

General Conference

GC(62)/COM.5/OR.2

Issued: December 2018

General Distribution

Original: English

Sixty-second regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Second Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Tuesday, 18 September 2018, at 10.15 a.m.

Chair: Mr GLENDER RIVAS (Mexico)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹		Paragraphs
16	Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards (<i>continued</i>)	1–42
13	Nuclear security	43–62

¹ GC(62)/17.

Abbreviations used in this record

AdSec	Advisory Group on Nuclear Security
CPPNM	Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material
EU	European Union
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
NSGC	Nuclear Security Guidance Committee
SLA	State-level approach

16. Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards (continued)

(GC(62)/COM.5/L.2 and L.3)

1. The representative of AUSTRIA, speaking on behalf of the EU, introduced the draft resolution set out in document GC(62)/COM.5/L.3, which was based on resolution GC(61)/RES/12. As the traditional drafters and sponsors of General Conference resolutions on safeguards, the EU had submitted the draft resolution after a series of informal, open-ended meetings over recent months. Apart from certain small additions and three new paragraphs that dealt mainly with Member State Support Programmes, ISSAS missions and the 2018 Symposium on International Safeguards, the principle departure from resolution GC(61)/RES/12, and the main issue on which further consultation would be needed, was paragraph 30. The current draft text, which reflected discussions in meetings of the Board of Governors held the previous week, had been included as a ‘placeholder’; originally, the drafters had not intended to include any such paragraph.

2. The representative of BRAZIL expressed the view that the process by which the draft resolution contained in document GC(62)/COM.5/L.3 had been arrived at had been characterized by a lack of engagement on the part of those coordinating it. Relatively few informal, open-ended meetings had been held, particularly after the Board had concluded its discussions on the subject of safeguards the previous week. Several proposals that had enjoyed a degree of support had not been reflected in the draft resolution, including his delegation’s suggestion that paragraph 30 should reproduce the analogous section of resolution GC(61)/RES/12 until alternative wording could be agreed. While tradition had its place, a departure from the traditional approach was legitimate if Member States felt that their views were not being given due consideration. Such a concern had resulted in the Russian Federation’s submission of an entirely separate draft resolution on the agenda item. Renewed commitment from the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document GC(62)/COM.5/L.3 to pursue meaningful dialogue would be welcome. As to the substance of the matter, neither draft resolution seemed to command consensus; further consultations would be needed once the procedural issue of which text to use as a basis for discussion had been resolved.

3. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, expressing support for the comments made by the representative of Brazil, said that his country had always attached great importance to the continual improvement of the safeguards system. SLAs, however, represented one of the most revolutionary innovations in the Agency’s safeguards activities since the introduction of the Model Additional Protocol. Member States, as those who financed the Agency, were entitled to know about, understand and influence changes in how the Secretariat operated. In the face of a perceptible decrease in transparency of late, Member States should not remain bystanders but must play an active role in guiding the Agency’s work.

4. Clear rules on safeguards and SLA implementation were vital. The inability of officials to provide convincing responses to questions raised by the Russian Federation and other Member States suggested that the Secretariat itself lacked a clear understanding of the issues at stake. The report² submitted to the Board of Governors in September 2018, after a significant delay, was of poor quality, despite claims to the contrary made during the Board’s discussions the previous week. The concerns of a number of Member States had been sidelined within the Board, some members going so far as to suggest that the

² GOV/2018/20.

report be noted without debate. Those who disagreed with his delegation's position had failed to provide effective counter-arguments.

5. In the absence of genuine dialogue, his delegation had seen no option but to submit a separate draft resolution on safeguards to the General Conference. Paragraph 30 of the draft resolution submitted by the EU contained no specific instructions to the Secretariat. Adopting it would effectively give the Secretariat free rein to pursue the development of SLAs, as well as unjustifiably endorsing the Director General's aforementioned report to the Board. The reference to "periodic reports" gave no indication of how often such reports should be issued. As drafted, the paragraph was not only unacceptable, but harmful. The Russian Federation stood ready to continue consultations with a view to reaching a solution agreeable to all and called upon the EU to reciprocate.

6. The representative of ITALY said that the draft resolution submitted by the EU was the result of an open and inclusive negotiation process lasting several weeks, consistent with Agency custom. Many proposals had been considered and some had been incorporated; however, in recognition of the significant issues outstanding, she was willing to continue discussions with a view to achieving consensus.

7. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, echoing the comments of the representatives of Austria and Italy, said that it had been agreed by all Member States present at the first informal, open-ended meeting, including the Russian Federation, that only proposals commanding consensus would be included in the draft resolution submitted. Those coordinating the drafting process had been open to discussion, but very few specific proposals had been made. Paragraph 30 of the draft resolution eventually submitted by the EU represented a compromise, incorporating the first part of the text proposed by the Russian Federation during informal meetings; more consultations would be needed to achieve consensus.

8. He strongly opposed the version of paragraph 30 contained in the draft resolution submitted by the Russian Federation. Far from being a revolutionary concept, the various elements of SLAs had been in development for several decades. The Supplementary Document³ to the Report on The Conceptualization and Development of Safeguards Implementation at the State Level, noted by the Board of Governors in September 2014, provided a clear direction for the further development of SLAs; attempting to unpick that agreement four years on was inappropriate.

9. The Director General's report to the Board on lessons learned and experience gained in SLA implementation for States under integrated safeguards responded exactly to the requests made by the General Conference in resolutions GC(60)/RES/13 and GC(61)/RES/12. As explained by the Deputy Director General for Safeguards in his remarks to the Board the previous week, the Secretariat had very limited experience in that regard. Given the complex nature of fuel cycles, it would be several years before sufficient additional experience had been gained to justify a further report. Moreover, the confidential nature of State-specific safeguards information made a detailed report of the kind envisaged in the Russian Federation's draft resolution unfeasible. He appealed to the Committee to hold constructive discussions on the basis of the draft text submitted by the EU.

10. The representative of ROMANIA, expressing support for the comments made by the representative of Austria regarding the drafting processes, which she had helped to coordinate, said that the right of Member States to submit draft resolutions to the General Conference was not in question but should be exercised with due regard for the Agency's tradition of consensus-based decision-making.

11. The representative of PAKISTAN, recalling his country's longstanding position on the substance of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, which in both versions of the text was identical to paragraph 7 of

³ GOV/2014/41.

resolution GC(61)/RES/12, said that his delegation had engaged constructively in attempts to reformulate the wording but agreement had unfortunately not been reached. As at the 60th and 61st regular sessions of the General Conference, his delegation would not block consensus on the paragraph but would make a statement reflecting its understanding when the draft resolution was submitted for adoption. Paragraph 30 did not command consensus in either version of the draft text, but there was a clear willingness to discuss the issue with a view to reaching agreement and further consultations should be held. Once the issue of the wording of paragraph 30 had been resolved, the procedural issues raised would automatically be resolved, too.

12. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA expressed appreciation to those who had coordinated work on the EU draft resolution for their efforts to ensure an inclusive process. Notwithstanding the points raised by the representative of Brazil, issues of procedure were important. The custom of having a small number of countries to lead preparatory discussions on draft resolutions had evolved to facilitate consensus and avoided the submission of multiple drafts. To depart from that custom risked polarization and division. A return to the path of consensus, under the EU's coordination, was desirable.

13. It was recognized that the views of some Member States had not been reflected in the draft resolution submitted by the EU, and consensus could only be reached if the views of those Member States were heard and addressed. Disagreement on the wording of paragraph 30 had arisen because some Member States had unanswered questions regarding the implementation of the State-level concept, which the Secretariat had undertaken to discuss. It was appropriate for the text of the resolution to reflect that situation. Apart from paragraph 30, the two texts were extremely similar.

14. Paragraph 30 of the EU draft, as a 'placeholder', did not yet contain the elements required to achieve consensus. The EU should seek additional input from all interested Member States, including the Russian Federation, to that end. It was to be hoped that the Russian Federation would be willing to negotiate on its proposed wording for paragraph 30, as several Member States had already expressed reservations in that regard. Additional informal consultations were needed to allow the views of all interested Member States to be considered and a revised draft prepared by the EU.

15. The representative of the NETHERLANDS, emphasizing the Agency's history of striving for consensus and the unfortunate precedent set by the submission of a separate draft resolution, said that the EU traditionally coordinated work on General Conference resolutions on safeguards as it comprised a group of countries with differing fuel cycles, safeguards agreements, and opinions on the merits of nuclear power. A text that enjoyed support in that context was more likely to lead to consensus within the General Conference.

