

General Conference

GC(56)/COM.5/OR.5

Issued: November 2012

General Distribution

Original: English

Fifty-sixth regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Fifth Meeting

Held at the Austria Center, Vienna, on Wednesday, 19 September 2012, at 10.20 a.m.

Chairman: Mr SHUKRI (Saudi Arabia)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹	Paragraphs
13 Measures to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety (<i>resumed</i>)	1–13
14 Nuclear security	14–114

¹ GC(56)/19.

13. Measures to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety (resumed) (GC(56)/COM.5/L.1/Rev.1)

1. The representative of AUSTRALIA, introducing the revised draft resolution contained in GC(56)/COM.5/L.1/Rev.1, said that it had been prepared on the basis of consultations and took account of comments made and amendments proposed during the Committee's first meeting.
2. The representative of ARGENTINA thanked the delegation of Australia for taking account of his delegation's proposal that the word "robustness" in paragraph 32 be replaced by "safety" and proposed that in paragraph 33 "robustness" be replaced by "resilience".
3. His country had traditionally been among the sponsors of the draft resolutions on measures to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety. It was not among the sponsors of the draft resolution now before the Committee, however, as the text placed excessive emphasis on nuclear safety, to the detriment of radiation protection. Nuclear safety was of crucial importance to countries with nuclear power programmes, like Argentina, but most Member States did not have nuclear power programmes and were concerned mainly about radiation protection.
4. The draft resolution referred to the radiation protection of patients, but mentioned occupational radiation protection — in paragraph 42 — only in connection with the activities of other organizations, despite the fact that Article III.A.6 of the Statute mandated the Agency to establish or adopt "standards of safety for protection of health [...] (including such standards for labour conditions) [...] and to provide for the application of these standards ...".
5. Radioactive waste safety, which was a major concern for many countries, was dealt with only briefly, while remediation was mentioned only in connection with the remediation of uranium mining sites, although it was a major concern for Japan after the Fukushima Daiichi accident.
6. His delegation, which welcomed the intention of the Secretariat to prepare a comprehensive report on the Fukushima Daiichi accident, considered that the main focus of that report should be on radiation protection. The people living in and near Fukushima Prefecture cared little about broken pumps and other technical problems; they were concerned about environmental contamination and the attendant health effects.
7. He hoped that in 2013 the Secretariat would focus more strongly on radiation protection and that the stronger focus would be reflected in the draft resolution submitted to the General Conference under the agenda item "Measures to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety".
8. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, having commended the authors of the draft resolution for their efforts, proposed inserting the words "of Member States" after "greater participation" in subparagraph 42 (iv).
9. The representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FRANCE, FINLAND and CANADA expressed support for the proposed addition of the words "of Member States" in subparagraph 42 (iv).

10. The representative of CHINA, having expressed support for the draft resolution, said that paragraph 22 might need some editing for the sake of clarity.

11. The representative of CANADA, supported by the representatives of JAPAN and AUSTRALIA, suggested the insertion of a comma between “lessons learned” and “identified” in paragraph 22.

12. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(56)/COM.5/L.1/Rev.1, as orally amended.

13. It was so agreed.

14. Nuclear security

(GC(56)/15 and Corr.1; GC(56)/COM.5/L.4)

14. The representative of FRANCE, introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(56)/COM.5/L.4, said that it had been prepared in the light of wide consultations. It was based to a large extent on resolution GC(55)/RES/10 adopted in 2011, but it referred to recent developments such as the decision that the Agency would host in 2013 a conference entitled “International Conference on Nuclear Security: Enhancing Global Efforts”, the establishment of the Nuclear Security Guidance Committee, and the endorsement by the Board of Governors of the Nuclear Security Fundamentals document “Objective and Essential Elements of a State’s Nuclear Security Regime”.

15. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN proposed the insertion, after paragraph (i), of a paragraph reading “Underscoring the importance of nuclear safety and security and mindful of the need to prevent any acts of industrial sabotage in nuclear facilities.”.

16. The proposal was not politically motivated; rather, it was prompted by the experience of Iranian experts in connection with the commissioning of nuclear facilities.

17. With regard to paragraph (i), his delegation had reservations about the inclusion of a reference to the Nuclear Security Summits held in Washington D.C. and Seoul, given the fact that not all Agency Member States had been invited to attend them.

18. His delegation had in 2011 not blocked a consensus on paragraph (i) of resolution GC(55)/RES/10, hoping that the Nuclear Security Summit to be held in Seoul in 2012 would be open to all Member States. Unfortunately, its hopes had not been fulfilled.

