



GC

GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/OR.90

16 November 1993

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

Original: FRENCH

International Atomic Energy Agency

# GENERAL CONFERENCE

---

THIRTY-SEVENTH (1993) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE NINETIETH MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna  
on Wednesday, 29 September 1993, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. POSTA (Hungary)

## CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
14	Measures to strengthen international co-operation in matters relating to nuclear safety and radiological protection (continued)	1 - 96
(a)	Implementation of resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/582	
(iv)	The preparation of a nuclear safety convention (paragraph 5)	1 - 36
(v)	The implementation and status of the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency	37 - 38

---

[\*] GC(XXXVII)/1085.

---

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XXXVII)/INF/328/Rev.2.

93-3777 (IV)

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
(b) Implementation of resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/583: The preparation of new Basic Safety Standards	39 - 59
(c) Implementation of resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/584: Programme for education and training in radiation protection and nuclear safety	60 - 77
(d) Implementation of resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/585: Liability for nuclear damage	78 - 96
- Draft resolution GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/124	97 - 111

Abbreviations used in this record

BSS	Basic Safety Standards for Radiation Protection
ICRP	International Commission on Radiological Protection
INSAG	International Nuclear Safety Advisory Group
NUSS	Nuclear Safety Standards
NUSS programme	Agency's programme on nuclear safety standards for nuclear power plants

MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN MATTERS  
RELATING TO NUCLEAR SAFETY AND RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION (continued)

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION GC(XXXVI)/RES/582

(iv) The preparation of a nuclear safety convention (paragraph 5) (GC(XXXVII)/1066)

1. Mr. MANNINEN (Finland), recalling that work on drafting a nuclear safety convention had begun more than one year before, said it was high time that the work be completed and the convention enter into force. The credibility of the nuclear community and of the Agency was at stake. Happily, the end was now in sight as the Group of Experts had reached a consensus on limiting the convention in the first phase to civil nuclear power plants. Although Finland still held the view that the convention should apply to all nuclear facilities, including waste management facilities, it had been prepared to be flexible in the interests of resolving the disagreement which had been obstructing finalization of the convention. However, his delegation expected the parties to the future convention to commit themselves to continuing the work with a view to broadening the scope of application of the convention, and it was in that spirit that it had been participating in the preparation of a draft resolution on the matter.

2. Mr. BOSMAN (Netherlands) was satisfied with the results obtained by the Group of Experts even though the scope of application of the convention was more limited than he had originally hoped for. While the new draft text seemed to be a good point of departure for a rapid and successful conclusion of the task, it represented only a partial response to resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/582. For that reason, the preparation of a convention on nuclear waste management should be started as soon as the relevant safety principles had been decided upon.

3. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece) said that, although his delegation would have preferred a convention with a broader scope, in a spirit of compromise and in order to speed up conclusion of the work it had agreed that the convention be limited to nuclear power plants on the understanding that the preparation of a convention on waste management would start as soon as the relevant safety principles became operative. He

commended the work of INSAG, from which the Group of Experts should derive considerable benefit at its meeting in October.

4. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America) was pleased with the consensus which had emerged at the June meetings of the Board on the drafting of a text which would serve as the basis for the October meeting of the Group of Experts and praised the efforts being made by the group to finalize a text for submission to the Board in February. He fully endorsed the general approach taken by the Group of Experts and agreed that the convention should establish a commitment for parties to review their national reports at periodic meetings, thereby satisfying the convention's "peer review process" requirement. The convention would not, of course, detract from the obligations of States with regard to nuclear safety, which was, after all, a sovereign responsibility. His delegation agreed that the scope of the convention should be limited to civil nuclear power plants; they were the type of installation which represented the greatest risk to the public, and there was a greater degree of international consensus on the measures necessary for ensuring the safety of such plants. Work should, however, begin on preparing a waste management convention as soon as the relevant safety principles had been agreed upon.

5. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) welcomed the agreement reached by the Group of Experts on the scope of the convention; the conclusion of the exercise seemed to be at hand. The somewhat general wording of a number of obligations in the latest draft made it imperative to develop a strong and well-defined peer review system which would add credibility to the convention. His delegation fully endorsed the INSAG recommendations in that connection and also its recommendations on the more technical role to be entrusted to the Agency regarding implementation of the convention.

6. It went without saying that, since the agreement which had emerged was conditional on early settlement of the waste management issue, a firm commitment to settle that issue soon should be made in the most appropriate form and fora. His delegation hoped that the Secretariat would complete the work on safety fundamentals soon, so that the debate on a convention on radioactive waste management could begin.

7. Mr. HÖGBERG (Sweden) welcomed the progress achieved in preparing a nuclear safety convention, which Sweden considered of crucial importance. For that reason it had accepted a limitation of the convention's scope to civil nuclear power plants, on the understanding that work would subsequently start on preparing a convention on waste management. He hoped that the compromise achieved would pave the way to agreement on other matters, such as a review mechanism - regarding which INSAG had provided valuable input - and meetings of the contracting parties, so that a final text could be approved early the following year.

8. Of course, his delegation still considered it imperative that a convention covering the safety of other nuclear activities - such as waste management - be prepared as soon as possible. It therefore hoped that Member States would commit themselves to the conclusion of the nuclear safety convention and to the early completion of work on a waste management convention, and in that connection it commended the Agency for the work it had done with regard to waste management safety fundamentals.

9. Mr. FITZGERALD (Ireland) said that his delegation attached great importance to the envisaged nuclear safety convention, the need for which had been recognized two years previously. He regretted that it had not been possible in the intervening time to secure agreement on a scope of application covering the entire nuclear industry and its associated risks. In the interests of overcoming the impasse, his delegation had reluctantly agreed to a limitation of the scope of the convention to civil nuclear power plants, on the clear understanding that the issue of waste management would be tackled as soon as the technical criteria had been identified, so that - ultimately - the entire nuclear industry would be covered. He now looked forward to conclusion of the convention in 1994; that would demonstrate the great importance attached by all Member States to safety.

10. Mr. TABET (Algeria) said that in June 1993 the Board of Governors had established guidelines giving the necessary impulse to the work of the Group of Experts, which was due to hold its fifth meeting in October. The Chairman of the Group of Experts had finalized, in co-operation with Member States and as a result of broad consultations in which Algeria had taken part, the text of a draft convention on nuclear safety which would facilitate preparations for the convening of a diplomatic conference. His delegation, which

noted that the consensus on limiting the scope of the convention to power plants was attributable more to necessity than to conviction, hoped that broadening the convention's scope would not be delayed too long and that the other elements of the nuclear fuel cycle would not be overlooked.

11. Mr. ORNSTEIN (Argentina) said that his Government attached great importance to completion of the preparatory work for an international convention on nuclear safety and considered that the progress that had been made was encouraging. Such a convention was essential if the general public was to accept the nuclear option for electricity production. His delegation therefore urged those Member States which still held intransigent positions to show more flexibility in the interests of speeding up the process of reaching a consensus so that a diplomatic conference could be held in the course of 1994.

12. Ms. CZOCH (Hungary), recalling that Hungary had taken part in the work of the Group of Experts, said that the Chairman had presented a text which provided a good basis for continuation of the work. The safety fundamentals and the peer review process would be of great importance in the implementation of the convention. Financial problems were likely to arise, however, unless countries made provision for funds for the preparation of reports and for their experts to take part in meetings. It was to be hoped that the Agency would be able to continue financing the work on drafting the convention and, subsequently, to contribute to its implementation.

13. Mr. PEREZ-MARTIN (Cuba) said that his Government attached particular importance to nuclear safety issues. The safety of nuclear installations required international co-operation free of any political pressure, and the convention under discussion was a good means of achieving that end. The convention should apply to all nuclear facilities no matter what their purpose; if that were not possible, the wording of the convention should accurately reflect its field of application. His delegation, which believed that international co-operation should be provided for in the actual text of the convention, would resist any attempt to impose conditions of a discriminatory nature dictated by political or other motives.