16. It had originally been the EU's intention not to include paragraph 30 in its draft text as it considered that the matters it dealt with were already covered by paragraph 27. Recognizing the need for transparency and fairness in the drafting process, however, and in view of the concerns voiced at informal meetings and in the Board of Governors, it had incorporated the first part of the Russian Federation's proposed text into paragraph 30. The particular concern that the Secretariat should provide more information on its implementation of SLAs was addressed both in paragraph 30, in general terms, and in paragraph 26, which was intended to apply to confidential safeguards-related information best discussed on a one-to-one basis by the Secretariat and the State concerned. Endorsing the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom on the substance of the SLA debate, she reaffirmed the EU's willingness to continue discussions on the draft resolution it had submitted.

17. The representative of MEXICO, welcoming the draft resolution submitted by the EU, expressed her willingness to continue discussions on the basis of that text.

18. The representative of FRANCE, echoing the comments of the representative of Austria, said that the draft resolution submitted by the EU represented the best hope for achieving consensus and should form the basis for further negotiations. France had already made compromises regarding the wording of paragraph 30.

19. The representative of INDIA, referring to paragraph 7 of the text, which was identical in the two versions submitted, said that Agency safeguards should apply to all Member States and other relevant parties in accordance with their respective legal obligations. In the interests of consensus, India was willing to proceed on the basis of the current wording but would deliver a statement on the issue when the draft resolution was presented to the General Conference for adoption.

20. The representative of SLOVENIA said that the draft resolution proposed by the EU, which had been subject to significant preparatory work and incorporated proposals made by a number of Member States, should be taken as the basis for discussion. It was important to maintain the tradition of submitting a single draft resolution produced through an open and transparent process, but further negotiations were needed on paragraph 30.

21. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, expressing appreciation for the open and transparent consultations coordinated by the EU that had led to the submission of its draft resolution, stressed that, by questioning certain paragraphs in a draft resolution, he was not neglecting the established process. It was important to note that the draft resolution proposed by the Russian Federation built on past consultations and differed from the EU's draft text only in those paragraphs where consensus had not been reached during preparatory discussions. Concerning paragraph 30, Iran had raised several specific questions regarding SLA implementation with the Secretariat but was still awaiting answers. The suggestion that paragraph 30 should be deleted was illogical, as it did not stand in isolation but was closely related to the preceding section of the text and provided necessary context. Iran was ready to engage constructively in consultations to reach consensus on the issue. With regard to preambular paragraph (i), on which he had abiding concerns that had yet to be addressed despite his having made a number of proposals, a statement would be made when the draft resolution was presented to the General Conference for adoption.

22. The representative of BELGIUM said that paragraph 30, as worded in the draft resolution submitted by the EU, constituted an acceptable starting point for further discussions: the placeholder text, though not ideal, contained factual information. He encouraged further consultations with a view to reaching consensus on what was an important subject for Belgium and the Agency as a whole.

23. The representative of CUBA said that efforts to strengthen the Agency's safeguards system were welcome, provided that they did not affect the legitimate rights of Member States or involve discriminatory or selective practices. The issue of SLAs was sensitive, complex and carried many implications, so it must be considered fully through a transparent consultation process involving all Member States, with decisions taken by consensus of the Agency's Policy-Making Organs. The report contained in document GOV/2018/20 did not provide answers to all the questions raised by Member States or dispel their legitimate concerns. Cuba therefore agreed with the Russian Federation and others, including fellow NAM countries, that the Secretariat should supply additional information, through periodic reports and Board briefings, on the development and implementation of the State-level concept.

24. The representative of AUSTRALIA, thanking the EU for its efforts to coordinate work on the draft resolution proposal, emphasized that the text that the EU had submitted as a result should be considered a work in progress. The State-level concept referred to in paragraph 30 of the draft was simply part of the evolution of safeguards implementation and could scarcely be described as revolutionary. Many of the questions raised by Member States concerned general safeguards implementation practices which pre-dated the introduction of SLAs. The implementation of SLAs

required no new legal authority, in which respect they differed from additional protocols or other arrangements, nor was there any need for specific approval from the Board. With regard to reporting, various mechanisms were already in place through which the Secretariat could report to Member States. It was important to strike a balance between Member States being adequately and appropriately informed, and Member States overmanaging the Secretariat or overstepping their role in the Secretariat's responsibility for the implementation of safeguards, which were clearly laid out in the Statute and in safeguards agreements. Consensus on the text of the draft resolution should be sought through a combination of work within the Committee and informal consultations.

