

General Conference

GC(56)/COM.5/OR.8

Issued: November 2012

General Distribution

Original: English

Fifty-sixth regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Eighth Meeting

Held at the Austria Center, Vienna, on Thursday, 20 September 2012, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr SHUKRI (Saudi Arabia)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹		Paragraphs
15	Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities (<i>resumed</i>)	1–50

¹ GC(56)/19.

15. Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities (resumed) (GC(56)/COM.5/L.5/Rev.1)

1. The representative of PERU, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, for developing Member States, the Agency's technical cooperation activities were extremely important.
2. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, commending the draft resolution, said that the technical cooperation activities of the Agency were extremely important for the Agency's membership as a whole, not just for developing Member States.
3. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU), said that the EU attached particular importance to the Agency's technical cooperation activities, which could make a substantial contribution to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.
4. It was critical that the management of those activities become increasingly efficient, effective, transparent and accountable, especially, as far as the EU was concerned, at a time of severe economic constraints.
5. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee consider the draft resolution section by section.

Section 1

6. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA proposed the addition to paragraph 1, after "with the IAEA Statute", of the following: ", and further urges the Secretariat to make available assistance needed to ensure all projects are designed consistently with the Statute".
7. The representative of PERU, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the proposed addition was not necessary, as the idea was already contained in the draft resolution.

Section 2

8. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the EU and supported by the representatives of CANADA, the PHILIPPINES and SOUTH AFRICA, proposed the deletion of paragraph (e) on the grounds that it singled out one thematic area among others that were equally important.
9. The representative of BELARUS said that paragraph (e) should be retained, but with the deletion of "developing" before "countries".
10. The representatives of CANADA and the NETHERLANDS said that they would like to see in the draft resolution a reference to the gradual phasing-out of Agency technical cooperation with recipient countries as they developed beyond the point of needing it.
11. The representative of INDIA, supported by the representatives of INDONESIA, EGYPT, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, called for the retention of paragraph (e).
12. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the EU, proposed that paragraph 2 be amended through the insertion after "of the countries concerned," of the words "as well as their commitment and responsibilities in implementing the TC Programme".

13. The representative of EGYPT said that the proposed insertion did not bring added value to paragraph 2.

14. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed that paragraph (h) be amended through the addition of “such as, inter alia, experts, training courses and infrastructure” after “in-kind contributions”.

15. The representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INDIA and EGYPT expressed support for the proposed amendment to paragraph (h).

16. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC, supported by the representative of PERU, suggested that paragraph 10 of section 4 be moved to section 2, as paragraph (i) of section 2 also dealt with the *InTouch* communication platform.

17. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA proposed the insertion, after paragraph 2, of a paragraph reading “Welcomes the Secretariat’s efforts to promote gender equality throughout the TC Programme, while noting with concern that the average female participation in TC projects remains below 30 per cent, with several regions falling short of even this low level, and encourages the Secretariat to continue its efforts to ensure gender balance, consulting with regional agreements and groupings where appropriate, and urging all Member States to work with the Secretariat to increase the number of women participating in the TC Programme;”.

18. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC, having called for the retention of paragraph (e), said that her delegation could support the amendment to paragraph (h) proposed by the representative of the Russian Federation if it read “such as experts and training”. In her delegation’s view, “infrastructure” could not be regarded as an “in-kind contribution”.

19. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, supported by the representatives of INDIA and EGYPT, said that his proposal regarding paragraph (h) was based on the standard Country Programme Framework approved in 2002. According to the Secretariat, States could, in certain circumstances, provide technical support in the form of infrastructure.

20. The representative of INDONESIA said that his delegation was in favour of the retention of paragraph (e) as a suitable complement to paragraph (d).

21. The representative of GERMANY said that he saw no connection between the two paragraphs and that paragraph (e) should be deleted.

22. The representative of INDIA, supported by the representative of INDONESIA, proposed the addition, at the end of paragraph (d), of the phrase “and emphasizing the importance of the Agency’s support in the area of human resources and nuclear power infrastructure development”. That phrase reflected the essence of paragraph (e), which could then be deleted.

23. The representative of AUSTRIA said that his delegation was unhappy about the words “emphasizing the importance of” in the proposed additional phrase.

24. The representative of SINGAPORE suggested replacing “emphasizing” by “noting”.

25. The representative of AUSTRIA, supported by the representatives of CHINA, PERU, EGYPT, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SOUTH AFRICA, ITALY on behalf of the EU, and INDIA, proposed that the additional phrase read “and noting the Agency’s support aimed at human resources and nuclear power infrastructure development”.

26. The representative of PORTUGAL, supported by the representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, proposed deleting the phrase “, particularly developing countries and Least Developed Countries (LDCs),” in paragraph 3.

27. The representative of EGYPT said that in paragraph (d) the comma after “safety standards” should be deleted so that “IAEA” qualified both “safety standards” and “nuclear security guidelines”.

28. The CHAIRMAN said, after comments by the representatives of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SWEDEN, INDIA, SOUTH AFRICA and CHINA, that the comma after “IAEA safety standards” would be deleted.

