

# General Conference

**GC(68)/COM.5/OR.3**

Issued: October 2024

**General Distribution**

Original: English

---

## Sixty-eighth regular session

# Committee of the Whole

## Record of the Third Meeting

*Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Tuesday, 17 September 2024, at 3.20 p.m.*

**Chair:** Mr LODDING (Sweden)

### Contents

Item of the agenda <sup>1</sup>	Paragraphs
14 Nuclear security ( <i>continued</i> )	1–74
16 Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications ( <i>resumed</i> )	75–84
17 Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards ( <i>resumed</i> )	85–89

---

<sup>1</sup> GC(68)/21



**Abbreviations used in this record**

CRP	coordinated research project
ICONS	International Conference on Nuclear Security
NSTDC	Nuclear Security Training and Demonstration Centre
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America



## 14. Nuclear security (continued)

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

1. The CHAIR said that discussions on the draft resolution on nuclear security contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.15 would continue. He invited the coordinator to introduce paragraph (aa).
2. The representative of FRANCE, speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the wording at the start of paragraph (aa) concerning attacks or threats of attack against peaceful nuclear facilities was new. The current wording appeared to best reflect the agreement reached following consultations. He noted that the intention had been to propose an operative paragraph as well, but that consensus had proved impossible.
3. The representative of ARMENIA said that his delegation welcomed the revision of paragraph (aa) and the inclusion of wording in line with the ICONS 2024 Co-Presidents' statement.
4. Regarding a potential operative paragraph, he said that a great deal of work had been done and suggested that he continue to facilitate consultations in order to try to reach consensus.
5. The CHAIR said that he encouraged consensus to be found and that consultations could continue.
6. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation continued to believe that paragraph (aa) lacked certain elements; it proposed citing the relevant UN Security Council and General Assembly resolutions in order to provide background and emphasize that the issue had been dealt with at the highest level. The language agreed in that context might help in finding a way forward.
7. The representative of FRANCE, speaking in her national capacity, said that the inclusion of both the word "any" — in the phrase "any attacks" — and the word "cyber-attacks" was superfluous.
8. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that her delegation would not be comfortable referring to resolutions in paragraph (aa) other than those currently mentioned. As a matter of principle, the draft resolution did not cite texts inculcating specific countries as that was not conducive to consensus.
9. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation would be willing to consider any specific proposed wording in order to achieve consensus. However, it insisted on retaining both "any" and "cyber-attacks". The question of cyber-attacks was very important to his country, as such attacks could have similar implications to other kinds of attack and therefore represented a clear threat to nuclear security. His delegation had explained the use of "any" on previous occasions, and he noted that such wording was used both in the General Conference resolutions referred to and the other resolutions that could be cited.
10. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that although her delegation had preferred, for the sake of clarity, to separate out the ideas of attacks, cyber-attacks and wider conduct in armed conflict, it was willing to accept the current wording. She noted that neither of the cited General Conference resolutions GC(XXIX)/RES/444 and GC(XXXIV)/RES/533 specifically mentioned cyber-attacks; the current wording therefore represented a step forward, and a major compromise on the part of her delegation and, doubtless, others as well.
11. The CHAIR said that he encouraged consensus to be found.

12. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, referring to paragraph (dd) bis, said that the matter of small modular reactors was very important to his country. His delegation had understood that the new wording had been added in order to emphasize Member States' growing interest in such new technologies. However, the current wording, by mentioning nuclear security before proceeding to state the growing interest, seemed to focus more on constraints. The formulation was, therefore, unacceptable.

13. The representative of GERMANY said that the emphasis on nuclear security as an impediment to deploying small modular reactors was precisely the point. There seemed to be a euphoria with regard to small modular reactors that could, at times, occlude the importance of nuclear security. The draft resolution concerned nuclear security: its primary task, therefore, was to address nuclear security, with the promotion of nuclear power as a secondary consideration.

14. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that he agreed that there should be a link between small modular reactors and nuclear security, but that the current wording was unacceptable. His delegation was prepared to supply specific wording.

15. The representative of the AUSTRIA said that the matter at hand had already been the subject of extensive discussion. He agreed that the main focus of the draft resolution must remain on nuclear security.

16. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that the current wording was a good reflection of previous discussions, including in the context of ICONS 2024. Noting that the wording was likely the optimum version that could be achieved at the current juncture, he called for flexibility.

17. The CHAIR encouraged further discussion to find consensus.

18. He invited the representative of France to continue through the draft resolution.

19. The representative of FRANCE said that paragraph (nn) had been added in order to invoke the notion of insider threats and to underline the importance of international cooperation.

20. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that some aspects of paragraph (nn) remained unclear. His delegation was awaiting final instructions.

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

22. The representative of FRANCE said that paragraph 32 was the result of merging and simplifying paragraphs 32 and 33 from the previous year's resolution on nuclear security<sup>2</sup>.

23. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that the wording "in consultation with Member States" from paragraph 33 in the previous year's resolution had been omitted from the current draft resolution. He proposed that it be included in the first line of paragraph 32 of the draft resolution, following the words "Encourages the Secretariat".

24. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that, in the previous year's resolution, "in consultation with Member States" had applied specifically to fostering and maintaining a robust nuclear security culture. Adding an analogous phrase in the location proposed by Iran would seem to alter the entire structure of the paragraph.

25. The CHAIR said that, in the previous year's resolution, "in consultation with Member States" had also been used in conjunction with increasing assistance to States, upon request. He proposed adding

---

<sup>2</sup> GC(67)/RES/8

“in consultation with Member States” to the third line of the draft resolution: “compatible with States’ nuclear security regimes, and, in consultation with Member States, to increase its assistance to Member States”. Such a placement would seem to reflect the text of the previous year’s resolution more closely.

26. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that in the previous year’s resolution, the phrase in question had been used in connection with developing, fostering and maintaining a robust nuclear security culture. His delegation had proposed adding the phrase to the first part of paragraph 32 of the draft resolution, as that was where nuclear security culture was mentioned.

27. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that she required more time to consider the matter.

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

29. The representative of FRANCE, drawing attention to paragraph 37, said that Saudi Arabia had proposed amendments that had not previously been discussed.

30. The representative of SAUDI ARABIA proposed the following wording: “Welcomes the first year of activities at the Nuclear Security Training and Demonstration Centre (NSTDC) at Seibersdorf, inaugurated in 2023, calls upon the IAEA to continue to host activities at the NSTDC that complement, and do not duplicate the activities of Member States’ Nuclear Security Support Centres, encourages the Secretariat, in close consultation with Member States and the Friends of the NSTDC, to most effectively manage its financial and technical resources to enable the long term sustainability and operation of the NSTDC, and calls on the Secretariat to keep Member States informed on progress made on the NSTDC, including through regular briefings and the IAEA’s Nuclear Security Review and Nuclear Security Report”.

31. The representative of SWITZERLAND, supported by the representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, requested that the proposed amendment be made available in writing.

32. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, noting that her delegation too wished to see the wording in writing, offered initial support for the proposed amendment and thanked Saudi Arabia for its work as a co-chair — along with her own country — of the Friends of the NSTDC group.

33. The CHAIR suggested that Saudi Arabia send its proposed amendment to the Secretariat for further circulation.

34. He invited the representative of France to continue through the draft resolution.

35. The representative of FRANCE drew attention to paragraph 52, which had been expanded to mention international cooperation in the area of insider threats.

36. The CHAIR said that paragraph 52 was seemingly closely related to paragraph (nn), on which no specific concerns had been raised, although the representative of Iran had requested more time for consideration.

37. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that the question of insider threats was a priority for his country. His delegation could not agree with the text that had been added and preferred the wording from the previous year’s resolution. Any improvements to the text must have a clear scope and framework, and should be made on the basis of agreed language or consensual documents — for example, Member States could be invited to consider IAEA Nuclear Security Series No. 8-G (Rev. 1). He was unconvinced that there was a document or instrument that dealt with the criminalization of insider threats within a clear scope and framework; furthermore, any improvements

to documents or instruments should be made through the Nuclear Security Guidance Committee. On that basis, his delegation could not accept the new wording.

38. The representative of SWITZERLAND, supported by the representative of GERMANY, said that the existing wording “consistent with their national legislation and regulation” established the framework and scope.

