

General Conference

GC(55)/COM.5/OR.5

Issued: January 2012

General Distribution

Original: English

Fifty-fifth regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Fifth Meeting

Held at the Austria Center, Vienna, on Thursday, 22 September 2011, at 6.15 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms YPARRAGUIRRE (Philippines)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹		Paragraphs
18	Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and application of the Model Additional Protocol (<i>resumed</i>)	1–4
15	Nuclear security, including measures to protect against nuclear and radiological terrorism (<i>resumed</i>)	5–18
16	Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities (<i>resumed</i>)	19–171

¹ GC(55)/COM.5/1.

Abbreviations used in this record:

OIOS	Office of Internal Oversight Services
RSA	Revised Supplementary Agreement Concerning the Provision of Technical Assistance by the IAEA
TCF	Technical Cooperation Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

18. Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and application of the Model Additional Protocol (*resumed*) (GC(55)/COM.5/L.6)

1. The CHAIRPERSON invited Mr Brady, of the delegation of Iceland, who was chairing the working group established to conduct negotiations on the draft resolution contained in document GC(55)/COM.5/L.6, to report on progress.
2. Mr BRADY said that the working group had thus far held three sessions, at which the negotiations had taken place in a very constructive manner. He thanked the participating delegations for their patience and flexibility. Further negotiations were needed in respect of six paragraphs.
3. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee wished to postpone discussion under item 18 to allow for further negotiations.
4. It was so agreed.

15. Nuclear security, including measures to protect against nuclear and radiological terrorism (*resumed*) (GC(55)/COM.5/L.11/Rev.2)

5. The representative of GERMANY, introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(55)/COM.5/L.11/Rev.2, said that, following broad consultations, the sponsors had decided to retain the language of the original paragraph (g), with the reference to “Nuclear Security Summits”, which had the support of a large majority of the delegations consulted. At the same time, that paragraph had been moved, and it was now paragraph (i).
6. Paragraph 21 had been amended in order to accommodate concerns raised by the representative of the Russian Federation during the Committee’s third meeting.
7. The representative of CUBA said that there was no consensus on paragraph (i), with the phrase “, including Nuclear Security Summits,”. It was regrettable that the genuine concerns of a group of Member States regarding nuclear security summits were not being taken into account. If the “spirit of Vienna” prevailed in the General Conference, the resolutions adopted would reflect the interests of all Member States, rather than marginalize some of those countries.
8. She proposed that, in order to accommodate the concerns of those Member States which were not invited to participate in nuclear security summits, three paragraphs be added to the draft resolution, on the following lines: “Stressing that nuclear security is a matter that concerns all Member States and that calls for collective efforts and broad mutual understanding”; “Regrets the fact that nuclear security summits are being organized in a discriminatory and exclusive manner”; and “Invites the Member States concerned to take the corrective measures necessary in order to make nuclear security summits inclusive, with the aim of promoting comprehensive collective action in this very sensitive area”.

9. If those three paragraphs were added, her delegation would not object to paragraph (i).
10. The representative of SWITZERLAND said that the Secretariat should, pursuant to paragraph (i), which his delegation would like to see retained, report to the Board in November on the contributions made by the Agency to different international nuclear security forums.
11. The representative of the BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA said that his delegation, which had been unable to participate in the consultations on the draft resolution, shared the concerns of the delegation of Cuba with regard to the nature of nuclear security summits and welcomed the proposal just made by the representative of Cuba. Nuclear security was indeed a matter that concerned all Member States.
12. The representative of the REPUBLIC OF KOREA said that, although his delegation's proposal for the inclusion of a reference to the Nuclear Security Summit to be held in Seoul in 2012 had not been taken up by the sponsors of the draft resolution, his delegation could go along with paragraph (i).
13. Nuclear security summits made a meaningful contribution in the area of nuclear security, and participants in the 2010 Nuclear Security Summit had underlined the central role of the Agency in that area. The reference to "Nuclear Security Summits" in paragraph (i) of the draft resolution was as legitimate as the reference to the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism in paragraph 9.
14. As host of the 2012 Nuclear Security Summit, the Republic of Korea had conducted a series of outreach activities in different regions, highlighting the spirit of openness and transparency of that important event.
15. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that nuclear security was a sensitive matter of relevance to all Member States, but most Member States had not been invited to the 2010 Nuclear Security Summit, held in Washington, D.C., and issues discussed there had been raised at subsequent Agency meetings. That was not acceptable. Unless all Member States were equally entitled to participate, nuclear security summits should not be commended or similarly referred to within the framework of the Agency, and the Secretariat should not contribute in any way to such events.
16. His delegation would not object to paragraph (i) if a phrase along the lines of "to which all Member States are invited" were inserted after "Nuclear Security Summits".
17. The CHAIRPERSON proposed that there be further informal consultations on paragraph (i).
18. It was so agreed.

16. Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities

(resumed)

(GC(55)/COM.5/L.14)

19. The representative of PERU, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that during informal consultations on the draft resolution contained in document GC(55)/COM.5/L.14 since the Committee's previous meeting it had been agreed that the words "expert services" should be inserted after "training courses," in paragraph (cc) and that in paragraph (ff) the final phrase ("by identifying project ... resources") should be deleted.

20. The Group of 77 and China could accept the proposal for an additional paragraph about the Revised Supplementary Agreement made by the representative of the United States of America during the previous meeting.
21. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA welcomed the acceptance of his proposal.
22. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union, proposed the insertion, after paragraph (bb), of a paragraph reading “Stressing the importance for the Agency of having appropriate internal and external evaluation capacity to maintain within all technical cooperation activities high quality standards, achieving measurable and sustainable results”.
23. The representative of PERU questioned the appropriateness of the expressions “high quality standards” and “measurable and sustainable results” in the wording proposed by the representative of Italy and suggested that the paragraph proposed by her be amended to read “Stressing the importance for the Agency of regular internal and external evaluations (as performed by the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the External Auditor, respectively) in order to achieve more effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the TC programme”.
24. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC, expressing support for the suggestion made by the representative of Peru, said that, in her opinion, the evaluations performed by the OIOS and the External Auditor were sufficient for achieving more effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the TC Programme.
25. She proposed amending paragraph (jj) to read “... the role of the National Liaison Officers, the Permanent Missions to the IAEA and the Programme Management Officer (PMO)”.
26. The representative of CANADA suggested that, in the wording just suggested by the representative of Peru for the proposed additional preambular paragraph, the phrase “, as well as results,” be added after “more effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability”.
27. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA expressed support for the suggestion made by the representative of Canada and suggested that, in paragraph (gg), the phrase “as well as the transparency” be inserted between “ the effectiveness and efficiency” and “of the TC Programme”.
28. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union, said she could accept the wording suggested by the representative of Peru with the addition suggested by the representative of Canada.
29. Welcoming the suggestion made by the representative of the United States with regard to paragraph (gg), she suggested that the additional phrase be expanded to read “as well as the transparency and accountability”.
30. She suggested that paragraph (gg) be amended also through the addition of “in maintaining the quality standards of projects” after “in this regard”.
31. The representative of PERU said that he could go along with the insertion of “, as well as results,” in the wording suggested by him for the proposed additional preambular paragraph.
32. Regarding the suggested amendments to paragraph (gg), he could go along with the insertion of “as well as the transparency” but not of “as well as the transparency and accountability”, since it was not clear who was accountable to whom. He could not go along with the addition of “in maintaining the quality standards of projects”, since he considered the phrase to be unclear.

33. With the insertion of “as well as the transparency”, paragraph (gg) would be identical with paragraph (aa) of resolution GC(54)/RES/9 adopted in 2010.

34. The representative of EGYPT said that her delegation shared the views of the representative of Peru regarding paragraph (gg) and the views of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic regarding the evaluations performed by the OIOS and the External Auditor.

35. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that she welcomed the acceptance by the representative of Peru of the insertion of “as well as the transparency” in paragraph (gg) and would consider withdrawing her suggestion regarding the insertion of “as well as the transparency and accountability” if agreement was reached on the proposed addition of a preambular paragraph regarding evaluations.

