

General Conference

GC(59)/COM.5/OR.3

Issued: November 2015

General Distribution

Original: English

Fifty-ninth regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Third Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Tuesday, 15 September 2015, at 3.15 p.m.

Chair: Mr BENHOCINE (Algeria)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹	Paragraphs
15 Nuclear security (<i>continued</i>)	1–37
17 Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications	38–48

¹ GC(59)/25.

Abbreviations used in this record:

G8	Group of Eight
INTERPOL	International Criminal Police Organization
INSEN	International Nuclear Security Education Network
ITDB	Incident and Trafficking Database
LEU	low-enriched uranium
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
NSSC	Nuclear Security Support Centre

15. Nuclear security (continued)

(GC(59)/12; GC(59)/COM.5/L.4 and Add. 1)

1. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, recalling comments made by the representative of the Russian Federation at the previous meeting, said that his country wished to retain paragraph (dd). Reporting through the ITDB was voluntary. Furthermore, information sharing with ITDB national contact points and external ITDB users had been clarified by the Secretariat in the 2015 Nuclear Security Report contained in document GOV/2015/42–GC(59)/12, which had been noted by the Board of Governors at its session during the previous week.
2. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation would discuss paragraph (dd) further in informal consultations.
3. Turning to paragraph 13, she said that her delegation preferred the wording used in the corresponding paragraph in resolution GC(58)/RES/11.
4. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that the reference to implementing the recommendations provided in the Nuclear Security Series publications had been added to strengthen the text.
5. The representative of JAPAN said that his delegation favoured the current wording, noting that the insertion “on a voluntary basis” had been accepted as a compromise.
6. The representative of PAKISTAN supported the comment made by the representative of the Russian Federation regarding paragraph 13.
7. Turning to paragraph 14, he said that his delegation preferred the same wording to be used as in the corresponding paragraph of resolution GC(58)/RES/11. He then requested the Secretariat to provide more information on the nature of its coordination and interaction with INTERPOL.
8. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN observed that the international organizations and initiatives listed in paragraph 14 were not open to all States. Furthermore, if the Agency shared information with the Nuclear Security Summits, then other summits such as NAM summits should also be listed. Besides, the phrase “other methods of sharing information” was vague. He could, therefore, support the suggestion that the same wording be used as in the corresponding paragraph of the previous year’s resolution. Alternatively, the paragraph could be amended to read “Encourages the Secretariat to play, in coordination with Member States, a central role in coordinating nuclear security activities among international organizations and initiatives, within their respective mandates and memberships, and to keep Member States informed about these activities.”
9. The representatives of CUBA and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION were in favour of using the same wording as in the corresponding paragraph of resolution GC(58)/RES/11, but could agree to the amendment proposed by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.
10. The representative of the BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA agreed, stressing that the paragraph referred to initiatives in which his country had not been invited to participate.
11. The representative of CANADA said that her delegation could not accept the amendment proposed by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

12. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, referring to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, requested the Secretariat to provide additional information on its interaction with INTERPOL covering information exchange, planned activities and the avoidance of duplication and overlap.

13. The HEAD OF THE PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION SECTION said that, pursuant to requests in previous General Conference resolutions, the Agency held biannual meetings with other international organizations, namely INTERPOL, the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, the G8 Global Partnership, the United Nations Security Council 1540 Committee and the nuclear security summit organizers to exchange information on planned activities and thus avoid duplication of work. No details of activities undertaken in individual States were discussed. Further information on the meetings was contained in the Annual Report.

14. In 2014, INTERPOL had worked with the Agency and the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute on the development of an implementing guide entitled ‘Radiological Crime Scene Management’ (IAEA Nuclear Security Series No. 22-G). It had worked with the Agency to develop a training course, which took full account of the respective mandates of the organizations, to assist States in implementing the recommendations contained in that document. INTERPOL had held a related training course on radiological and nuclear investigations, and the Agency had been invited to deliver lectures on subjects within its mandate. INTERPOL had attended, as an observer, other events organized by the Agency. The Agency had attended events organized by INTERPOL, during which it had explained its role and provided details on the support available to States under the Nuclear Security Plan. INTERPOL, which did not interact only with the Division of Nuclear Security, had a practical arrangement with the Incident and Emergency Centre and played an integral part in the Joint Radiation Emergency Management Plan of the International Organizations.

15. The representative of EGYPT said that, for the sake of clarity, “good practices” should be replaced by “best practices” in paragraph 15.

16. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION suggested that “and request the Secretariat to report to the Board of Governors, as appropriate, on these activities, in particular in the context of the INSEN and NSSCs” be added at the end of paragraph 18.

17. The representative of JAPAN did not support that amendment to paragraph 18; information on the Nuclear Security Support Centres (NSSCs) Network and the International Nuclear Security Education Network (INSEN) was already provided in the annual Nuclear Security Report.

18. The HEAD OF THE PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION SECTION confirmed that the annual Nuclear Security Report provided information on NSSCs Network and INSEN meetings. The Chairs’ reports on those meetings were available on the Agency’s website and on the Nuclear Security Information Portal.

19. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation would discuss the paragraph further in informal consultations.

