
Sixty-eighth regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Second Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Tuesday, 17 September 2024, at 10.10 a.m.

Chair: Mr LODDING (Sweden)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹	Paragraphs
13 Nuclear and radiation safety	1–4
14 Nuclear security	5–8
16 Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications (<i>resumed</i>)	9–13
13 Nuclear and radiation safety (<i>resumed</i>)	14–80
14 Nuclear security (<i>resumed</i>)	81–107

¹ GC(68)/21

Abbreviations used in this record

CNS	Convention on Nuclear Safety
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
HEU	high enriched uranium
ICONS	International Conference on Nuclear Security
IRMIS	International Radiation Monitoring Information System
Joint Convention	Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management
LEU	low enriched uranium
MOX	mixed oxide
NPT	Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SIDS	small island developing States
TC	technical cooperation
TECDOC	technical document
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America

13. Nuclear and radiation safety

(GC(68)/11; GC(68)/INF/2; GC(68)/COM.5/L.9)

1. The CHAIR said that the Committee had before it a report by the Director General on nuclear and radiation safety, contained in document GC(68)/11; the Nuclear Safety Review 2024, contained in document GC(68)/INF/2; and a draft resolution on nuclear and radiation safety, contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.9.

2. The representative of AUSTRALIA, speaking as coordinator and introducing the draft resolution, said that eight meetings of the open-ended working group and a number of small group discussions had been held with the aim of ensuring a transparent, collaborative and inclusive process. She thanked all those that had participated in the negotiations, in particular the delegation of New Zealand, which had led the discussions on transport safety, and expressed her gratitude to the Secretariat for its support.

3. In the spirit of transparency, all outstanding proposals were indicated by square brackets in the draft resolution. One open paragraph — paragraph 120*bis* — constituted a proposal by Mauritius, which did not have a permanent presence in Vienna and had therefore been unable to take part in the open-ended working group discussions — a predicament faced by a number of delegations and disproportionately affecting developing countries. She thanked delegations for agreeing to defer the discussion on that paragraph until a representative from Mauritius could be present and requested that the Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations in Geneva be invited to introduce her country's proposal when the Committee proceeded to its first reading of the text.

4. The CHAIR, welcoming the representative of Mauritius, said that it was regrettable that certain delegations did not have a permanent presence in Vienna, which posed difficulties when intensive in-person discussions were held. It was worth considering digital solutions as a means of ensuring a more inclusive process in the future.

14. Nuclear security

(GC(68)/7; GC(68)/INF/3 and 6; GC(68)/COM.5/L.15)

5. The CHAIR said that the Committee had before it the Nuclear Security Report 2024, contained in document GC(68)/7; the Nuclear Security Review 2024, contained in document GC(68)/INF/3, and a draft resolution on nuclear security, contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.15.

6. The representative of FRANCE, speaking on behalf of the European Union and as coordinator, and introducing the draft resolution, said that the text was the product of an open, constructive and cooperative consultation process. Proposed updates to the previous year's resolution on nuclear security² — aiming to clarify certain wording and to take into account the work of the Agency and security-related developments, notably those discussed at the recent International Conference on Nuclear Security: Shaping the Future (ICONS 2024) — appeared to command consensus. At the same time, opinion remained divided on a number of issues, in particular references to the statement issued by the ICONS 2024 Co-Presidents, the balance between the three pillars of the NPT, attacks on nuclear facilities

² GC(67)/RES/8

devoted to peaceful purposes, the issue of gender and an Agency technical document on the application of nuclear security guidance in armed conflict situations.

7. Discussions relating to attacks on nuclear facilities had been intense but fruitful, resulting in a proposed compromise text in the form of a preambular paragraph. For certain delegations, that represented a major step forward; others, however, considered the progress made to be insufficient, as the proposed text was not accompanied by an operative paragraph. Although various proposals had been made, agreement seemed too remote to be able to put forward an operative paragraph in the draft resolution. The matter therefore required further attention.

8. He thanked the Secretariat for its support and hoped that the prevailing spirit of cooperation would allow the Committee to reach a consensus in order to strengthen nuclear security worldwide.

16. Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications (resumed)

(GC(68)/10; GC(68)/INF/4; GC(68)/COM.5/L.3, L.4, L.5, L.6, L.7, L.8, L.10, L.12 and L.13)

9. The CHAIR said that he understood that there had been positive developments on the draft resolution on strengthening support to Member States in food and agriculture contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.13. He invited the representative of the Russian Federation to present her delegation's proposed amendments.

10. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, referring to paragraph (i), said that the word "new" should be removed from the first line, since the FAO Strategic Framework 2022–2031 could no longer be described as new. In the interests of streamlining the text, she proposed removing the phrase "for improvement and development of vaccines" from preambular paragraph (k) and editing the end of operative paragraph 3 to read "invites the Secretariat to carry out activities in the sphere of 'climate-smart agriculture'".

11. The representative of INDONESIA, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Russian Federation's proposals had been discussed by the Group, including in consultations with the Russian delegation, and were acceptable.

12. The CHAIR took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.13, as amended.

13. It was so decided.

13. Nuclear and radiation safety (resumed)

(GC(68)/11; GC(68)/INF/2; GC(68)/COM.5/L.9)

14. The CHAIR invited the representative of Mauritius to present her country's proposal on the draft resolution on nuclear and radiation safety contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.9.

15. The representative of MAURITIUS said that her country welcomed the consideration of her country's proposal during the preliminary discussions and its inclusion in the draft resolution as paragraph 120*bis*. The paragraph concerned SIDS — some 39 small, isolated countries with inherent vulnerabilities, very few of which were represented in Vienna. Her country was grateful for the Agency's continued support, noting that at the fourth International Conference on Small Island Developing States, the Deputy Director General and Head of the Department of Technical Cooperation had announced that some US \$13.7 million were available for 49 TC projects ongoing in SIDS. Those States welcomed the Agency's use of innovative solutions to help them ensure atoms for peace. She thanked all delegations that had supported her country's proposal and engaged constructively with the Mauritian delegation in Geneva, in particular Armenia, Australia and Singapore.
16. The representative of NEW ZEALAND, commending the representative of Mauritius on her engagement, echoed comments made regarding the challenges faced by SIDS, including those in the Asia and Pacific region.
17. The representative of SINGAPORE said that, as a small island State, her country recognized the importance of the proposed paragraph and supported its inclusion in the text.
18. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation would welcome some additional time to examine the new paragraph.
19. The CHAIR suggested that the Committee revisit the matter in due course and asked whether any delegations wished to comment on wording not contained in square brackets.
20. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, referring to paragraph (II), expressed her country's reservations on the use of the word "sustainable" in relation to the management of spent fuel and radioactive waste and requested clarification as to how the Agency determined the sustainability of the various different methods.
21. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that the proposal to include the concept of sustainability in the text had been made very early on in the negotiations and that it had been understood that the Russian Federation was not opposed to its inclusion. While noting the Russian Federation's concerns, she said that a number of Agency documents and publications could provide clarity on the Agency's definition of sustainability in the context of spent fuel management. Overall, the wording was aimed at bringing the paragraph more into line with the Fundamental Safety Principles (IAEA Safety Standards Series No. SF-1), notably paragraph 3.29 therein.
22. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, welcoming the detailed clarification provided, suggested that the issue be discussed further to avoid any potential misunderstanding.
23. Turning to paragraph 95*bis*, she asked why the wording referred only to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and not to the other four United Nations Economic Commissions.
24. The representative of ITALY said that paragraph 95*bis* reflected the conclusions of the Denial of Shipment Working Group.
25. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, welcoming the explanation provided, said that it would be more appropriate in the context of a draft General Conference resolution either to omit the reference to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, to refer to all five regional commissions, or to refer more broadly to UN regional bodies. She suggested consulting with the Secretariat to ensure that those bodies were referenced in an appropriate manner.
26. The representative of ARGENTINA, expressing concern at the possible deletion of a reference to any organization appearing in paragraph 95*bis* — as they had presumably been included in the draft

resolution for good reason — suggested that the matter be discussed among interested delegations and the Secretariat.