14. The technical aspects of the convention should be based on the fundamental principles and the safety codes which the Agency had been developing for several years. The

mechanisms created by the convention should be transparent and accessible to all States. The convention should under no circumstances serve unilateral interests, and the Agency's role - which, as far as his delegation was concerned, was basically a technical one - should therefore be clearly defined.

15. Having made those comments, his delegation endorsed the report submitted by the Director General.

16. Mr. LIU (China) was satisfied with the progress achieved in preparing the convention. Nuclear safety was a matter of interest to the international community as a whole. China had taken an active part in drafting the text of the convention, one of whose main aims was to strengthen international co-operation with a view to enhancing the level of safety in the entire world and thereby protecting man and the environment from the harmful effects of radiation. In order to achieve that aim, all parties to the convention should make every effort to comply with their obligations under the convention and ensure that the safety of their installations met with the established norms. They should also submit regular reports at meetings of the parties. The convention called for the strengthening of international co-operation in the field of nuclear safety. The peer review process was of paramount importance in that respect, but it should not represent the only form of co-operation within the framework of the convention.

17. His delegation was pleased that after four meetings a consensus had finally emerged on the scope, structure and practical modalities of the convention. It agreed that the convention should apply initially to civil nuclear power plants on the understanding that efforts would subsequently be made to include waste management and other facilities. It also held the view that the convention should lay down principles but not impose detailed technical standards, which were more the concern of individual States. Although it would be a good thing for the contracting parties to hold meetings, it was essential that the Agency be allowed to play a more dynamic role. Finally, his delegation approved the proposed timetable for the work and hoped that the text of the convention could be finalized by the end of 1993 for approval by a diplomatic conference in the course of 1994.

18. Mr. FARAHAT (Egypt) said that Egypt, which had taken part in the meetings of the Group of Experts, would have preferred the convention on nuclear safety to cover all stages of the nuclear fuel cycle, research reactors and nuclear waste management. In the interests of consensus, however, Egypt had agreed to a three-stage procedure. The first would cover power reactors, the second would cover waste management, and the third would cover all other nuclear activities and would be undertaken once the safety principles for the two previous stages had been established. His delegation, which hoped that drafting of the convention would soon be concluded and that the diplomatic conference could be held in 1994, would like the Secretariat to speed up work on preparing safety fundamentals.

19. Mr. LABROSSE (France) welcomed the progress made by the Group of Experts in preparing an international nuclear safety convention. He called on States, particularly all those with nuclear reactors, to take an active part in the preparatory work for that convention. France hoped that the Group of Experts, which was due to meet in Vienna at the end of October, would finalize the draft text of the convention at that time. On that assumption, and in order that the convention might be concluded soon, his delegation hoped that a diplomatic conference would be convened at the beginning of 1994.

20. Mr. MOHAN (India) said that his Government attached fundamental importance to all aspects of nuclear safety. As many States as possible should accede to the convention so as to ensure maximum impact. Furthermore, the cause of safety would be greatly served by technical co-operation in that area. The envisaged convention might also provide an opportunity for discussing the strong and weak points of safety and assisting countries in need.

21. Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation) said that his Government attached great importance to the preparation of a nuclear safety convention, which could go a long way to improving the safety level of installations; he regretted that work was proceeding so slowly. He hoped that the compromise achieved with regard to the scope of the convention would now result in rapid conclusion of the convention and that work could start on radioactive waste management.

22. Mr. ECHÁVARRI (Spain) said that his delegation, which had taken an active part in the work of the Group of Experts, was satisfied with the progress made. It felt sure that at its next meeting the Group of Experts would reach agreement on the basis of the text submitted by its Chairman. At the outset his delegation had felt that the convention should also cover radioactive waste management and the entire fuel cycle, but, in a spirit of compromise, it had later accepted limitation of its scope to civil nuclear power plants on the understanding that preparation of a convention on radioactive waste management would start as soon as possible.