39. The CHAIR said that additional consultations would be required on the paragraph.

40. He invited the representative of France to continue through the draft resolution.

41. The representative of FRANCE said that paragraph 61 had not been modified. The paragraph had been the subject of negotiations at the previous regular session of the General Conference and although it had been extensively discussed, no consensus had been reached on altering the wording with regard to the principle of professionalism and, in particular, gender equality.

42. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his country’s position remained unchanged. The same issue had been discussed with regard to other draft resolutions and a consistent approach should be followed. A solution could be found on that basis.

43. The representative of CANADA said that the solution was represented by the current wording, which had commanded consensus in the previous year’s resolution. It did not make sense to keep debating the paragraph, as previous discussions had suggested that no agreement would be within reach.

44. The representative of COSTA RICA, supported by the representatives of NORWAY, the UNITED KINGDOM, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, NEW ZEALAND, AUSTRALIA, COLOMBIA, SOUTH AFRICA, FRANCE, the KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS, BELGIUM, DENMARK, JAPAN, GERMANY, SWEDEN, EL SALVADOR, SPAIN, AUSTRIA, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and FINLAND, said that he preferred retaining the current wording.

45. The representative of PAKISTAN said that the phrases “workforce diversity” and “inclusive workforce” posed problems for his delegation.

46. The representative of MEXICO, noting that discussions on the question — albeit a sensitive one — were taking up a lot of the Committee’s time, said that his delegation preferred retaining the current wording.

47. The representative of IRELAND said that his delegation preferred retaining the current wording, and that the Director General had stated that the topic in question was a priority.

48. The representative of SAUDI ARABIA, taking note of the different positions expressed, said that his delegation looked forward to working with others to reach a positive outcome.

49. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that if a country harboured reservations, they must be properly considered, in particular given that the analogous paragraph from the previous year’s resolution on nuclear and radiation safety had also been opened for discussion.

50. The representative of FRANCE said that the subject had been thoroughly dealt with, but no consensus had been reached — hence the decision to retain the agreed wording from the previous year’s resolution.

51. The CHAIR encouraged further discussion to find consensus.

52. He invited the representative of France to continue through the draft resolution.



53. The representative of FRANCE said that paragraph 68 bore two numbers because it was generally agreed that it was not located in the right place; it could be moved earlier in the document. The content had been included in the previous year's resolution, with the exception of the final phrase concerning the issuance of the related technical document.

54. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation had requested that the paragraph be moved earlier in the document. It was not in agreement with the wording added to the end of the paragraph and requested that the wording from the previous year's resolution be reinstated, for the reasons that it had already given during the discussions on the draft resolution on nuclear and radiation safety.

55. The representative of FRANCE, speaking in her national capacity, said that her delegation supported moving the paragraph earlier in the document but preferred retaining the current wording.

56. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation could not accept a reference to a technical document. All such documents bore a disclaimer stating, among other things, that "The views expressed remain the responsibility of the contributors and do not necessarily represent the views of the IAEA or its Member States" and that "recommendations provided ... are not made on the basis of a consensus of all Member States". Technical documents, therefore, were not adopted on the basis of consensus and the Agency did not take responsibility for their contents.

57. The representative of SWITZERLAND, noting that a similar discussion had been held with regard to the draft resolution on nuclear and radiation safety, proposed replacing "and to issue the related technical document" with "and to inform Member States on the findings".

58. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her country continued to hold the same position. The wording from the previous year's resolution was sufficient and her delegation could not accept any additions.

59. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC said that her delegation supported the comments made by Iran and the Russian Federation, and preferred reinstating the wording from the previous year's resolution.

60. The representative of UKRAINE said that her delegation could support the current wording and was also prepared to consider the proposal put forward by Switzerland.

61. The representative of BULGARIA supported the proposal put forward by Switzerland, which appeared to accommodate different views. She noted that in the previous year's resolution, the Secretariat had been encouraged to continue its work in close consultation with Member States; however, no such consultations had taken place. She therefore proposed expanding Switzerland's proposal to read "and to inform Member States on the progress and findings".

62. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA, noting that the issue had been discussed extensively, including in the context of the draft resolution on nuclear and radiation safety, said that the proposal by Switzerland offered a way forward in both cases, as it was not prescriptive in terms of how feedback would be given.