36. The PROGRAMME COORDINATOR, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION, responding to a request for clarification as regards project quality standards from the representatives of PERU and ITALY, said that, in the international cooperation and development context, project quality standards were embedded in the logical framework approach to results-based management. Results-based management involved —inter alia — requirements as regards effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, results and impact, stakeholder involvement and ownership. The project quality standards specific to Agency technical cooperation were defined in document INFCIRC/267 and the Technical Cooperation Strategy, and reflected in the central criterion.

37. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee agreed on the following wording for the additional preambular paragraph: “Stressing the importance for the Agency of regular internal and external evaluations (as performed by the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the External Auditor, respectively) in order to achieve more effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, as well as results, of the TC Programme”.

38. It was so agreed.

39. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee agreed to the insertion of “expert services” after “training courses,” in paragraph (cc).

40. It was so agreed.

41. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee agreed to the deletion of the phrase “by identifying projects that could be funded through extrabudgetary resources” at the end of paragraph (ff).

42. It was so agreed.

43. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee agreed that paragraph (jj) should be amended to read “... the role of the National Liaison Officers, the Permanent Missions to the IAEA and the Programme Management Officer (PMO)”.

44. It was so agreed.

45. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union, proposed amending paragraph 6 to read “Urges Member States to pay in full and on time their voluntary contributions to the TCF, preferably in United States dollars or euros, encourages ...”.

46. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, expressing support for the proposal, said that it was important that contributions to the TCF be made in readily convertible currencies.

47. The representative of CANADA, also expressing support for the proposal, said that his Government had recently agreed to close its Canadian dollar TCF account and would henceforth be contributing to the TCF in United States dollars and euros.
48. The representative of CHINA said that the most important thing about contributions to the TCF was that they should be paid in full and on time; the currency of payment was a matter of secondary importance. In paragraph 75 of the Technical Cooperation Report for 2010 it was stated that "... the rate of attainment on payments decreased from 94.5% in 2009 ... to 90.8% in 2010 ...", while paragraph 82 reported a reduction in the amount of TCF resources held in currencies "difficult to use in the implementation of the TC programme" following an agreement between the Agency and UNDP China.
49. The Chinese Government always pledged and paid its full TCF target share in a timely manner, but for historical reasons it paid 30% in United States dollars and 70% in Chinese renminbi. There had been discussions within the Chinese Finance Ministry regarding a 50/50 split, but it would take time to make the necessary adjustments, and the proposal just made on behalf of the European Union would therefore present difficulties for his country.
50. Regarding paragraph (gg), his delegation could go along with the proposal by the representative of the United States of America.
51. The representative of ITALY invited the representative of China to propose alternative additional wording for paragraph 6.
52. The representative of CHINA proposed the phrase " , if possible in United States dollars and euros or national currencies".
53. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION expressed support for the proposal made by the representative of China.
54. The representative of MEXICO suggested — after an explanation given by the PROGRAMME COORDINATOR, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION — that "National Participation Costs" be inserted before the abbreviation "NPCs" in paragraph 6, even though the abbreviation was already spelled out in paragraph (w).
55. The representative of CANADA, supported by the representatives of SPAIN and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, said that the phrase " , if possible in United States dollars and euros or national currencies" proposed by the representative of China covered all currencies in which Member States might wish to contribute to the TCF, and it therefore added nothing to the draft resolution.
56. The representative of PERU said that it would be simpler to leave paragraph 6 unchanged as the paragraph was virtually identical with paragraph 6 of resolution GC(54)/RES/9 adopted in 2010.
57. He welcomed the information given in paragraph 82 of the Technical Cooperation Report for 2010 about a reduction in the amount of TCF resources held in currencies "difficult to use in implementation of the TC programme".
58. The representative of FRANCE, welcoming the information given in paragraph 82 of the Technical Cooperation Report for 2010, agreed with the representative of Peru that paragraph 6 should be left unchanged.
59. The underlying issue could be revisited in 2012 in the light of any relevant decisions taken by the Chinese authorities.