25. The representative of EGYPT, while welcoming the EU's efforts, emphasized that the consultation process remained incomplete. Although several representatives had referred to paragraph 30 of the draft resolution submitted by the EU as a 'placeholder', there had been no indication of that in the text itself. The representative of Brazil had raised valid procedural concerns: negotiations could not continue on the basis of two separate draft resolutions on the same issue. He therefore suggested that the EU, which traditionally sponsored General Conference resolutions on safeguards, should produce a revised version of the draft resolution combining the EU and Russian versions, with square brackets to indicate where they differed. Discussions could then proceed on the basis of a single text with a view to reaching consensus.

26. The representative of CANADA expressed support for the draft resolution submitted by the EU and for its efforts to coordinate an inclusive and transparent consultation process. While it was the right of any Member State to submit a draft resolution, the long-established practice whereby a single draft resolution was submitted on any given agenda item should be protected. The informal agreement that paragraph 30 of the EU draft text should serve as a 'placeholder' because of time constraints had been broken by the Russian Federation's submission of its own draft resolution. As further dialogue was clearly required to reach consensus, he suggested that the Chair should request the EU to resume informal consultations, focusing in particular on paragraph 30. Regarding the substance of that paragraph, there should be no suggestion that Member States had any discretion as to the manner in which the Secretariat implemented safeguards in Member States or its ability to do so. Safeguards were implemented on the basis of obligations and were in no way discretionary. Given the nature and extent of the nuclear fuel cycle in Canada, the State-level concept had significant implications. Canada had worked closely with the Secretariat to develop its SLA and encouraged other Member States to do likewise.

27. The representative of JAPAN said that the draft resolution submitted by the EU would provide a solid basis for discussion, especially on key elements such as paragraph 30. Further informal consultations seemed necessary in order to compile a single, consolidated text and make progress towards consensus.

28. The representative of UKRAINE said that the preparatory drafting process had been transparent and inclusive, in keeping with the customary consensus approach to decision-making. Several suggestions made by Ukraine had not garnered sufficient support to be included in the draft resolution, which Ukraine accepted as part of that approach. Paragraph 30, on which the representative of the United Kingdom had provided useful background, remained a point of contention. Although additional Secretariat reports on lessons learned and experience gained in SLA implementation were needed, the development and implementation of SLAs should not be suspended, not least because that would prevent the Secretariat from acquiring further experience. The safeguards system must be allowed to evolve. The draft resolution proposed by the EU should be used as the basis for further discussions as it was more likely to enjoy consensus, and Ukraine stood ready to engage in that process.

29. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC, echoing the comments made by the representative of Brazil on procedural issues, said that the State-level concept was indeed revolutionary.

Although the measures and definitions it involved had existed for some time, the move to extend SLAs to all Member States was recent. More clarification was needed, either in the form of a report from the Secretariat or in the text of the draft resolution itself. The draft resolution proposed by the EU was a balanced text and provided much useful information, particularly in paragraph 24, but there was an urgent need to establish a timeframe for the Secretariat to clarify matters raised by Member States during the September 2018 meetings of the Board. The version of paragraph 30 proposed by the Russian Federation addressed both that issue and Member State consent. It was important to remember that, once adopted, a General Conference resolution was binding on all Member States. Consensus was vital to avoid the application of a resolution being limited by statements indicating individual States' interpretation of its scope, but that would only be achieved if their concerns were taken into account.

30. The representative of BELARUS, expressing appreciation to the EU and in particular Austria for their efforts, said that paragraph 30 of the EU's draft resolution did not provide sufficiently detailed instructions to the Secretariat. To ensure widespread global confidence in the safeguards system, the Secretariat's actions must be objective, impartial and technically sound, with a view to ensuring that all parties complied fully with their safeguards obligations. Any change in safeguards activities needed to be fully understood and agreed to by Member States as a result of discussions in the policy-making organs of the Agency. The General Conference should therefore request the Secretariat to produce a report on SLA implementation before its 63rd regular session. The report should be discussed at meetings of the Policy-Making Organs and should include answers to all questions raised by Member States regarding SLAs.

31. In terms of procedure, it should be noted that a number of Member States, for a variety of reasons, had been unable to engage fully in informal discussions prior to the current session of the General Conference. All Member States should have the opportunity to present their own views and listen to the views of others on substantive issues.