23. Mr. AAMODT (Norway) said it was the view of his delegation that nuclear energy was acceptable only if nuclear installations operated in all countries according to the strictest safety, environmental protection and nuclear waste management standards. Preparation of a nuclear safety convention was therefore crucial. Norway would have preferred a convention which also included waste management from the outset, but, in a spirit of compromise, accepted the proposed formula on the understanding that work on waste management would be taken up immediately thereafter. His delegation hoped that drafting of the convention would proceed rapidly, so that the convention might be adopted in 1994.

24. Mr. WOJCIK (Poland) commended the work of the Group of Experts and thanked INSAG for its contribution towards preparation of the convention and the advice it had given to the Director General, particularly with regard to the peer review process - which was crucial if the convention were to function properly - and to the role that could be played by the Agency within the framework of the convention. The contracting parties should also be able to call more extensively than was provided for in the present text on the technical expertise of the Agency, particularly with regard to the preparation of technical standards. The Group of Experts had reached agreement on the scope of the convention, which would be limited in the first instance to civil nuclear power plants. A commitment had been made, however, to start soon on preparing a waste management convention. His delegation was able to agree with those decisions, on the understanding that work undertaken by the Agency and other organizations in the field of international safety standards would cover the other aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle in the near future. It hoped that the timetable for work proposed by the Director General would be adhered to.

25. Ms. TOMI (Australia) said that her Government, which supported preparation of an international nuclear safety convention, had been closely following the work done and had taken part in the meetings of the Group of Experts held in October 1992 and in February and June 1993. It had been pleased with the progress made thus far and had taken note of the draft of the nuclear safety convention prepared by the Chairman of the Group of Experts.

26. Australia would have preferred a framework convention with technical annexes covering all aspects of the fuel cycle. Nevertheless, it was prepared to work towards a series of conventions covering various aspects of the fuel cycle, the first of which would deal with civil nuclear power plants. Her delegation was pleased therefore that the draft resolution under preparation took up two of the ideas presented in the preamble to the draft by the Chairman of the Group of Experts, in particular the idea that the preparation of an international convention on the safety of nuclear waste management should commence as soon as there was broad international agreement on the relevant safety fundamentals.

27. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico) said that adoption of an international convention could help enhance safety at many nuclear power plants in the world. The convention should ideally cover all types of nuclear installation, whether military or civil; it was none the less acceptable that the convention should initially apply only to civil nuclear power plants, with reference in the preamble to the need for subsequent extension of the convention's scope to other types of installation. The safety principles applied should also reflect as closely as possible the objectives of the safety fundamentals established by the Agency.

28. The inclusion of radioactive waste processing facilities within the present scope of the convention would simply complicate finalization at the present stage, if only because it had not been possible to formulate fundamental safety principles which met with international consensus. It was his delegation's view that the safety fundamentals should be no more detailed than the Agency's Codes of Practice and the NUSS Guides and that they should not refer to them. Finally, care should be taken that the convention did not bestow on the Agency a new institutional role which would turn it into an international regulatory body, with the concomitant risk of reducing the responsibilities of States with regard to safety.

29. Mr. OMRAN (Syrian Arab Republic) felt that the preparation of an international convention on nuclear safety was of considerable interest not only for States with nuclear reactors. After all, the harmful consequences of an accident at a power plant affected not only the State in which that plant was located. For that reason the envisaged convention had a humanitarian and universal character, and all countries should voluntarily comply with its requirements in the interests of the safety both of their citizens and of the citizens of other countries. His delegation appreciated the efforts of the Group of Experts responsible for preparing the draft of the convention, which it hoped could be adopted soon, thereby paving the way to the preparation of an international convention on radioactive waste.

30. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) said that Austria, like many other countries, attached great importance to the question of nuclear safety and was therefore very appreciative of the work performed in that area by the Agency, including its work on preparing a nuclear safety convention. The experts convened by the Agency had made considerable progress, and Austria was willing to contribute to an early conclusion of the work since there was no doubt that a convention on nuclear safety should be concluded as a matter of urgency. His delegation would have preferred the convention to have a broader scope; however, it could accept limitation at this stage to nuclear power plants on the understanding that work on the other stages of the nuclear fuel cycle would start very soon. The draft prepared by the Chairman of the Group of Experts seemed an excellent basis for the next meeting, which was due to take place in October. His delegation was also pleased with the work done by INSAG, especially the three-stage peer review system which was recommended in its report to the Director General and which combined the elements of sovereignty, technical expertise and democracy.

31. With regard to the continuation of the work of the Group of Experts, his delegation hoped that the preparation of an international safety convention would be concluded in the near future. It was convinced of the need to make an early start on drafting an international convention on radioactive waste management. Work of a technical nature should also be undertaken with a view to drawing up safety principles and guidelines for other areas of the nuclear fuel cycle.

32. In conclusion, his delegation considered that the work being done by the Agency in the field of nuclear safety as a whole was very important and that consequently the Agency should be closely associated with the implementation of any nuclear safety convention adopted.

33. Mr. VIEIRA (Portugal) welcomed the progress made in preparing an international nuclear safety convention. Portugal had, in a spirit of compromise, accepted limitation of the scope of the convention, but it would have preferred the convention to cover all the activities of the nuclear fuel cycle, including radioactive waste management. He hoped that the convention would be adopted in 1994 and that, in the relatively near future, installations of the entire nuclear fuel cycle would come under an international instrument.

34. Mr. MULTONE (Switzerland) associated himself with the position taken by the representative of France. He hoped that in October a text on the safety of nuclear power plants would be forthcoming that could be accepted by governments in the first half of 1994. His delegation felt strongly that the part of the convention dealing with nuclear waste should not suffer any additional delay, especially as the material contained in the Safety Fundamentals documents was sufficient for preparation of a text on waste.

35. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that a draft resolution on the matter under discussion was being finalized. He therefore proposed that discussion be suspended and taken up again when that draft resolution had been submitted.

36. It was so decided.

(v) The implementation and status of the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency

37. Mr. RAZAK (Indonesia), recalling that his Government had signed the Convention on Early Notification and the Convention on Assistance on 26 September 1986, said that it had ratified them on 1 September 1993 on the basis of Presidential Decrees No. 81 and No. 82 respectively.

38. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico) emphasized the importance of the two Conventions and welcomed the fact that they were being implemented in an appropriate

manner. It was essential that all States should sign and ratify the two texts, and he therefore welcomed the fact that further countries were doing so, particularly the States of the former Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. All countries that had not yet done so should sign and ratify the two conventions as soon as possible.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION GC(XXXVI)/RES/583: THE PREPARATION OF NEW BASIC SAFETY STANDARDS (GC(XXXVII)/1077)

39. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) said that his delegation had noted at meetings of the Board of Governors in previous years that a small number of countries were holding up the Agency's work on the preparation of normative texts, for example for the safety principles for future nuclear plants. His delegation was very concerned and wished once again to express its confidence in the Secretariat: the Agency's texts were prepared by all the experts involved and reflected all of their opinions.

40. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico) said that the draft of the new BSS, which included radiation protection and the safety of radiation sources, was the most comprehensive text ever prepared on the subject. In the area of radiation protection, it took into account the ICRP recommendations published in 1990 and provided guidance concerning their implementation in the national regulatory context, while defining the responsibilities involved and explaining the concepts from the regulatory point of view. In the field of safety, it took concepts which had been under consideration for some time for nuclear facilities and extended them to other facilities which emitted ionizing radiation.

41. While recognizing the valuable work which had resulted in the new BSS, he noted that their application would pose problems, particularly in developing countries, as they would require efforts which were beyond the present capacities of those countries. Such efforts would be worthwhile only to the extent that they resulted in real safety improvements.