29. The representative of SWEDEN said that, in keeping with paragraph 25 of resolution GC(55)/RES/11, the words “and nuclear techniques” should be added after “applications of atomic energy” at the end of paragraph 2.

Section 3

30. The representative of CANADA, supported by the representatives of AUSTRALIA, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, proposed that between “as well as” and “results” in paragraph (b) the phrase “outcome-driven decision-making and” be inserted and that after “regular reporting on implementation” in paragraph 4 the words “and outcomes” be inserted.

31. He proposed the addition of a final operative paragraph reading as follows: “Requests the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the External Auditor to evaluate TC projects on the basis of specific outcomes achieved in relation to objectives outlined in the relevant Country Programme Framework or national development plan, and further requests the External Auditor to report the results to the Board of Governors;”.

32. The representatives of the PHILIPPINES, EGYPT and the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC said that the concept “outcome-driven decision-making” was insufficiently clear.

33. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the EU, proposed a number of amendments: the insertion of “accountability, transparency” after “efficiency” in paragraph (b); the addition of “and noting with concern that the review reported incomplete compliance in both areas,” at the end of paragraph (c); the replacement of paragraph (d) by a paragraph reading “Considering that the key lesson of the review process was to move towards bigger and better TC projects,”; the deletion of “requests,” in paragraph 1; the addition, after paragraph 4, of a paragraph reading “Requests the Secretariat, when applying the two-step mechanism in monitoring the quality of TC projects, to report to the Board of Governors on the findings;”; and the addition, also after paragraph 4, of a paragraph reading “Requests the Secretariat to set up a new mechanism to enhance compliance with the central criterion and all the TC requirements, including reporting on activities on a regular basis, in order to improve the capacity of the TC Programme to respond to the needs of Member States;”.

34. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC called for the retention of “requests,” in paragraph 1, on the grounds that no technical cooperation project could take place unless a State requested it.

35. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA asked the Secretariat what impact acceptance of the proposals made by the representative of Canada would have on its work in the area of technical cooperation. It was her understanding that there already existed monitoring and reporting mechanisms that would cover all the concerns underlying those proposals.

36. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF PROGRAMME SUPPORT AND COORDINATION, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION, said that a results-based management approach to technical cooperation was already being pursued by the Secretariat, which had been developing further tools for monitoring. Also, the Secretariat was helping Member States to carry out self-assessments of their technical cooperation projects so that they could learn from experience.

37. The representative of JAPAN expressed support for the insertion of “accountability, transparency” in paragraph (b) proposed by the representative of Italy.

38. The representative of PERU said that the importance of accountability and transparency in Agency technical cooperation activities should certainly be reflected in the draft resolution. Perhaps “effectiveness”, “efficiency”, “accountability”, “transparency” and “sustainability” could be dealt with together, in a single paragraph.

39. He would prefer that “requests,” in paragraph 1 not be deleted.

40. Regarding the proposed replacement of paragraph (d) by a shorter version, he would prefer that paragraph (d) be retained since it quoted very fully from a paragraph in the Technical Cooperation Report for 2011, whereas the proposed shorter version constituted a kind of selective quotation.

41. Regarding the proposed addition of a paragraph reading “Requests the Secretariat to set up a new mechanism to enhance compliance ... to respond to the needs of Member States;”, he considered that it would be better to strengthen the existing mechanisms.

42. The representative of EGYPT, expressing support for the comments made by the representative of Peru, said that the Secretariat should not be overburdened with additional monitoring and reporting requirements and that the General Conference resolutions on “Strengthening of the Agency’s technical cooperation activities” should not give the impression that the Secretariat was underperforming.

43. The representative of CUBA, expressing support for the comments made by the representative of Egypt, said that the Committee should recommend adoption of the draft resolution with as few alterations as possible.

44. The representative of the PHILIPPINES said that she had no objection to the rationale behind the proposal made by the representative of Canada regarding paragraph (b), but considered that the addition of the following wording at the end of paragraph (b) might make matters clearer: “taking note of lessons learned from similar TC projects in the development and implementation of national programmes,”.

45. Like the representative of Peru, she would prefer that paragraph (d) be retained.

46. With regard to the proposed additional paragraphs reading “Requests the Secretariat, when applying the two-step mechanism ... on the findings;” and “Requests the Secretariat to set up a new mechanism to enhance compliance ... to respond to the needs of Member States;”, she had considerable misgivings.

47. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF PROGRAMME SUPPORT AND COORDINATION, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION, said that, in his view, it would not be helpful for reports on the quality assessment of the project preparation process to be submitted to the Board before the process had been completed.

48. With regard to monitoring, a more effective means of monitoring the implementation of projects was needed.

49. He called for consistency in the use of the terms “outputs” and “outcomes” in draft resolutions and elsewhere.

50. The Secretariat was introducing a new tool — the project progress assessment report (PPAR) — to help in measuring implementation during and at the end of projects. It hoped to be incorporating the PPAR into its present methodology, but input from Member States would be necessary.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.