20. The representative of PAKISTAN, supported by the representatives of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION and CUBA, said that he preferred the wording of paragraph 24 to be replaced by that of the corresponding paragraph of resolution GC(58)/RES/11. The phrase “while avoiding duplication with the informal mechanism for assistance provided by the UNSC 1540 Committee” diluted the focus of the paragraph and should be deleted.

21. The representative of the REPUBLIC OF KOREA said that the intention had been to raise awareness of the mechanism for assistance provided by the 1540 Committee and to encourage the Secretariat to avoid duplication. Her country would not insist on inclusion of the phrase.
22. The representative of EGYPT said that the paragraph might be reworded to be State-driven rather than Secretariat-driven.
23. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed that paragraph 27 be deleted, as the Board had not taken any decision on the development of international guidance on the management of disused sealed sources. Paragraph 25 sufficed.
24. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that her delegation insisted on the inclusion of paragraph 27. At an open-ended meeting in October 2014, some 162 legal and technical experts from 73 Member States had supported the initiative to continue developing guidance on the management of disused sources as supplementary guidance under the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources. The meeting had supported the approach and proposed format of the draft guidance under discussion. The Nuclear Safety Review 2015 set out in document GOV/2015/9, which had been noted by the Board in March 2015, had referred to that meeting. The Secretariat had, moreover, provided information on the elaboration of the guidance at that meeting of the Board.
25. The representatives of AUSTRALIA, SWEDEN and FRANCE, stressing the usefulness of developing supplementary guidance on disused sources, called for paragraph 27 to be retained. The representative of CANADA agreed, expressing surprise at the Russian delegation's position.
26. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that the wording of paragraph 28 should be brought into line with paragraph 104 of the draft resolution on measures to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety that the Committee had decided to recommend for adoption by the General Conference.
27. It was so agreed.
28. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, in considering paragraph 30, said that her delegation wished to make comments at a later point.
29. Turning to paragraph 32, she proposed that "in capacity building" be added after "to assist Member States", because the focus of the Secretariat's work in that area was to boost the capacity of Member States to take preventive measures.
30. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that his delegation would consider the proposal by the Russian Federation.
31. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, in considering paragraph 33, proposed that "promote and" and "as one of the key elements of nuclear security" be deleted.
32. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that his delegation needed time to consider the proposal by the Russian Federation because it changed the context of the paragraph.
33. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, in considering paragraph 38, sought clarification as to the identify of the report mentioned in the paragraph.
34. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF NUCLEAR SECURITY said that the Director General's Nuclear Security Report, issued each year, contained information on all of the Agency's activities in that field.

35. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation would clarify the issue independently and would return to paragraph 38 at a later point.

36. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, in considering paragraph 39, said that her delegation wished to make comments at a later point.

37. The CHAIR, concluding the first reading of draft resolution GC(59)COM.5/L.4, urged representatives to engage in informal consultations on all unresolved issues and report to the Committee later.

17. Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications (GC(59)/5 and Corr.1; GC(59)/INF/2; GC(59)/COM.5/L.5)

38. The representative of FRANCE, introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(59)/COM.5/L.5, said that it had been co-drafted and co-sponsored by many Member States and that the United Arab Emirates and Germany wished to be added as co-sponsors.

39. A similar resolution was submitted to the Conference every year, the content of which varied depending on the year; as 2015 was an odd-numbered year, the current draft resolution contained a section on small and medium or modular nuclear reactors, but not one on nuclear knowledge management. The "General" paragraph of the draft resolution had been split into three sections to simplify the document and improve its readability.

40. The draft resolution was the result of consultations that had covered a large range of opinions and a number of key issues, and it focused on the development and application of nuclear energy, duly taking into account the Agency's highest safety and security standards, its Safety Guides and the energy choices made by each Member State.

41. The text of the draft resolution had not been modified in comparison with previous resolutions, but an attempt had been made to group new Member States together with Member States that wished to relaunch their nuclear power programmes, as they faced similar challenges. For the same reason, activities concerning the management of nuclear fuel and the management of radioactive waste had been combined where possible.

42. The representative of BRAZIL proposed that paragraph 23 be deleted because his delegation did not understand the rationale behind it, given that the discussions that it encouraged had already been held. A number of proposals had been submitted over the years as a consequence of those discussions and, therefore, all possible results had been achieved.

43. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA objected to the deletion of paragraph 23 because, in the light of the recent side event attended by his delegation concerning the front end of the fuel cycle, it was clear that further discussions on the mechanics of establishing the LEU bank were required. The paragraph also covered the back end of the fuel cycle, on which discussions had only recently resumed in the Agency. In that connection, Member States had expressed support, during recent meetings of the Board, for Agency activities to develop multinational approaches to spent fuel management.

44. The representative of FRANCE said that his delegation supported the statement made by the representative of the United States of America and stressed the importance of further discussions within the Agency on the management of spent fuel, to which the second part of paragraph 23 applied.

45. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION supported the statements made by the representatives of the United States of America and France.

46. The representative of ARGENTINA supported the statement made by the representative of Brazil.

47. The CHAIR urged all interested parties hold informal consultations on paragraph 23. When a final agreement had been reached on the text of the paragraph, it would be inserted directly into the draft resolution. On that understanding, he took it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution set out in document GC(59)/COM.5/L.5.

48. It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.