19. His delegation had no problems with the reference in paragraph (i) to the conference entitled “International Conference on Nuclear Security: Enhancing Global Efforts”, as it was to be open to all States.

20. Regarding paragraph 14, his delegation would like the words “and provide” to be deleted.

21. The representative of FRANCE, referring to paragraph (i), said that, in drafting it, the sponsors had been guided by the compromise reached in 2011: emphasis of the need for the involvement of all Member States in nuclear security-related activities and initiatives, followed by the mention of Nuclear Security Summits.

22. If the other sponsors agreed, his delegation would go along with the deletion of the words “and provide” in paragraph 14, so that the paragraph would be identical with paragraph 13 of resolution GC(55)/RES/10.

23. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that the Tehran International Conference on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, held in 2010, deserved to be mentioned in paragraph (i) just as much as the Nuclear Security Summits held in Washington D.C. and Seoul. In 2011, in order to facilitate a consensus, his delegation had not called for the inclusion of a reference to that conference in paragraph (i) of resolution GC(55)/RES/10.

24. The representative of CUBA said that his delegation did not consider the wording of paragraph (i) to be balanced and would like the last part of the paragraph to be deleted, so that the paragraph would end with the words “and open to all States”.

25. It would also like the following paragraph to be inserted immediately after paragraph (i): “Noting the role that relevant international processes and initiatives could play in facilitating synergy and cooperation in the area of nuclear security.”

26. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said it was regrettable that nuclear security, basically a technical issue, was being treated by some as though it were primarily a political issue. All countries with a nuclear power programme or thinking of embarking on one needed to address the issue of nuclear security regardless of whether they were invited to participate in various international processes and initiatives, and the Agency should assist such countries in that regard.

27. Some Member States had begun to argue, however, that progress in the area of nuclear security depended on progress in the area of nuclear disarmament, referring to, for instance, United Nations General Assembly resolution 65/62, which was mentioned in paragraphs (d) and (j) of the draft resolution. His delegation was concerned about attempts to link nuclear security and nuclear disarmament in the context of the Agency.

28. He proposed amending paragraph (q) to read “Recognizing the IAEA’s central role in compiling and sharing information through the Illicit Trafficking Database (ITDB) on illicit trafficking ... ,”

29. He proposed the insertion of the words “as appropriate” in paragraph 3 after “Calls upon all States to ensure”.

30. Noting that paragraph 8 had been placed in square brackets, he said that, as the Board of Governors had endorsed the Nuclear Security Fundamentals document mentioned in that paragraph, the square brackets should be removed.

31. He proposed replacing “the Secretariat, in cooperation with Member States,” in paragraph 9 by “the Agency” and the deletion of the words “and nuclear security culture” at the end of paragraph 11.

32. He wondered why paragraph 10 referred to the Global Partnership as a nuclear security-related initiative, since it had not engaged in any important work to date in the area of nuclear security.

33. The representatives of the CZECH REPUBLIC and SWEDEN said that they were in favour of keeping paragraph (i) as it stood, since Nuclear Security Summits were extremely important.

34. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION noted that Member States were encouraged in paragraph 18 to establish “national nuclear forensics libraries”, whereas in paragraph 18 of resolution GC(55)/RES/10 they had been encouraged to establish “national nuclear material databases”. Nuclear forensics libraries were considerably more complex than nuclear material databases.

35. The representative of the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, urging that paragraph (i) be left as it stood, said that Nuclear Security Summits helped to boost the Agency's role in the area of nuclear security.

36. The representatives of ROMANIA and POLAND said that paragraph (i) was a well-balanced paragraph and should remain unchanged.

37. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA expressed support for the replacement of "the Secretariat, in cooperation with Member States," by "the Agency" in paragraph 9 as proposed by the representative of the Russian Federation.

38. References to disarmament had been included in earlier resolutions relating to nuclear security, and they provided an important context for work in the nuclear security area.

39. The representative of EGYPT said that, in her view, the references to General Assembly resolution 65/62 in the draft resolution before the Committee did not forge a mandatory link between nuclear security and nuclear disarmament.

40. She requested the representative of the Russian Federation to explain why he had proposed the insertion of the words "as appropriate" in paragraph 3.

41. The representative of BRAZIL said that there was a nuclear disarmament dimension to nuclear security and that the references to United Nations General Assembly resolution 65/62 should therefore be retained.

42. He expressed support for the proposed amendment to paragraph 9.

43. His delegation had doubts about the proposed insertion of the words "as appropriate" in paragraph 3.

44. Regarding paragraph (o), his Government, which attached great importance to the efforts being made to establish a collaborative network of nuclear security support centres, intended to establish such a centre in Brazil.

45. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, explaining his proposal that the words "as appropriate" be inserted in paragraph 3, said that international cooperation in the field of peaceful nuclear activities should not be allowed to compromise nuclear security — or nuclear safety — under any circumstances. It was difficult to predict the risks that might be involved in such cooperation, but if unacceptable risks were detected, certain international cooperation projects would have to be terminated.

46. The representative of INDIA said that nuclear security in the context of the Agency was a technical matter and concerned the physical protection of nuclear material and facilities — not nuclear disarmament. He requested the Secretariat to inform the Committee of the scope of the Agency's mandate in the area of nuclear security.

47. The DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR SECURITY said that the Advisory Group on Nuclear Security (AdSec) had defined nuclear security in 2003 as "the prevention and detection of, and response to, theft, sabotage, unauthorized access, illegal transfer or other malicious acts involving nuclear material, other radioactive substances or their associated facilities". That definition constituted the basis for the activities of the Office of Nuclear Security, including the development of Nuclear Security Series publications.

48. The representative of CANADA, in response to the comment by the representative of the Russian Federation regarding the mention of the Global Partnership in paragraph 10, said that in 2010 the G8 Muskoka Declaration had highlighted four priority areas for renewed international

commitment, one of them being nuclear and radiological security, and members of the G-8 were carrying out nuclear and radiological security-related activities within the framework of the Global Partnership. Thus, the mention of the Global Partnership in paragraph 10 was relevant.

49. Regarding the proposal by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for a preambular paragraph about industrial sabotage, it was not clear what the Agency's role would be in preventing acts of industrial sabotage. When making the proposal, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran had stated that it was not politically motivated, but that was precisely how his delegation viewed the proposal. In its opinion, the proposed paragraph would be completely out of place in the draft resolution under consideration.

50. The representative of ARGENTINA said that his delegation agreed with the delegation of Brazil that the references to United Nations General Assembly resolution 65/62 should be retained. Nuclear disarmament was clearly an essential aspect of nuclear security; if there were no nuclear weapons in the world, the problems of nuclear security would be far less serious.

51. The representative of India had rightly pointed out that nuclear security in the context of the Agency was a technical matter, but the position of India was not incompatible with the position of Brazil and Argentina.

52. His delegation agreed with the delegation of the Russian Federation that the words "the Secretariat, in cooperation with Member States," in paragraph 9 should be replaced by "the Agency". It also agreed that in paragraph 11 the words "and nuclear security culture" should be deleted; the concept "nuclear security culture" had not yet been clearly defined, and there were no legally binding obligations relating to it. The same applied to the concept "nuclear safety culture"; it had not been possible to agree on legally binding obligations relating to nuclear safety culture in discussions concerning the Convention on Nuclear Safety.

53. With regard to paragraph 18, his delegation shared the misgivings of the delegation of the Russian Federation about the phrase "national nuclear forensics libraries".

54. Paragraph (k) contained the phrase "reaffirming the importance of coordination between security and safety activities". His delegation would have preferred "reaffirming the importance of integrating security and safety activities".

55. The representative of AUSTRALIA, referring to paragraph 11, said it was true that the concepts "nuclear security culture" and "nuclear safety culture" were difficult to define, but paragraph (b) of the draft resolution contained in document GC(56)/COM.5/L.1/Rev.1 (entitled "Measures to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety") referred to "nuclear safety culture", and his delegation considered that it would be regrettable not to have a reference to "nuclear security culture" in the draft resolution now under consideration, if only in the preamble.

56. With regard to the deletion of the words "and provide" in paragraph 14 requested by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, those words did not appear in the corresponding paragraph — paragraph 13 — of resolution GC(55)/RES/10. Was that the reason for the request for their deletion?

57. The representative of the BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA, referring to paragraph (i), said that his delegation welcomed all nuclear security-related initiatives involving all Member States of the Agency. However, the last part of the paragraph mentioned "international processes and initiatives" in which not all Member States of the Agency had taken part or would take part. Within the framework of such processes and initiatives, resolutions had been adopted which his country, not having taken part, could not endorse.

58. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, having commended the sponsors of the draft resolution on a well-balanced text, said that the language in paragraph (i) was the result of a compromise that had worked well in the past.

59. Her delegation could accept the change in paragraph 9 proposed by the delegation of the Russian Federation, and it would give careful consideration to the proposals relating to paragraph 14 and other paragraphs.

60. Her delegation agreed with what the representative of Canada had said about industrial sabotage and about the Global Partnership.

61. Her delegation understood the concern expressed by the representative of the Russian Federation about attempts to link nuclear security and nuclear disarmament in the context of the Agency. However, it could go along with the references to United Nations General Assembly resolution 65/62 in paragraphs (d) and (j), although it was not entirely comfortable with them.

