultations, his delegation wished to propose the following changes: in paragraph (c), “vital” should be replaced by “significant”; in paragraph 6, “interested” should be inserted before “Member States”; and in paragraph 7, “Welcomes” should be replaced by “Notes with interest” and the phrase “those States and the Secretariat to exchange information and, as appropriate, coordinate their activities in that regard” should be replaced by “this exchange”.

19. The representatives of NEW ZEALAND and IRELAND expressed support for the amendments proposed by the delegation of Canada.

20. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.7 with the amendments just proposed.

21. It was so agreed.

22. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to revert to the draft resolution entitled “Strengthening the support to Member States in food and agriculture”, which was contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.5 and had been introduced by China during the Committee’s third meeting.

23. The representative of CHINA said that in informal consultations it had been agreed: that paragraphs (i) and (h) of the draft resolution should be merged; that “Urges” in paragraph 2 should be replaced by “Requests”; that “significant support provided” in paragraph 4 should be replaced by “work undertaken”, with any necessary editorial changes; and that paragraph 5 should be deleted.

24. With the deletion of paragraph 5, there would be no reference to the FAO/IAEA Agriculture and Biotechnology Laboratory. His delegation therefore proposed inserting the phrase “,including the FAO/IAEA Agriculture and Biotechnology Laboratory in Seibersdorf,” after “Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture” in paragraph 4.

25. Regarding paragraph 8, some delegations had expressed reservations about the description of the partnership of the Agency and FAO as “fruitful and mutually beneficial”. Although his delegation considered that description to be accurate, it would not insist on the retention of those words. It would like the word “strengthened” to be retained, but could go along with the deletion of “directly”.
26. The representatives of PAKISTAN, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, MALAYSIA and BRAZIL expressed support for the draft resolution with the amendments indicated by the representative of China.
27. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that, in his view, paragraphs (h) and (i) should simply be deleted.
28. Regarding paragraph 4, he saw no need for the inclusion of a reference to the FAO/IAEA Agriculture and Biotechnology Laboratory.
29. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that he could support the merging of paragraphs (h) and (i) if the phrase “which urged the strengthening of the Joint FAO/IAEA Agriculture Programme” was deleted.
30. With regard to paragraph 8, his delegation would like the phrase “fruitful and mutually beneficial” to be deleted.
31. The representative of CHINA said that he was somewhat mystified by the objection to the phrase “which urged the strengthening of the Joint FAO/IAEA Agriculture Programme” in paragraph (i). That phrase was based on paragraph 9 of resolution GC(51)/RES/14.A.1 adopted by the General Conference in 2007. However, for the sake of consensus his delegation would not object to its deletion.
32. Regarding paragraph 8, his delegation could go along with deletion of the words “fruitful and mutually beneficial”.
33. The CHAIRMAN, noting that no other Committee members wished to take the floor, took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.5: with paragraphs (h) and (i) merged and the phrase “which urged the strengthening of the Joint FAO/IAEA Agriculture Programme” deleted; with “Urges” replaced by “Requests” in paragraph 2; with “significant support provided” replaced by “work undertaken” and the phrase “, including the FAO/IAEA Agriculture and Biotechnology Laboratory in Seibersdorf,” inserted after “Food and Agriculture” in paragraph 4; with the deletion of paragraph 5; and with the deletion of “fruitful and mutually beneficial” and “directly” in paragraph 8.
34. It was so agreed.
35. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to revert to the draft resolutions on non-power nuclear applications, which were contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.3/Rev.1 and had been introduced by Brazil — on behalf of the Group of 77 and China — during the Committee’s third meeting.
36. The representative of MALAYSIA recalled that consideration of paragraph 9 of the draft resolution had been deferred pending consideration of the draft resolution contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.5. In the light of the agreement reached on that document, she believed that paragraph 9 of the draft resolution now before the Committee should be retained as it stood.
37. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, supported by the representatives of CANADA and the NETHERLANDS, said that, if the draft resolution contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.5 was to be added to the draft resolutions contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.3/Rev.1, paragraph 9 was superfluous and should be deleted.

38. The representative of CANADA, supported by the representative of the NETHERLANDS, suggested that the phrase in paragraph (d) reading “and noting that many Member States are obtaining benefits from the application of nuclear techniques in food and agriculture through the Joint FAO/IAEA Programme” and paragraph 10 be deleted.

39. The representative of MALAYSIA said that paragraph 9 addressed capacity building and other issues not addressed in the draft resolution contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.5. Similarly, paragraph 10 referred to the possible use of nuclear techniques as a component of an integrated approach for combating locusts — also an issue not addressed in that draft resolution. Paragraphs 9 and 10 should therefore be retained.