63. The CHAIR encouraged further discussion, perhaps on the basis of the proposal by Switzerland.

64. He asked whether there were any further comments on the draft resolution contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.15.

65. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION drew attention to paragraph 54. The decision as to whether to hold conferences on computer security on a regular basis should be made by Member

States rather than the Secretariat. She therefore proposed deleting the words “and to consider holding such conferences on a regular basis”.

66. Turning to paragraph 57, she proposed changing the first word from “Welcomes” to “Notes”.

67. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that her delegation preferred to retain the end of paragraph 54. Such conferences represented a setting in which Member States were exercising their agency on the issue and the holding of further conferences would be positive.

68. Additionally, the US delegation would prefer to retain the current wording in paragraph 57.

69. The representative of AUSTRALIA, echoing the comments made by the representative of the USA concerning paragraph 54, said that his country would support regular future conferences. He also questioned why paragraph 57 posed a problem and expressed a strong preference for the current wording.

70. The representative of CHINA, referring to paragraph 54, said that his delegation had expressed similar views to that of the Russian Federation while the draft resolution was being prepared. Such a technical meeting was held in accordance with the needs of Member States, and it was not appropriate to determine that it should be held on a regular basis. He therefore proposed omitting the words “on a regular basis” from the paragraph.

71. The representative of SWITZERLAND said that the wording of paragraph 54 clearly suggested that the conference and its recommendations had some value. Wording that indicated the holding of a subsequent conference at some point in the future could represent a solution.

72. Turning to paragraph 57, he said that CRPs were normally welcomed, as they were of direct assistance to Member States.

73. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation supported the proposal to change “Welcomes” to “Notes” in paragraph 57.

74. The CHAIR encouraged further consultations on the draft resolution contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.15.

## **16. Strengthening the Agency’s activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications (resumed)** (GC(68)/10 and 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)

75. The CHAIR suggested that the Committee resume consideration of the draft resolution on isotope hydrology (“A. Non-power nuclear applications. 5. Use of isotope hydrology for water resources management”) contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.7.

76. The representative of ALGERIA, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that progress had been made as a result of extensive consultations among members of the Group and with the delegation of the Russian Federation, which had proposed a number of edits.

77. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation’s proposals were essentially editorial. With regard to the preambular part, she proposed removing the erroneous “and” from the first line of paragraph (g). In paragraph (j), it was not entirely clear what was meant by the term

“bilateral agencies”; she therefore proposed removing the reference to such agencies. In paragraph (p), the phrase “along with renewed collaboration with” should be replaced with “and”.

78. Turning to the operative part, she proposed deleting the words “selected” and “new and” from the second and fifth lines of paragraph 1(ii), respectively; the phrase “from very young to very old water” from paragraph 1(vii); and the phrase “designed to provide practising hydrologists with the ability to use isotope techniques” from paragraph 2.

79. The representative of COLOMBIA, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the proposed edits to paragraphs (g), (p), 1(ii), 1(vii) and 2 were acceptable. With regard to paragraph (j), he proposed replacing “bilateral and international agencies” with “Member States and other international agencies”.

80. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation could accept the proposed amendment to paragraph (j).

81. 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.7, as amended.

82. It was so decided.

83. The representative of ALGERIA, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, noted that all the draft resolutions submitted by the Group had been adopted by consensus. He thanked delegations for their support, flexibility and constructive engagement and also expressed appreciation to the Secretariat for its assistance.

84. The CHAIR conveyed thanks to those involved in preparing the draft resolutions under item 16 and to Member States for their support and flexibility.

## **17. Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards (resumed)** (GC(68)/9; GC(68)/COM.5/L.1)

85. The CHAIR, turning to the draft resolution on strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards, contained in document GC(68)/COM.5/L.1, invited the representative of Syria to update the Committee on her delegation’s position.

86. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC said that, as per instructions from its capital, her delegation would join the consensus regarding paragraph (l).

87. The CHAIR, thanking Syria for its flexibility, 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.1.

88. It was so decided.

89. The CHAIR, recalling that discussions on the draft resolutions contained in GC(68)/COM.5/L.9, L.10 and L.15 were ongoing, strongly encouraged delegations to intensify their consultations and demonstrate the necessary flexibility to enable the Committee to reach a consensus on those important texts.

**The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.**