32. The representative of SWEDEN said that, in accordance with established practice, interested Member States could attend informal, open-ended meetings to contribute to the development of a consensual draft resolution. Delegations that were unhappy with the negotiation process were entitled to submit competing draft resolutions, but such a step compromised both the work of the coordinators and the 'spirit of Vienna'. In the present case, the preparatory process had not resulted in consensus on paragraph 30, but progress had been made on substance, with the understanding that further discussions would be held on that paragraph within the Committee.

33. There was a clear need for regular dialogue between Member States and the Secretariat on SLA implementation. Further negotiations were required on the frequency and form of that dialogue and the wording to be used in the draft resolution. With regard to the assurances provided by the Secretariat on, among other things, States' rights and obligations in relation to the State-level concept, past discussions had partly been reflected in paragraph 24 of the draft text.

34. The representative of FINLAND expressed appreciation for the work of the EU coordinators, whose preparation of the draft resolution had been transparent and inclusive; her country would pursue the discussions in that spirit.

35. The representative of GERMANY, echoing the comments of the representatives of Australia and the United Kingdom, said that the State-level safeguards approach was not revolutionary but constituted a process of updating, developing and optimizing the Secretariat's work. As had been noted, many of the concerns expressed by Member States were already addressed in the draft resolution; it was to be hoped that consensus on paragraph 30 could be reached through further consultations.

36. The representative of PORTUGAL noted the support of the majority for continuing discussions on the basis of the draft resolution submitted by the EU, in accordance with the usual practice. He

expressed support for the coordinators' work. The text they had prepared already reflected an effort to reach consensus: the original intention had been to delete paragraph 30. Further consultations were required to tackle outstanding issues.

37. The representative of the REPUBLIC OF KOREA expressed support for the work of the EU coordinators. All Member States had been invited to engage in the lengthy consultations on the draft resolution, which had been transparent and open. Despite some Member States' dissatisfaction with the process, it was not possible to work on two different draft resolutions simultaneously. She commended the EU on its openness and flexibility, and on its offer to continue dialogue. In the spirit of consensus, she supported the call for informal consultations made by the representatives of the United States of America, Canada and Japan.

38. The representative of NEW ZEALAND expressed appreciation for the coordinators' efforts in preparing the draft resolution. Despite the concerns expressed about the State-level safeguards approach, the Committee had much common ground to build on with regard to SLAs. In the light of the draft resolution submitted by the Russian Federation and other views expressed, discussions were clearly required on how to reflect, in paragraph 30, the form that reporting and dialogue with the Secretariat should take. Consensus on that could best be obtained through informal consultations led by the EU coordinators. With regard to paragraph 7, he thanked the representatives of Pakistan and India for their constructive approach.

39. The CHAIR expressed optimism about the spirit of openness and readiness to negotiate being displayed. As it was unfeasible for the Committee to work on two draft resolutions on the same agenda item, he proposed to suspend the meeting so as to hold informal consultations with representatives of the Russian Federation and the EU coordinating States, Austria and Romania, together with the Secretariat, to determine how to proceed.

40. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION expressed appreciation for the willingness to hold consultations. Some members had implied that an informal agreement reached during preparatory work on the draft resolution had been broken, specifically by his country; however, no such agreement had been reported.

41. In all discussions on safeguards during the September 2018 series of Board meetings, a group of Western countries and, most worryingly, the Secretariat had appeared unwilling to listen to others and reach agreement. That had prompted his delegation to submit its own draft resolution, contrary to usual practice. It was not aiming at duplication but was mindful of a situation that had arisen recently within the United Nations Security Council: one group of countries had not been open to constructive dialogue but had sought to impose its opinion on others. A similar situation within the General Conference would be worse than having two draft resolutions on the same subject. The atmosphere in the Committee was noticeably better than it had been in the Board; the 'spirit of Vienna' and the willingness to listen to others were more in evidence, and he was ready to work towards a mutually acceptable solution.

The meeting was suspended at 12 noon and resumed at 12.30 p.m.

42. The CHAIR said that, as a result of consultations with both parties, he would issue a 'Chair's paper' merging the draft resolutions submitted by the EU and the Russian Federation and presenting alternative wordings in square brackets as non-agreed text. That document would form the basis for further discussions focused on the substance of the draft resolution; he hoped to avoid further political discussion.