42. Mr. ORNSTEIN (Argentina) said that Argentine experts had played an active role in the work of the INSAG group referred to in paragraph 23 of document GC(XXXVII)/1077. His delegation shared the favourable opinion expressed by the group on the new BSS and on the advisability of preparing as soon as possible a document on basic principles of radiation protection, which would be published by the Agency in the Safety

Series like the document on the safety fundamentals relating to the safety of nuclear installations, approved in June 1993.

43. In that connection, an extensive system of consultations with Member States should be set up for the preparation of such documents, in view of their importance and their position in the hierarchy of Agency publications on safety. It was also important to take account of cost-effectiveness, so that no financial penalty would be imposed on nuclear power without any real benefit for nuclear and radiation safety. His delegation was sure that the fifth version of the new BSS would be completed in December 1993, so that it could be considered by the Board in February 1994.

44. Mr. DICKSON (United Kingdom) noted that the present item had been discussed at length the previous week in the Board of Governors, where his delegation had reiterated the importance it had always attached to the BSS prepared by the Agency in consultation with other international organizations. However, it had also expressed serious concern about a number of issues relating to the way in which the current review of the BSS was progressing.

45. Firstly, use was made of mandatory terms, which gave rise to confusion. Secondly, the practice of paraphrasing internationally recognized documents had in several areas led to an inaccurate reflection of international concerns - for example, with regard to probabilistic safety assessment, technical requirements and potential exposures. Thirdly, and most seriously, in many areas the draft was running ahead of the current international debate and attempting to set standards in areas where no consensus existed. Particularly worrying in that respect was the treatment of occupational risk constraint, medical reference levels, intervention levels and consumer products.

46. The BSS should not serve as a vehicle for concepts and numerical standards on which no international consensus had been reached, and his delegation could not support the adoption of a final text until those defects had been remedied. It had already expressed its opinion on the possible structure of a revised text, and he hoped that its proposals would pave the way for the timely preparation of a new set of texts which would be of real use to both the Agency and its Member States.

47. Mr. LABROSSE (France) thanked the Secretariat and the working group for all their work in preparing the new BSS following the revision of the ICRP standards.

48. The French delegation had followed those efforts with interest and had noted the progress achieved recently in the review of the fourth version of the BSS. The situation was developing in line with the views which France had held for a long time and which it had expressed not only to the Secretariat but also at various meetings at which the Board of Governors had considered the issue. His delegation hoped that it would be possible to produce a set of really usable texts. With regard to the structure of the documents, it had always favoured the approach which it believed to be the most appropriate for reaching the desired objective: the documents should present in a clear and concise manner the basic principles of radiation protection, with one section covering all aspects which were relevant to the activities of the Agency and could serve as a model for those Member States which so desired, and a later - perhaps separate - section containing all numerical data on which the necessary consensus had already been reached. The texts should not, however, be regulatory in tone.

49. There was a need to proceed rapidly but cautiously, and his delegation believed that the approach which it had advocated on several occasions and which had been endorsed by all of the international organizations associated with the project was the one whereby a set of documents suitable for publication and easily applicable in the field could be produced in the shortest time.

50. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America) supported the idea of the Agency developing BSS and revising them whenever necessary. He therefore approved the Joint Secretariat's report on activities associated with the current revision of the Agency's BSS on the basis of the recommendations in ICRP Publication 60.

51. His Government was taking an active role in the revision process and appreciated the Agency's efforts to respond to its concerns regarding the review and approval schedule for the final document and to take account of the comments made on previous drafts. He was pleased at the progress made, but regretted that a number of issues - such as "potential exposure", intervention levels and the use of prescriptive language - had not yet been

resolved. It was unlikely that those issues would all be resolved at the meeting of the Technical Committee in December. His delegation therefore favoured a continuation of the deliberations and would continue to participate in the revision process.

52. Mr. WOJCIK (Poland) noted that in document GC(XXXVII)/1077 it was recalled that the Agency's BSS should be based as far as possible on recommendations of the ICRP. The latter had published its latest recommendations in 1990, and he hoped that all those who were participating in the development of new BSS would ensure that the revised version was published before the end of 1994 - in other words, within four years of the publication of the ICRP's latest recommendations; otherwise the ICRP might publish new recommendations before the revision of the BSS on the basis of the 1990 recommendations had been completed.