60. The CHAIRPERSON asked whether the Committee wished to leave paragraph 6 unchanged except for the addition of “National Participation Costs” before “NPCs”.

61. It was so agreed.

62. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union, suggested that the following phrase be added at the end of paragraph 8: “, leading to fewer and more integrated, comprehensive projects with a higher impact and measurable outcomes”.

63. She further suggested the deletion of paragraph 11, so that the Secretariat would not have to continue exploring “ the possibility and practicability of paying NPCs in kind” and to seek “efficient ways of accurately valuing in-kind contributions”.

64. In addition, she suggested that, in paragraph 13, the phrase “, taking into account the recommendations of the OIOS and the External Auditor” be inserted after “programmes and their management”, in the light of the additional preambular paragraph already agreed on.

65. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, referring to paragraph 8, expressed support for the addition suggested by the representative of Italy. Also, he suggested that “requests,” be deleted; document INFCIRC/267 made it clear that Agency technical cooperation was based on needs.

66. Having expressed support for the suggested deletion of paragraph 11, he suggested the insertion, after paragraph 20, of a paragraph reading “Requests the Secretariat to develop a formal mechanism for Member States to share voluntarily their CPFs and footnote-a/ project details, via a searchable electronic format, with other Member States in order to facilitate cooperation and extrabudgetary contributions”. His country had recently found it difficult to match its extrabudgetary contributions, particularly ones made within the framework of the IAEA Peaceful Uses Initiative, to footnote-a/ projects in specific areas, and the envisaged formal mechanism would facilitate the process.

67. The representative of PERU, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that he recognized the validity of the suggestion made by the representative of Italy regarding paragraph 8. However, he could not go along with the deletion of “requests” suggested by the representative of the United States of America; although Agency technical cooperation was indeed based on needs, requests from Member States were required in order to initiate the technical cooperation process. He suggested that paragraph 8 be left unchanged and that it be followed by a paragraph reading “Notes with appreciation the efforts of the Secretariat to rationalize the number of TC projects in order to increase programme efficiency and create synergies among projects, whenever feasible, and in coordination with the Member States concerned, while also ensuring that such rationalization will not affect programme delivery”.

68. The representative of CANADA suggested that, in the new paragraph suggested by the representative of Peru, the words “will not affect” be altered to “will only improve”, so as to render the formulation more positive.

69. With regard to paragraph 13, he said that it was important that the Secretariat update the Technical Cooperation Strategy, which was almost ten years old, and suggested that “, as appropriate,” be deleted.

70. The representative of EGYPT said that, like the representative of Peru, she could not go along with the suggested deletion of “requests,” in paragraph 8.

71. She could also not go along with the additional phrase suggested by the representative of Italy for paragraph 8; in her view, Member States should not become involved in micro-managing the Secretariat's technical cooperation activities.

72. As regards paragraph 13, if reference was to be made to the recommendations of the OIOS and the External Auditor, the paragraph should be split into two — one paragraph starting with “Stresses the need ...” and the other starting with “Requests the Secretariat to update ...”.

73. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that he welcomed the new paragraph suggested by the representative of Peru for insertion after paragraph 8, particularly if “will not affect” was replaced by “will only improve” as suggested by the representative of Canada. Also, he suggested, in the light of the reference to ‘projects with a higher impact’ in the additional phrase suggested by the representative of Italy for paragraph 8, that the words “and impact” be added after “programme delivery” at the end of that paragraph.

74. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC called for the retention of “requests,” in paragraph 8.

75. She could not go along with the suggestion made by the representative of Italy for the addition to paragraph 8 of a phrase advocating “... fewer ... projects ...”; the number of projects in a technical cooperation programme did not necessarily affect the efficiency of the programme or the rate of delivery.

76. The representative of EGYPT said that she could not accept the suggested replacement of “will not affect’ by “will only improve” in the new paragraph suggested by the representative of Peru. That paragraph, with its reference to rationalization of the number of TC projects, already represented a concession of the Group of 77 and China to the European Union and should not be modified.