62. A concept that resonated strongly with countries thinking of embarking on a nuclear power programme during discussions about nuclear security education and training was “nuclear security culture”. Although the concept had not yet been clearly defined, the scientific and technical community considered that nuclear security culture was something well worth fostering. Her delegation therefore believed that the words “and nuclear security culture” at the end of paragraph 11 should be retained.

63. As regards the comments of the representatives of the Russian Federation and Argentina about the reference to national nuclear forensics libraries in paragraph 18, such libraries had already been established and, as stated in paragraph 40 of the Nuclear Security Report 2012, the Agency had initiated a coordinated research project on “the identification of high confidence nuclear forensics signatures for the development of national nuclear forensics libraries.”

64. The representative of LEBANON said his delegation was strongly in favour of paragraph (j), with the reference to “the area of disarmament and non-proliferation” being left unchanged.

65. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, responding to the comment made by the representative of Canada regarding his proposal for a preambular paragraph about industrial sabotage, said that the proposal was definitely not politically motivated and that the Agency could no doubt develop guidance on the prevention of acts of industrial sabotage in nuclear facilities.

66. The representative of NEW ZEALAND said that her delegation welcomed the reference to Nuclear Security Summits in paragraph (i), the reference to the Global Partnership in paragraph 10, the reference to nuclear security culture in paragraph 11 and the reference to national nuclear forensics libraries in paragraph 18.

67. The representative of FRANCE said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had no objection to the replacement of “the Secretariat, in cooperation with Member States,” by “the Agency” in paragraph 9.

68. He confirmed that paragraph 8 no longer needed to be in square brackets.

69. The sponsors could accept the insertion in paragraph (q) of the phrase “through the Illicit Trafficking Database (ITDB)”.

70. Regarding paragraph 18, the sponsors could go along with the replacement of “national nuclear forensics libraries” by “national nuclear material databases”, although the term “nuclear forensics library” was widely used by experts in the relevant field.

71. If there was agreement regarding paragraphs 9, 8, (q) and 18, all that remained was for the Committee to consider paragraphs 3, 10, 11 and 14 in the light of the comments made about them.

72. The representative of SPAIN said that his delegation considered paragraph (i) to be well balanced and would like it to be retained as it stood.

73. The insertion of a paragraph about industrial sabotage, proposed by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, was, in his delegation's view, inappropriate, because the issue of preventing acts of industrial sabotage in nuclear facilities did not fall within the Agency's mandate. Preventing such acts was a national responsibility.

74. The representative of AUSTRALIA said, with regard to the proposed insertion in paragraph (q) of a reference to the Illicit Trafficking Database (ITDB), that it was his delegation's understanding that the name of that database had recently been changed or was to be changed. He asked the Secretariat for clarification.

75. The DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR SECURITY said that in July there had been a meeting involving experts from more than 90 countries at which, inter alia, the name and scope of the ITDB had been discussed. The matter had not yet been resolved internally. Once it had been resolved, the Secretariat would inform Member States.

76. Regarding the matter of "nuclear forensics libraries" and "nuclear material databases", the experts preferred the former expression. Paragraph 7.16. of Nuclear Security Series No. 15, published in 2011, read as follows: "The State should consider establishing nuclear forensics libraries for its inventory of nuclear and other *radioactive material*. These libraries should include databases of all material produced, used and stored in the State ...". Thus, a library was a collection of databases.

77. Work was under way on a guide on nuclear forensics libraries; the draft guide would be considered by the Nuclear Security Guidance Committee in December and, if approved, it would be submitted to Member States for comment.

78. Regarding the concept "nuclear security culture", in document GOV/2012/39 ("Draft Nuclear Security Fundamentals: Objective and Essential Elements of a State's Nuclear Security Regime"), which had been before the Board the previous week, it was defined as "The assembly of characteristics, attitudes and behaviours of individuals, organizations and institutions which serve as a means to support, enhance, and sustain nuclear security."

79. The representative of ITALY said that there should be a reference to "nuclear security culture" in paragraph 11.

80. The representative of ARGENTINA said that, if the intended meaning of the last part of paragraph 11 was "to foster nuclear security culture through nuclear security education and training", then wording of that sort should be used.

81. Regarding paragraph 18, notwithstanding what the Director of the Office of Nuclear Security had said about "libraries" and "databases", his delegation would like the word "databases" to be used — not "libraries".

82. The representative of FINLAND said that his delegation would like paragraph (i) to remain unchanged.

83. Regarding paragraph 11, his delegation would like to see a reference there to "nuclear security culture" or perhaps to "good nuclear security culture".