40. Moreover, she saw no harm in the General Conference noting the benefits that many Member States were obtaining through the Joint FAO/IAEA Programme and therefore believed that paragraph (d) should be retained.

41. The representative of CANADA said that, while the draft resolution contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.5 did not reproduce the precise wording of paragraphs (d), 9 and 10, it addressed issues pertaining to the Joint FAO/IAEA Programme and to collaboration between the Agency and FAO. Retention of the aforementioned paragraphs was thus unnecessary.

42. The representative of PAKISTAN urged that paragraphs (d), 9 and 10 be retained.

43. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee postpone further discussion of the draft resolution in order to permit informal consultations.

44. It was so agreed.

45. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, introducing the draft resolution on “Agency activities in the development of innovative nuclear technology” contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.9/Rev.2, drew particular attention to paragraphs (d), (f), 2 and 5.

46. In informal consultations that had taken place since document GC(52)/COM.5/L.9/Rev.2 had been issued, it had been agreed that in paragraph 5 the phrase “for the 21st century” should be deleted and that in paragraph 6 “to implement” should be replaced by “to address” and the phrase “on implementation progress” should be deleted.

47. The representative of FRANCE, referring to paragraph 3, suggested that the word “all” before “the actions of the Secretariat” be deleted.

48. The CHAIRMAN, noting that no other Committee members had requested the floor, took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.9/Rev.2 with the word “all” deleted in paragraph 3, with the phrase “for the 21st century” deleted in paragraph 5 and with “to implement” replaced by “to address” and the phrase “on implementation progress” deleted in paragraph 6.

49. It was so agreed.

**The meeting was suspended at 4.45 p.m. and resumed at 5.45 p.m.**

50. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume consideration of the draft resolutions contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.3/Rev.1.

51. The representative of MALAYSIA said that, following informal discussions, the sponsors had agreed that operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution 1 should read: “Urges the strengthening of FAO/IAEA partnership activities, in order to enhance the continuing efforts in support of Member States, ...”.

52. Paragraphs (d) and 10 would remain, as originally worded.
53. The representatives of CANADA and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for the flexibility they had displayed.
54. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolutions contained in document GC(51)/COM.5/L.3/Rev.1: with the word “developing” before “Member States” in paragraph 6 of draft resolution 1 deleted; with paragraph 9 of that draft resolution reading as just indicated by the representative of Malaysia; with paragraphs 4 and 6 of draft resolution 2 deleted; with paragraph 4 of draft resolution 3 amended to read “... to strengthen — through the Regular Budget, the Technical Cooperation Fund and other partnerships — its support ...”; and with “2007” replaced by “2008” in paragraph (i) of draft resolution 4.
55. It was so agreed.

## **15. Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities** (resumed) (GC(52)/COM.5/L.10)

56. The representative of BRAZIL, reporting on the informal consultations that had taken place on the draft resolution contained in document GC(52)/COM.5/L.10, made the following proposals: at the end of paragraph (aa), add the phrase “and recognizing that several Member States, in addition to the eight pilot countries, are implementing the “One United Nations” exercise on a voluntary basis, and encouraging other Member States to consider this as well”; reword paragraph 2 to read “Urges Member States to make every effort towards facilitating the process for setting the TCF targets”; in paragraph 4, delete “, including a hedging mechanism,”; amend the last part of paragraph 18 to read “... whilst aiming at achieving sufficient, assured and predictable resources for the TC programme”; insert, after paragraph 19 of the draft text, paragraph 19 of resolution GC(51)/RES/13, relating to the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster; in paragraph 24, replace “recipient Member States” by “developing Member States” and delete “entirely”; and in paragraph 27, add, after “this resolution” the phrase: “highlighting significant accomplishments of the prior year and indicating goals and priorities for the year to come”.
57. The representative of MALAYSIA said that her delegation was in favour of the proposed amendments to paragraph 24.
58. The representative of PAKISTAN said that his delegation preferred the original wording of that paragraph but, in the interests of consensus, was prepared to go along with the proposed amendments.
59. The representatives of NORWAY and the NETHERLANDS welcomed the proposed amendment to paragraph 18.
60. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that her delegation could go along with the proposed rewording of paragraph 2 but would prefer paragraph 4 to be deleted since, in its view, the protection of TCF resources issue was adequately covered in paragraph (n). It would also prefer paragraph 24 to be deleted.

61. Her delegation could go along with the proposed amendment to paragraph 27, but wondered whether the Secretariat would be able to include information about “goals and priorities for the year to come” in the Technical Cooperation Report for 2008.

62. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF PROGRAMME SUPPORT AND COORDINATION, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION, said that it would, but the task would be a complex one.