77. The representative of PERU, having expressed support for what had just been said by the representative of Egypt, said that he saw merit in the suggested addition of the words “and impact” at the end of the new paragraph suggested by him but would prefer that the paragraph remain unchanged.

78. With regard to paragraph 11, he would prefer that it not be deleted; in effect, it was identical with paragraph 11 of resolution GC/54/RES/9 adopted in 2010.

79. He expressed support for the suggested deletion of “, as appropriate,” in paragraph 13 and for splitting the paragraph into two paragraphs. He suggested that the first of the two resulting paragraphs read as follows: “Stresses the need to strengthen TC activities, including the provision of sufficient resources, and to continually enhance the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programmes and their management, with due account, and in close consultation with Member States and the Secretariat, of the recommendations of the OIOS and the External Auditor”.

80. The representative of the BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA expressed concern regarding the suggestion made by the representative of the United States of America for a paragraph about the development of “a formal mechanism for Member States to share voluntarily their CPFs”. How would the development of such a mechanism be funded? In his view, it should be funded through voluntary, extrabudgetary contributions.

81. The representative of EGYPT said that the authors of the draft resolution, including her delegation, had shown considerable flexibility in accepting amendment proposals from outside the Group of 77 and China during the drafting process and would not like the balance of the draft resolution to be disturbed further than it would be through the addition of the suggested paragraph about rationalization of the number of TC projects, which should remain as suggested by the representative of Peru.

82. The representative of PERU echoed the views expressed by the representative of Egypt.
83. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, responding to the comment made by the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, drew attention to paragraph (ff) as it was to be amended — “Noting that interested Member States making their CPFs available to potential partners on a voluntary basis could facilitate additional cooperation,” — and said that he was ready to provide further explanations of his suggestion for a paragraph about the voluntary sharing of CPFs.
84. The representative of AUSTRALIA, referring to the new operative paragraph suggested by the representative of Peru, suggested that the words “will not affect programme delivery” be replaced by “will affect programme delivery positively”.
85. The representative of EGYPT requested time to consider that suggestion.
86. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union, welcomed the suggestion.
87. The CHAIRPERSON suggested that interested delegations hold informal consultations.

The meeting was suspended at 8.45 p.m. and resumed at 9.05 p.m.

88. The representative of PERU thanked the representatives of the United States of America, Australia, Canada and Italy for the flexibility shown by them with regard to paragraph 8 and the additional operative paragraph suggested by him.
89. As to paragraph 8, there had been agreement that “requests,” should be retained, so that the paragraph would remain unchanged.
90. As to the paragraph to follow paragraph 8 suggested by him, there had been agreement on two amendments proposed by him — the replacement of “Notes with appreciation” by “Welcomes” and the replacement of “will not affect” by “will support”.
91. The CHAIRPERSON took it that there was now a consensus on those two operative paragraphs.
92. It was so agreed.
93. The representative of PERU, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, expressed concern about the suggestion that paragraph 11 be deleted.
94. The representative of ITALY said that she had made the suggestion because the European Union feared that acceptance of paragraph 11 would open the door to the widespread payment of NPCs in kind. However, the European Union was prepared to be flexible.
95. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that he could go along with the retention of paragraph 11, but the underlying issue should be revisited in 2012. Also, there should be a discussion on the issue of in-kind contributions to the TCF.
96. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC said that, if the issue underlying paragraph 11 was revisited in 2012, the General Conference should be informed of the results of the action taken by the Secretariat in response to that paragraph.
97. The representative of FRANCE said that he could accept retaining paragraph 11 in the draft resolution now before the Committee. In 2012, however, in the light of a report by the Secretariat on the results of the action taken by it, the General Conference should seriously consider whether the Secretariat should be requested to continue taking such action.
98. The CHAIRPERSON took it that there was a consensus on retaining paragraph 11.

