

# General Conference

**GC(58)/COM.5/OR.8**

Issued: February 2015

**General Distribution**

Original: English

---

**Fifty-eighth regular session**

## Committee of the Whole

### Record of the Eighth Meeting

*Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Friday, 26 September 2014, at 3.05 p.m.*

**Chairperson:** Mr STUART (Australia)

---

### Contents

Item of the agenda <sup>1</sup>	Paragraphs
17 Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards ( <i>continued</i> )	1–17

---

<sup>1</sup> GC(58)/22.



## **17. Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards (continued)**

(GC(58)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.2 and Rev.3)

1. The CHAIRPERSON reported that, although progress was being made in the informal consultations on the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.2, an agreement had not yet been reached. He urged those involved to work with a sense of urgency.

**The meeting was suspended at 3.10 p.m. and resumed at 4.15 p.m.**

2. The representative of AUSTRIA said that, despite the many hours of negotiation and some encouraging progress, no agreement had been reached on a number of paragraphs in the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.2. She feared that the draft resolution was less important to some Member States than it was to others. The sponsors of the draft resolution now needed to make a fresh decision on the common approach they wished to adopt.

3. The CHAIRPERSON urged the sponsors to hold their meeting concurrently with the informal consultations so as to use the time remaining efficiently.

**The meeting was suspended at 4.25 p.m. and resumed at 5.55 p.m.**

4. The CHAIRPERSON reported that good progress was being made in the informal consultations but a little more time was required.

**The meeting was suspended at 6.00 p.m. and resumed at 6.25 p.m.**

5. The representative of AUSTRIA introduced a new version of the draft resolution, set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.3.

6. The third and fourth subparagraphs of paragraph 24 had been amended to read:

“• The SLC is not a substitute for the Additional Protocol and is not designed as a means for the Agency to obtain from a State without an Additional Protocol the information and access provided for in the Additional Protocol;

“• The development and implementation of State-level approaches requires close consultation with the State and/or regional authority, particularly in the implementation of in-field safeguards measures;”.

7. A new paragraph 25 had been added, reading: “Notes that the development and implementation of State-level approaches requires close consultation and coordination with the State and/or regional authority, and agreement by the State concerned on practical arrangements for effective implementation of all safeguards measures identified for use in the field if not already in place;”.

8. Paragraph 26 (corresponding to paragraph 25 in GC(58)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.2) had been amended to read: “... progress made in the development and implementation of safeguards in the context of the SLC;”.

9. Finally, in paragraph 27 (formerly paragraph 26), the term “Member States” had been replaced with “States”.

10. The representative of INDIA suggested including, as one of the subparagraphs of paragraph 24, a reference to the assurance given by the Secretariat before the Board of Governors that references to safeguards-relevant information in the Supplementary Document to the Report on The Conceptualization and Development of Safeguards Implementation at the State Level (GOV/2014/41) meant only information related to safeguards agreements. The addition would clarify a point which was not stated explicitly in the Supplementary Document.

11. The representative of PAKISTAN reiterated his proposal to delete paragraph 7 (formerly paragraph 6). Failing that, his delegation supported the addition to paragraph 24 proposed by the representative of India. If paragraph 7 was retained, his delegation would be obliged to call for a vote thereon when the draft resolution was considered by the Plenary.

12. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that the new wording which had been added to the draft resolution reflected a fundamental understanding between Member States about new approaches to safeguards implementation. His delegation was not opposed to the proposal by India to add a new subparagraph to paragraph 24.

13. With regard to paragraph 26, which noted that the Secretariat would keep the Board of Governors informed of progress made in the development and implementation of safeguards in the context of the SLC, his delegation felt that the matter was already amply covered by other provisions in the draft resolution.

14. Finally, with reference to paragraph 37, his delegation hoped that the Director General's report to the General Conference in 2015 would be comprehensive and contain detailed information on the implementation of the resolution.

15. The representative of FRANCE, following consultations with the representative of INDIA, proposed adding the following bullet point as the fifth subparagraph of paragraph 24:

“• Safeguards-relevant information is only used for the purpose of safeguards implementation pursuant to the safeguards agreement in force with a particular State – and not beyond it”;

16. The CHAIRPERSON, noting that there were no objections to the proposed additional subparagraph, said he took it that the Committee wished him to report to the Plenary that, although there had been broad agreement on most of the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.3, there was one paragraph on which some delegations had expressed concerns and which had prevented consensus from being reached.

17. It was so decided.

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