27. The CHAIR requested that the issue be resolved in informal consultations.

28. He invited the representative of Australia to present the outstanding proposals in square brackets.

29. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that there had been no progress on preambular paragraph (k)*bis* and its corresponding operative paragraph 45*bis* regarding the preparation of a TECDOC on nuclear safety and security in armed conflict. Those paragraphs, while additions to the previous year's resolution on nuclear and radiation safety³, had been present in the text throughout the negotiations and discussed at length.

30. The representative of DENMARK said that the two paragraphs had been EU proposals put forward in order to follow up on the request made in paragraph 45 — as agreed the previous year — for the Secretariat to continue reviewing the nuclear safety standards with regard to their application in armed conflict situations. In accordance with paragraph 45, the ongoing review was being held in close consultation with Member States, and Member States should therefore be informed about its outcome. Various versions had been proposed during previous discussions, including some that made no mention of a TECDOC, and she hoped that the Committee could agree on wording that built on paragraph 45.

31. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation could not accept the inclusion of paragraph (k)*bis* or paragraph 45*bis* in any form. TECDOCs were internal, lower-level documents that were not developed in consultation with Member States; therefore, they should not be referenced in a General Conference resolution. Paragraph 45 clearly stated that the process of reviewing the safety standards should be carried out in close consultation with Member States, which covered the concept of keeping States informed on progress. Furthermore, the review process was still under way and the TECDOC in question had yet to be finalized. The Secretariat should not be put under additional pressure at the current juncture.

32. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation could not accept the reference to the TECDOC, since that document had not yet been published and, furthermore, was not a consensus text.

33. The representative of FRANCE said that her delegation's preference was to retain paragraphs (k)*bis* and 45*bis*. The former simply noted the fact that the TECDOC was being prepared and put no pressure on the Secretariat; the latter could perhaps be reworded, but that seemed unnecessary.

34. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC said that her delegation wished to echo the comments made by the representatives of Iran and the Russian Federation.

35. The representative of SWITZERLAND reiterated that paragraphs (k) *bis* and 45 *bis* had been present in the draft resolution from the start of the negotiations and had been discussed at length, and that the TECDOC constituted the Secretariat's action in response to the request made in paragraph 45. At the same time, however, he recognized that the preparation of the document was still under way and that TECDOCs were not usually referred to in General Conference resolutions. As a compromise, he proposed deleting both paragraphs and adding the phrase "and to inform Member States on the findings" to the end of paragraph 45.

36. The representative of DENMARK said that the intention was not to put pressure on the Secretariat, but simply to reflect Member States' interest in being kept informed about the Secretariat's

³ GC(67)/RES/7

work. She welcomed the proposal made by Switzerland, which merited consideration, but stressed the need to discuss it with other EU delegations and the wider Committee.

37. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation did not see any need to expand paragraph 45, as the Secretariat was already expected to inform Member States on progress relating to all matters covered in the draft resolution, as per paragraph 148. She reiterated that the TECDOC in question was not finalized and that Member States had not had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with it. Numerous TECDOCs had been published over the past two years, and none had been referred to in resolutions on nuclear and radiation safety. Her delegation would therefore continue to request the deletion of paragraphs (k) bis and 45 bis.

38. The representative of FRANCE, supported by the representative of UKRAINE, said that her country could not accept the deletion of paragraph (k) bis. With regard to the proposal by Switzerland and the possible deletion of paragraph 45 bis, she would consult with her capital.

39. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC said that her country supported the comments made by the representative of the Russian Federation and emphasized that TECDOCs should not be referred to in General Conference resolutions.

40. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION reiterated that it did not make sense to refer to an internal, non-consensus document the preparation of which was still under way.

41. The CHAIR said that the matter clearly required further consideration.

42. He invited the representative of Australia to continue through the draft resolution.

43. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph (s), said that the delegation of Iran had proposed adding the words “voluntary and non-legally binding” before the references to the Code of Conduct on the Safety of Research Reactors and the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources. Similarly, it had proposed inserting the same wording before references to those Codes in paragraphs 23, 25 and 126. She suggested that all five additions be considered as a package proposal.

44. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation’s proposal had been made on the basis of an agreement reached the previous year to specify that all codes of conduct and their accompanying guidance were voluntary and non-legally binding — an agreement that had regrettably not been reflected in the resolution.

45. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that codes of conduct were by nature voluntary and non-legally binding and that it was therefore unnecessary to include the proposed modifier to all references in the draft resolution. If it were to be included in the text at all, it should appear once in the preambular part only.

46. The representative of AUSTRALIA proposed, in her capacity as coordinator, adding the phrase “Recalling that codes of conduct are voluntary and non-legally binding and” to the beginning of paragraph (s), or as a new paragraph (r) ter, and omitting the modifier in all other instances.

47. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that a number of operative paragraphs encouraged Member States to take action in relation to the codes of conduct and that their voluntary and non-legally binding nature should be highlighted in order to ensure an appropriate balance. His country would, however, consider the proposals made and work to reach an agreement.

48. The CHAIR thanked the delegation of Iran for its flexibility.

49. He invited the representative of Australia to continue through the draft resolution.

50. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph 17, said that Iran had proposed replacing “become Contracting Parties to the Joint Convention” with “consider becoming Contracting Parties to the Joint Convention” for consistency with paragraph 16, which urged Member States to consider becoming Contracting Parties to the CNS. A number of delegations had opposed the proposed change, on the basis that they considered the Joint Convention to be a particularly important instrument given the amount of radioactive waste managed worldwide.

51. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that, rather than aiming to replicate the language used in paragraph 16, his country’s proposal was aimed at mitigating the very strong phrase “Urges Member States”, which was inconsistent with the well-established principle that States must consent to be bound by any legal instrument, regardless of its importance. As an alternative solution, he proposed replacing “Urges” with “Encourages”.

52. The representative of AUSTRALIA, recalling that Iran’s alternative proposal had been made in the past and had met with opposition, said that “Urges Member States” had been agreed language for some time owing to the importance of the conventions concerned, and that changing it to “Encourages Member States” would constitute a significant change that would require further discussion.

53. The representative of SWEDEN, supported by the representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, said that the CNS and the Joint Convention were different in nature and said that the previously agreed language should be retained.

54. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that it was unclear why Iran’s proposal, which merited consideration, was unacceptable to certain delegations: no State could enter into a legal instrument without first considering it. The Russian Federation had always supported the universalization of the CNS and the Joint Convention, but could accept Iran’s proposal, as it merely reflected reality.

55. The representative of BULGARIA supported the comments made by Australia and Sweden and expressed regret at Iran’s proposal to amend the wording of paragraph 17, which had appeared in the previous two resolutions on nuclear and radiation safety.

56. The representative of FINLAND said that his country attached particular importance to the Joint Convention and wished to retain the previously agreed language.

57. The CHAIR encouraged delegations to continue their consultations on the matter.

58. He invited the representative of Australia to continue through the draft resolution.

59. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph 114, said that there had been a proposal by Chile to delete “or balance” after “gender equality”.

60. The representative of CHILE, supported by the representatives of COSTA RICA, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IRELAND, DENMARK speaking on behalf of the European Union, the UNITED KINGDOM, COLOMBIA, EL SALVADOR, AUSTRALIA speaking in her national capacity, FINLAND, CANADA, NEW ZEALAND, BELGIUM, AUSTRIA, the KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS, SWITZERLAND and SPAIN, said that Member States should be encouraged to develop their national strategies for capacity building in accordance with international standards — in particular the SDGs, which referred to gender equality. His country’s proposal simply served to reinstate the wording used in the 2022 resolution on nuclear and radiation safety and before, which was in line with those standards.

61. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his country wished to retain the current wording of paragraph 114, as agreed the previous year.

62. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA, supported by the representative of EGYPT, said that his country would prefer to retain the current wording, but recognized that the issue remained under discussion.
63. The CHAIR welcomed the ongoing discussions on the issue, which pertained to a number of the draft resolutions, and proposed revisiting the matter in due course.
64. He invited the representative of Australia to continue through the draft resolution.
65. The representative of AUSTRALIA turned to paragraph 120 bis, which contained the proposal by Mauritius.
66. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed adding “, upon request,” after “Small Island Developing States (SIDS)”. Her delegation also wished to work on the paragraph the following year in order to make it broader and more inclusive.
67. The representative of MAURITIUS said that support in building technical capacity was generally provided on request and therefore wondered if it was necessary to make that explicit?
68. The CHAIR said that it was not unusual to do so in resolutions relating to technical cooperation.
69. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that the Secretariat did not provide such assistance automatically, but rather received requests from Member States.
70. The representative of MAURITIUS said that her delegation could accept the proposed addition.
71. The CHAIR understood that paragraph 120 bis, as amended, was acceptable to the Committee.
72. He invited the representative of Australia to continue through the draft resolution.
73. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph 142, said that the USA had proposed adding “and enhancing the capabilities of” after the word “utilizing”.
74. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that her delegation’s proposal was based on the fact that more Member States were joining IRMIS every year and there were plans to enhance the system’s capabilities. She recalled that the Russian Federation had proposed the alternative wording of “upgrading”, which her delegation could accept; however, the word “capabilities” should be used, and her delegation could not accept the alternative proposal of “functionality”.
75. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that both the word “capabilities” and the alternative word “functionality” simply described the system’s technical and functional abilities. In any case, her delegation did not see a need to add anything, given that the Secretariat would presumably be enhancing or upgrading all its tools whether or not it was encouraged to do so in the draft resolution.
76. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA reiterated that her country could accept the proposal to change “enhancing” to “upgrading”, but that “capabilities” should be retained.
77. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that it was not clear to her delegation what the difference was between “capabilities” and “functionality” in the given context.
78. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that she was working on an alternative wording that would be acceptable to both the Russian Federation and the USA. She would consult further with both delegations to find a mutually agreeable solution.
79. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN requested that paragraphs 54, 63, 81, 88, 95 and 142 remain open while he awaited instructions from his capital.

80. The CHAIR said that the Committee would resume its discussion of the draft resolution in due course and requested that further informal consultations be held.

The meeting was suspended at 12.05 p.m. and resumed at 12.30 p.m.

14. Nuclear security (resumed)

(GC(68)/7; GC(68)/INF/3 and 6; GC(68)/COM.5/L.15)

81. The CHAIR invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the draft resolution on nuclear security, contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.15.

82. The representative of FRANCE, turning first to paragraph (d), said that there had been a proposal to strengthen the wording by highlighting the balance between the three pillars of the NPT. While a number of options had been discussed, no agreement had yet been reached. The current wording was that used in the previous year's resolution.

83. The CHAIR asked whether there were any objections to retaining the previous year's wording.

84. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation had proposed adding the phrase "that need to be implemented in a balanced manner" after "peaceful uses of atomic energy" and that discussions with interested delegations were ongoing.

85. The representative of PAKISTAN said that his delegation would continue to discuss the issue with the Iranian delegation and requested that paragraph (d) remain open.

86. The CHAIR invited the representative of France to continue through the draft resolution.

87. The representative of FRANCE, turning to paragraph (k), said that there had been discussions relating to the reference to the ICONS 2024 Co-Presidents' statement and very differing positions expressed. The intention behind the current wording was to recognize the fact that the statement, which had been supported by a number of countries, constituted the outcome of the significant work done by the Co-Presidents — Australia and Kazakhstan. Certain delegations therefore wished to refer to it explicitly. Others wished to omit the reference, as the statement was not a consensus document. He additionally drew attention to the corresponding operative paragraph 8, and said that a compromise had been reached in relation to the two paragraphs during the discussions.

88. The CHAIR suggested that paragraph (k) be considered alongside paragraph 8.

89. The representative of PAKISTAN said that his delegation could accept paragraph 8 as it stood. With regard to paragraph (k), it was opposed to the General Conference taking note of the Co-Presidents' statement, since that document had not been adopted by consensus. In order to express appreciation for the efforts of the Co-Presidents, he proposed replacing "Joint Statement" with "work".

90. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC said that, as the statement had not been adopted by consensus, it should not be referred to in a General Conference resolution.

91. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his country had participated in ICONS 2024 at a very high level, demonstrating its commitment to nuclear security. Echoing the comments made by Syria and the proposal made by Pakistan concerning paragraph (k), he proposed deleting the word "globally" in paragraph 8, which had, for some reason, been added to the previous year's wording.