99. It was so agreed.

100. The CHAIRPERSON said she understood that there was a consensus on splitting paragraph 13 into two paragraphs, the first one reading “Stresses the need to strengthen TC activities, including the provision of sufficient resources, and to continually enhance the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programmes and their management, with due account, and in close consultation with Member States and the Secretariat, of the recommendations of the OIOS and the External Auditor” and the second one reading “Requests the Secretariat to update the Technical Cooperation Strategy (GOV/INF/2002/8) in consultation with all Member States, taking into consideration the increasing number of Member States requesting TC projects and the Agency's Medium Term Strategy 2012–2017”.

101. It was so agreed.

102. The CHAIRPERSON recalled the proposal made during the previous meeting by the representative of the United States of America for a paragraph — to be inserted after paragraph 14 — reading “Stresses the importance of the Revised Supplementary Agreement (RSA) and requests all Member States receiving technical cooperation to sign an RSA Concerning the Provision of Technical Assistance by the IAEA”.

103. The representative of EGYPT said that, although the Group of 77 and China had accepted that proposal, she would like the word “requests” to be replaced by “encourages”.

104. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that he could go along with that change.

105. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee accepted the proposed additional paragraph with “requests” replaced by “encourages”.

106. It was so agreed.

107. The CHAIRPERSON recalled that the representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA had proposed — for insertion after paragraph 20 — an additional paragraph reading “Requests the Secretariat to develop a formal mechanism for Member States to share voluntarily their CPFs and footnote-a/ project details, via a searchable electronic format, with other Member States in order to facilitate cooperation and extrabudgetary contributions”.

108. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union, expressed support for the proposed additional paragraph.

109. The representative of EGYPT asked whether the TC-PRIDE website could be modified in order to accommodate the aims of the delegation of the United States of America.

110. The PROGRAMME COORDINATOR, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION, said that TC-PRIDE or another suitable IT platform could be so modified.

111. The representative of PERU, suggested — in the light of what had just been said by the Programme Coordinator — that further consideration of the proposed additional paragraph be postponed.

112. The representative of MEXICO — supported by the representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, COSTA RICA, SPAIN, PERU, the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC and AUSTRALIA — suggested that the words “national projects and” be inserted before “regional cooperation agreements” in paragraph 28.

113. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union and referring to paragraph 24, proposed that the phrase “, particularly developing countries and LDCs,” be reformulated to read “, focusing on developing countries and particularly LDCs,” and that the words “the promotion of key areas identified in the Istanbul Declaration” be replaced by “the implementation of the principles expressed in the Istanbul Declaration”.

114. She proposed that, for the sake of consistency, the word “particularly” be inserted before “LDCs” in paragraph 26.

115. The representative of PERU, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that he would prefer the retention of “, particularly developing countries and LDCs,” in paragraph 24. Accordingly, he was opposed to the insertion of “particularly” before “LDCs” in paragraph 26.

116. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA suggested that in paragraph 26 the words “problems of the developing countries and LDCs” be replaced by “challenges of the LDCs”.

117. In explanation of the suggestion, he said that the wording suggested by him would be more in line with the thinking of the new Deputy Director General for Technical Cooperation and that an in-depth examination of the specific characteristics and problems of all of the Agency’s developing Member States with respect to the peaceful applications of nuclear energy would place a significant burden on the Secretariat. Moreover, if all of the Agency’s developing Member States were included, why not include the other Member States that received technical assistance through the Agency?

118. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA said that paragraphs 24 and 26 should remain unchanged. Paragraph 24 was identical with paragraph 23 of resolution GC(54)/RES/9 except for the replacement of “the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation” by “the Istanbul Declaration, the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011–2020” and paragraph 26 was a natural follow-up to paragraph 24 of that resolution.

119. The representative of COSTA RICA said that he endorsed the comments made by the representatives of Peru and South Africa regarding paragraphs 24 and 26, although he would have no objection to replacing “problems” by “challenges” in paragraph 26.

120. The representative of CANADA expressed support for the suggestion made by the representative of the United States of America regarding paragraph 26. The new Deputy Director General for Technical Cooperation had indicated that LDCs had specific characteristics and faced specific challenges which needed to be examined.