84. The representative of SWEDEN said that he agreed with what the representative of Finland had just said regarding paragraph 11.
85. As regards paragraph 14, his delegation would like the words “and provide” to be retained.
86. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, referring to paragraph 11, said that the concept “nuclear security culture” was so important that it deserved a separate paragraph of its own.
87. As regards paragraph 18, his delegation considered that “databases” should be used instead of “libraries”.
88. The representative of the PHILIPPINES, referring to paragraph (i), proposed that the clause beginning “and noting” constitute a separate paragraph.
89. Regarding the proposed insertion of “as appropriate” in paragraph 3, she was not clear as to who would determine “appropriateness”.
90. The representative of FRANCE, responding to the comment on paragraphs 11 just made by the representative of Argentina, said that the sponsors of the draft resolution could accept the wording “to foster nuclear security culture through nuclear security education and training”.
91. The representative of PAKISTAN proposed the replacement of “central” by “leading” in paragraph 9 in order to bring it into line with the corresponding paragraph — paragraph 16 — of resolution GC(55)/RES/10.
92. Regarding paragraph 18, he would prefer the expression “nuclear material databases” to “nuclear forensics libraries”.
93. The representative of ARGENTINA said that, although the word “libraries” as used in paragraph 18 might be understood by experts, it would not be understood by anyone else.
94. The representative of FRANCE proposed that in paragraph 18 the expression “nuclear forensics libraries” be replaced by “nuclear material databases” on the understanding that the Secretariat and interested Member States would work during the coming year towards agreed language that would make such a lengthy discussion at the next session of the General Conference unnecessary.
95. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee accepted paragraph 11 with the last part reading “to foster nuclear security culture through nuclear security education and training”.
96. It was so agreed.
97. The representative of POLAND, referring to paragraph 10, said that, as his country’s representative in the Global Partnership, he could confirm that the Secretariat was playing a very constructive role in it with regard to the prevention of trafficking in nuclear material. He therefore considered that the reference to the Global Partnership in that paragraph should be retained.
98. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee accepted paragraph 10 as it stood.
99. It was so agreed.
100. The representative of FRANCE requested the representative of the Russian Federation to explain once again his proposal that the words “as appropriate” be inserted in paragraph 3.
101. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that international cooperation in the field of peaceful nuclear activities should not be allowed to compromise nuclear security — or nuclear safety — under any circumstances.

102. The representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and FRANCE said that they had no objection to the insertion of the words “as appropriate” in paragraph 3.

103. The representative of the PHILIPPINES, supported by the representatives of BRAZIL, PERU, EGYPT, ARGENTINA, SOUTH AFRICA, the BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA, INDONESIA and LEBANON, said that her delegation was firmly opposed to the insertion of the words “as appropriate” in paragraph 3.

104. Agency technical cooperation project proposals already underwent rigorous screening in order to ensure that they complied with nuclear security guidelines. The words “as appropriate” implied a further tier of screening for “appropriateness” — a very subjective concept.

105. The representatives of FRANCE and CHINA called for flexibility on the part of the delegation of the Russian Federation.

106. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that some of the delegations opposed to the insertion of the words “as appropriate” in paragraph 3 had displayed no flexibility as regards the reference to United Nations General Assembly resolution 65/62 in paragraph (j).

107. The representative of FRANCE proposed that, for the time being, the words “as appropriate” be inserted in paragraph 3 in square brackets.

108. He asked the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to explain why his delegation wanted the words “and provide” in paragraph 14 to be deleted.

109. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that, on reflection, his delegation could accept paragraph 14 as it stood.

110. The representative of FRANCE said that paragraphs (i) and (j) reflected the results of intensive discussions that had taken place in 2011 and, in his delegation’s view, should be left unchanged.

111. The representative of CUBA, supported by the representative of the BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA, said that the balance in paragraph (i) of resolution GC(55)/RES/10 did not exist in paragraph (i) of the draft resolution now being considered, owing to the reference in it to the “International Conference on Nuclear Security: Enhancing Global Efforts” to be hosted by the Agency in July 2013.

112. His delegation strongly objected to the fact that two completely different processes were being treated on the same level and in a single paragraph.

113. The representative of FRANCE proposed that the part of paragraph (i) beginning “Noting the role that...” be converted into a separate paragraph that would follow paragraph (i).

114. The representative of CUBA proposed that the middle part of paragraph (i) — from “welcoming the conference to be hosted by the Agency in July 2013 ...” to “... open to all States” — be converted into a separate paragraph that would precede paragraph (i).

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.