92. The CHAIR asked whether Pakistan's proposal was acceptable to the Committee.
93. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that lengthy discussions had been held on paragraphs (k) and 8 during the open-ended working group meetings. The wording initially proposed had been much stronger and more ambitious, in particular in relation to the operative paragraph, but changes had been made on the basis of concerns expressed by various delegations. He stressed the importance of referring to the Co-Presidents' statement, which had been supported by 76 Member States. He welcomed the compromise proposal made by Pakistan and suggested building on it by referring to the efforts of the Co-Presidents to develop a statement.
94. The representative of FRANCE said that, during the negotiations, concessions had been made in relation to paragraph 8 with a view to retaining the reference to the statement in paragraph (k).
95. The representative of CANADA, thanking the delegations of Australia and Kazakhstan for their flexibility in seeking a mutually acceptable solution, said that his delegation supported the two paragraphs as currently drafted. ICONS 2024 had been the most important nuclear security event of the year and the Co-Presidents' statement was one of its main outcomes. While his delegation would have preferred to retain the stronger language initially proposed, it was willing to show flexibility. He encouraged other delegations to do the same. At the same time, he was troubled by the assertion that only consensus documents should be referred to in General Conference resolutions; the phrase "taking note" should serve to enable reference to be made to non-consensus texts.
96. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, supporting the comments made by Canada, said that her country would also have preferred stronger language but had exercised flexibility in order to accommodate other delegations' concerns. Stressing the importance of including a reference to the outcome of Member States' joint efforts at ICONS 2024, she hoped that a compromise could be reached. Just because a document was not adopted by consensus, it did not mean that it had no value or relevance for Member States' work on nuclear security. Regarding paragraph 8, she supported the current wording and could not accept the deletion of "globally" as proposed by Iran.
97. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, stressing that maximum flexibility had been shown in relation to both paragraphs, said that her delegation also wished to retain the reference to the statement in paragraph (k) and the word "globally" in paragraph 8. While the principle of consensus was important, the idea that the General Conference should not even take note of documents that were not consensus texts — even highly important documents such as the Co-Presidents' statement — was troubling. She encouraged delegations that took that position to consult with their capitals on other important documents that, while not necessarily consensus texts, would nevertheless be worthy of inclusion in a draft resolution.
98. The representative of KAZAKHSTAN, reiterating the importance of referring to the Co-Presidents' statement, drew attention to the fact that a large number of the provisions of that statement were included in the draft resolution under consideration. It was highly regrettable that some Member States were opposed to making reference to the statement just because they had not supported it. He hoped that the utmost flexibility would be demonstrated in order to find a consensus-based solution.
99. The representative of NEW ZEALAND, acknowledging the impressive flexibility shown by the ICONS 2024 Co-Presidents during the discussions, supported the comments made by the representatives of Canada and the USA.
100. The CHAIR invited delegations to comment on Iran's proposal to delete the word "globally" from paragraph 8.

101. The representative of the KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS expressed a preference for retaining the word “globally”, but could also accept “worldwide”.

102. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his country’s proposal was to reinstate the previous year’s wording.

103. The CHAIR said that he was hopeful that an agreement could be reached on paragraph 8.

104. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, referring to paragraph (u), proposed adding the words “and separated plutonium” after the reference to HEU, as per the preceding paragraph (t). Separated plutonium presented both nuclear security risks and non-proliferation risks and all nuclear security measures that could apply to HEU could also apply to separated plutonium.

105. The representative of FRANCE said that Iran’s proposal had not been accepted during previous discussions, as it had not received support from any other delegation and a number of delegations had emphasized that nuclear security concerns relating to separated plutonium were already taken into account in paragraph (t). Including a reference to separated plutonium in paragraph (u) would confuse matters.

106. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that paragraph (t) concerned precautions to ensure the nuclear security of both HEU and separated plutonium; that balance was lost in paragraph (u), which referred only to HEU. The same nuclear security concerns applied to both.

107. The representative of SWITZERLAND reiterated that Iran’s proposal had been discussed at length during the open-ended working group meetings and had not garnered any support. There were two reasons for that: firstly, a number of Member States used separated plutonium in their MOX fuel; secondly, the distinction made in paragraph (u) between LEU and HEU could not be made in relation to plutonium.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.