121. The representative of SPAIN also expressed support for the suggestion made by the representative of the United States of America regarding paragraph 26.

122. The representative of PERU, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said with regard to paragraph 26 that he could go along only with the replacement of “problems” by “challenges”.

123. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC, referring to the proposed amendments to paragraphs 24 and 26, said that she was opposed to the formulation “particularly LDCs” as it made an unnecessarily strong distinction between LDCs and other developing countries.

124. The representative of AUSTRALIA, referring to paragraph 26, endorsed the idea of replacing “problems” by “challenges” and said that there would be significant advantage in focusing the in-depth examination on LDCs.

125. As regards paragraph 24, however, he saw no need to change the phrase “particularly developing countries and LDCs”.

126. As regards paragraph 28, he suggested the insertion of the words “projects under” before “the regional cooperative agreements”.

127. The representative of GERMANY, having expressed support for the replacement of “problems” by “challenges” in paragraph 26, said that there needed to be a stronger focus on LDCs in the Agency’s technical cooperation activities. His delegation was therefore in favour of the proposal by the representative of the United States of America.

128. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA asked whether the Secretariat had considered what resources would be needed in order to complete the in-depth examination called for in paragraph 26 if it covered both LDCs and developing countries in general.

129. The PROGRAMME COORDINATOR, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION, said that an analysis of the specific needs of LDCs had already started; to analyse the specific needs of all developing countries would require significant resources, but she would not dare to speculate about the amount.

130. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that, in his view, paragraph 26 should remain as it stood.

131. The representative of FRANCE proposed the following alternative wording for paragraph 26: “Welcomes the Secretariat’s intention to develop a tailor-made approach for LDCs”.

132. The representative of EGYPT said that the General Conference should not be welcoming intentions; its role was to mandate the Secretariat and to evaluate the Secretariat’s performance.

133. The CHAIRPERSON took it that there was agreement on the proposed insertion of the words “national projects and” and “projects under” in paragraph 28.

134. It was so agreed.

135. The CHAIRPERSON took it that there was agreement on paragraphs 29, 30 and 31.

136. It was so agreed.

137. The representative of CHINA, referring to paragraph 26, said that he agreed to replacing “problems” with “challenges”, but the rest of the text should remain unchanged.

138. The representative of FRANCE said that, if the reference to “the developing countries” was to remain in paragraph 26, he would insist on retaining “problems” rather than “challenges”. Developing countries were facing problems, not challenges.

139. The representative of PERU, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, agreed with the proposal by the representative of the United States of America that the words “as well as the transparency” be inserted after “the effectiveness and efficiency” in paragraph (gg).

140. He proposed the addition of the following phrase at the end of the operative paragraph about the voluntary sharing of CPFs and footnote-a/ project details proposed by the representative of the United States of America: “, while giving at the same time due consideration to the protection of confidentiality of the information contained in those reports”.

141. As to paragraphs 24 and 26, he proposed reverting to the wording of paragraphs 23 and 24 of resolution GC(54)/RES/9 adopted in 2010, with the replacement of “promotion of key areas identified” by “implementation of the principles expressed” in paragraph 24.

142. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union and referring to paragraph (gg), said that, since the representative of Peru had accepted the insertion of the words “as well as the transparency”, she could agree to withdraw the proposal for the insertion also of the words “and accountability”. However, she appealed to the Group of 77 and China to accept her proposal regarding the phrase “in maintaining the quality standards of projects”.

143. With regard to paragraphs 24 and 26, she could go along with the proposal made by the representative of Peru.

144. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that he could go along with the proposed addition of the phrase “, while giving at the same time due consideration to the protection of confidentiality of the information contained in these reports” at the end of the paragraph about the voluntary sharing of CPFs and footnote-a/ project details proposed by his delegation. He welcomed the fact that the representative of Peru, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, accepted the paragraph with that addition.

145. He also welcomed the fact that the representative of Peru had agreed to the insertion of the words “as well as the transparency” in paragraph (gg), and he could go along with the proposal made by the representative of Peru regarding paragraphs 24 and 26.

146. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee could accept paragraph (gg) with the insertion of the words “as well as the transparency”.

147. The representative of EGYPT recalled that the representative of Italy had proposed the addition of a phrase about the quality standards of projects.

148. The representative of ITALY said that, for the sake of consensus, she would not press the proposal in question.

149. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee wished to accept paragraph (gg) with the insertion of the words “as well as the transparency”, so that the paragraph would be identical with paragraph (aa) of resolution GC(54)/RES/9.

150. It was so agreed.

151. The CHAIRPERSON said she understood that the paragraph about the voluntary sharing of CPFs and footnote-a/ project details should read as follows: “Requests the Secretariat to develop a formal mechanism for Member States to share voluntarily their CPFs and footnote-a/ project details, via a searchable electronic format, with other Member States in order to facilitate cooperation and extrabudgetary contributions, while giving at the same time due consideration to the protection of confidentiality of the information contained in those reports”.

152. Following consultations with the representative of PERU, she proposed that the words “contained in those reports” be replaced by “contained in CPFs and footnote-a/ project details”.

153. It was so agreed.

154. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee wished paragraph 24 to read “Requests the Director General to make every effort to ensure, where relevant, that the Agency’s TC Programme, taking into account specific needs of each Member State, particularly developing countries and LDCs, contributes to the implementation of the principles expressed in the Istanbul Declaration, the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011–2020 and to the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals, and further requests the Director General to keep Member States informed of the Agency’s activities in this regard”.

155. It was so agreed.

156. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC, referring to the paragraph about the voluntary sharing of CPFs and footnote-a/ project details, said that, in her view, it should contain a phrase on the lines of “subject to the availability of resources”.

157. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that it was his delegation’s understanding that there was already agreement on that paragraph and also on paragraphs (gg), 24 and 26. If the consideration of that paragraph was to be reopened, perhaps the consideration of the other three paragraphs should be reopened.

158. The CHAIRPERSON asked the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic if the reference to “the availability of resources,” in paragraph 30 of the draft resolution met her concerns.

159. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC said that it did. However, her delegation would like the paragraph being discussed to start as follows: “Requests the Secretariat, in coordination with Member States, to develop a formal mechanism ...”.

160. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that his delegation would not accept the addition of the phrase “, in coordination with Member States,”. It had made several concessions with regard to the draft resolution under consideration and to other draft resolutions.

161. The representative of EGYPT said that she was disappointed at the situation which had developed. The Group of 77 and China had shown considerable flexibility in an effort to bring about a consensus on the draft resolution.

162. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that the paragraph being discussed had been worded by his delegation in such a way as to allow the Secretariat the flexibility necessary for developing the envisaged formal mechanism.

163. He wondered whether replacing “mechanism” by “process” would meet the concerns of some other delegations.

164. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC said that, in the interest of consensus, she could accept the paragraph with the replacement of “mechanism” by “process”.

165. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee wished to accept the following wording of the paragraph: “Requests the Secretariat to develop a formal process for Member States to share voluntarily their CPFs and footnote-a/ project details, via a searchable electronic format, with other Member States in order to facilitate cooperation and extrabudgetary contributions, while giving at the same time due consideration to the protection of confidentiality of the information contained in CPFs and footnote-a/ project details”.

166. It was so agreed.

167. The representative of FRANCE, recalling that he was opposed to the replacement of “problems” by “challenges” in an otherwise unchanged paragraph 26, expressed support for the proposal by the representative of Peru that the paragraph be identical with paragraph 24 of resolution GC(54)/RES/9, which spoke of “the specific characteristics and problems of the developing countries and LDCs ...”.

168. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that his delegation regretted the fact that the paragraph would not focus more on LDCs.

169. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that his delegation also regretted that fact, but it could go along with the proposal that the Committee revert to paragraph 24 of resolution GC(54)/RES/9.

170. The CHAIRMAN, having assumed that the Committee wished to revert to paragraph 24 of resolution GC(54)/RES/9, took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(55)/COM.5/L.14 as amended during the discussion under the present agenda item.

171. It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 10.50 p.m.