63. The representative of BELARUS, welcoming the proposed insertion in the draft resolution of paragraph 19 of resolution GC(51)/RES/13, relating to the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster, recalled that the United Nations General Assembly had, in resolution A/RES/62/9, proclaimed the period 2006-2016 as the Decade of Recovery and Sustainable Development of the Affected Regions.

64. The representative of AUSTRALIA welcomed the proposed rewording of paragraph 2.

65. Regarding paragraph 4, his delegation felt that the Secretariat should be requested to report to the General Conference only, not to the Board of Governors as well, since the Board was already dealing with the protection of TCF resources issue.

66. His delegation could go along with the proposed amendment to paragraph 18.

67. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF BUDGET AND FINANCE, responding to a comment made by the representative of Australia about paragraph 24, said that the Secretariat reviewed programme support costs on a case-by-case basis. Programme support costs were not currently charged on cost-sharing contributions from governments for footnote-a/ projects. However, activities funded from extrabudgetary resources that involved only the procurement of equipment were currently subject to a 3% charge in respect of programme support costs.

68. The representative of PAKISTAN said that programme support costs should not be charged in the case of projects funded from extrabudgetary resources that did not involve additional input from the Secretariat.

69. Basically, in his country’s view, activities for the promotion of nuclear science, technology and applications in developing Member States, as opposed to — for example — the repatriation of spent nuclear fuel, should be funded entirely from the Regular Budget.

70. The representative of EGYPT, referring to the comment made by the representative of the United Kingdom about paragraph 4, said it was important that the protection of TCF resources issue be covered in the operative part of the draft resolution as well as the preambular part. The issue, which had been highlighted by the External Auditor, was an important one and the wording of paragraph 4 did not prejudice the outcome of the requested Secretariat examination of possible mechanisms for protecting the resources of the TCF, especially given the proposed deletion of the phrase “, including a hedging mechanism,” and the continued inclusion of the phrase “, to the extent possible,”.

71. The representative of FRANCE expressed support for the view that paragraphs 4 and 24 were not acceptable in their current form and should be deleted.

72. The representative of the NETHERLANDS said that his delegation could go along with the proposed addition to paragraph (aa).

73. Regarding the proposed insertion of paragraph 19 of resolution GC(51)/RES/13, he suggested the addition, at the end, of the words “and stresses the importance of the TC programme for mitigating the consequences of possible future nuclear safety incidents in TC recipient countries”.



74. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, responding to the suggestion made by the representative of the Netherlands, said that, in the event of a nuclear safety incident in a Member State, that State could always request Agency assistance, possibly provided through a technical cooperation project, but the Agency's technical cooperation programmes were not the appropriate mechanism for "mitigating the consequences of possible future nuclear safety incidents".

75. Calling for the retention of paragraph 4, he said that the requested report by the Secretariat might help Member States in future decision-making.

76. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, having expressed support for the deletion of paragraph 24, said that his delegation had misgivings about the idea of — in paragraph 2 — "*a priori* criteria" to be applied in the setting of TCF targets.

77. The representative of CANADA, expressing support for the proposed addition to paragraph (aa) wondered whether the idea of encouraging additional Member States to consider implementing the "One United Nations" exercise on a voluntary basis should not be conveyed in the operative part rather than the preambular part of the draft resolution.

78. Welcoming the proposed rewording of paragraph 2, he withdrew the proposal he had made regarding that paragraph during the previous meeting.

79. He expressed support for the deletion of paragraph 24, but also for the proposed inclusion in paragraph 27 of the phrase "highlighting significant accomplishments of the prior year and indicating goals and priorities for the year to come".

80. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION expressed support for the insertion in the draft resolution of the paragraph of resolution GC(51)/RES/13 relating to the Chernobyl disaster.

81. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA suggested that ", including safety aspects," in paragraph (cc) be amended to ", including safety and security aspects".

82. He also suggested the insertion, after paragraph 13, of a new paragraph along the lines of "Requests the Secretariat to ensure, through internal coordination and in accordance with its established procedures, that TC projects do not entail safety, security and proliferation risks".

83. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA, expressing doubts about the new operative paragraph suggested by the representative of the United States of America, said that, with its insertion in the draft resolution the General Conference would be requesting the Secretariat to do something that it was already doing.

84. With regard to the proposal made by the representative of the Netherlands for an addition to paragraph 19 of resolution GC(51)/RES/13, he said that Agency technical cooperation was recipient-driven and the General Conference should avoid dictating the nature of technical cooperation activities.

85. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF PROGRAMME SUPPORT AND COORDINATION, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION, said that every technical cooperation project proposal was examined from the safety, security and non-proliferation standpoints during the pre-approval process.

**The meeting rose at 7 p.m.**