13. Nuclear security

(GC(62)/10, Corr.1 and Corr.2; GC(62)/COM.5/L.12)

43. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, introducing the draft resolution set out in document GC(62)/COM/5/L.12, said that to prepare the text, 12 open-ended working group meetings and a number of topical meetings had been held over the preceding months. Around 80 written proposals had been discussed. As agreed at the outset, only proposals on which all agreed had been included in the draft resolution. Consensus had been achieved on 29 paragraphs and general agreement was close on several further topics, thanks to the substantive discussions held in a positive and constructive atmosphere. For consistency, paragraph 10 of the draft text should be modified to refer to the Amended CPPNM.

44. The representatives of NIGERIA and UKRAINE expressed satisfaction with the drafters' work and asked for their countries to be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

45. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA thanked the drafters for their tireless and crucial work. The organization of small group meetings had contributed to progress.

46. He proposed the insertion of a new operative paragraph after paragraph 42, to read: "Requests the Secretariat to strengthen its internal planning and results-based management of its nuclear security programme and develop, where appropriate, goals and measures of effectiveness and keep Member States informed on progress and challenges in order to support the efficient and effective delivery of services in this regard".

47. He also proposed the insertion of a new preambular paragraph after existing paragraph (h): "Acknowledging that nuclear security can contribute to national confidence in the peaceful uses of atomic energy and recognizing the responsibility of Member States to adopt and maintain national nuclear security measures in this regard".

48. The representative of CANADA expressed support for the essence of the proposed operative paragraph but suggested that it should read: "Requests the Secretariat to strengthen its internal planning and results-based management within its mandate and develop, where appropriate, goals and measures of effectiveness for its nuclear security programme and report on its implementation".

49. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA said that more time was needed for consultations to ensure that the wording of the proposed paragraphs fully reflected the substance of preparatory discussions and requested that the text be circulated in writing.

50. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION echoed that request.

51. The representative of JAPAN, likewise echoing that request, expressed support for the proposals made by the representative of the United States of America.

52. The CHAIR said that the text of the proposals would be circulated informally by the Secretariat.

53. The representative of CHINA asked the representative of the United States of America to explain the rationale behind his proposals.

54. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that the proposed additions were based on the belief that all Agency departments should coordinate and cooperate with one another as effectively as possible. It was also hoped that, in line with the results-based approach, the Agency could devise quantifiable performance indicators for its activities.

55. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN proposed that paragraph 14 of the draft resolution should be brought into line with paragraph 12 of the General Conference's previous resolution on nuclear security (GC(61)/RES/9), so that the final part would read: "and requests the continued assistance of the Secretariat in this regard to enable representatives of all Member States to participate in the work of the NSGC".

56. The representative of NEW ZEALAND, having expressed appreciation for the drafters' work, said that consensus had almost been reached during the open-ended discussions on the two new paragraphs proposed, which should both be included in the resolution.

57. The representative of PAKISTAN thanked the drafters for their work and said that the preparatory discussions had been conducive to fostering a reasonable degree of agreement. More work was required to address his country's concerns about the wording of the proposed new preambular paragraph. The proposed operative paragraph also raised some questions and should be further considered. Paragraph 16 of the draft resolution should be deleted.

58. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that more time would be needed to reflect on and discuss the proposed deletion of paragraph 16.

59. The representatives of BRAZIL and INDIA, while expressing general appreciation for the proposals, said that they would wait for the text to be circulated in writing before commenting further.

60. The representative of the NETHERLANDS requested clarification on the proposal to delete paragraph 16, as consensus had almost been obtained on that paragraph in the open-ended preparatory discussions.

61. The representative of PAKISTAN replied that the preparatory discussions on paragraph 16 had not reached a conclusion. The paragraph, which had not been included in previous General Conference resolutions on nuclear security, introduced for the first time the notion that the AdSec Chairperson should communicate with Member States about AdSec outcomes and the recommendations AdSec made to the Director General. As the role of AdSec was to advise the Director General, communicating such information directly to Member States might exceed the mandate of an advisory body. Although similar advisory bodies existed under all Agency Major Programmes, such communication was not standard procedure. Why should AdSec be different?

62. The CHAIR invited the representatives of the United Kingdom, Pakistan and the Netherlands to consult informally before the Committee's next meeting with a view to resolving that question.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.