53. Mr. EKECRANTZ (Sweden) said that Sweden shared the concerns expressed by other countries concerning the scope of the new standards, and particularly their extension to the safety of all types of radiation sources. There was a risk of unnecessary duplication, and in some cases of ambiguity in the interpretation of the safety standards developed by the Agency for large and complex radiation sources, such as nuclear power plants and large nuclear waste management and disposal facilities. In order to achieve acceptable safety levels with regard to those sources, more specific safety standards were needed than the general standards in the present BSS draft; there was a need for standards such as those issued by the Agency. In addition, as had been noted elsewhere, the appropriate Agency advisory groups would have to do more work in order that general agreement might be reached on the safety fundamentals for waste management. His delegation looked forward to the comments requested by INSAG on that issue.

54. The development of a unified standards document covering all radiation sources should not be an overriding objective. A limited set of fundamental standards documents, each tailored to the specific needs of major areas such as reactor safety, waste management and radiological protection, might address the relevant issues more effectively and might be easier to apply and therefore more attractive from the user's point of view. Sweden was convinced that the Secretariat would be able to ensure consistency among such documents.

55. Nevertheless, a number of radiological accidents occurring around the world had shown that safety in the handling of radiation sources in industry, research and medicine would in many cases benefit from a more widespread application of the relevant parts of the fundamental safety principles, such as the defence-in-depth principle developed for large nuclear facilities. It was therefore appropriate that the revised BSS cover the safety of radiation sources in industry, research and medicine, and that they be rapidly finalized.

56. Mr. WEBB (Division of Nuclear Safety) noted that the process of developing the BSS had already taken some time; initially, it had seemed reasonable to see the scope of the BSS in a broader perspective, particularly as they were to be based on ICRP recommendations, whose scope had been extended to include probabilistic events and events likely to cause an accident. However, it had become clear that, particularly given the development of the document on nuclear safety fundamentals, it would not be appropriate to include those aspects in the BSS. The Secretariat nevertheless felt that there was scope within the BSS (for reasons mentioned by several representatives) for coverage of some aspects of the safety of small radiation sources - particularly those used in industry. It might be useful to prepare a document on radiological safety fundamentals complementing the one on nuclear safety fundamentals. That would be a way of formulating the BSS in the manner indicated by a number of delegations during the discussion.

57. The Technical Committee, at its meeting in December 1993, should take due account not only of the many suggestions received by the Secretariat regarding the BSS, but also of the opinions expressed in the Board of Governors and at the present session of the General Conference. The Secretariat recognized the importance attached to the BSS and their implementation and would treat the matter as one of considerable urgency; accordingly, if a conclusion was not reached at the meeting of the Technical Committee in December, it would do everything in its power to ensure that one was reached soon after the meeting.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that the summary record of the discussion during the present meeting would provide a good basis for the future work of the Secretariat. He assumed that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference to take note of the report contained in document GC(XXXVII)/1077.

59. It was so agreed.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION GC(XXXVI)/RES/584: PROGRAMME FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN RADIATION PROTECTION AND NUCLEAR SAFETY (GC(XXXVII)/1067 and 1067/Corr.1)

60. Mr. MOHAN (India) said that over the years the Agency had done considerable work on education and training in radiation protection and nuclear safety; as a result, developing countries had built up considerable expertise in those areas. The time had now come for the Agency to take advantage of that expertise and to expand its programme of education and training in those areas by making greater use of the available experts in developing countries. That would be in line not only with the provisions of paragraph 2 of resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/584, but also with the objectives of technical co-operation among developing countries.

61. Mr. ORNSTEIN (Argentina) welcomed the development of a programme for education and training in accordance with guidelines established by the General Conference at the suggestion of a number of Member States, including Argentina. The postgraduate course held in Spanish in Buenos Aires for the past 12 years could continue on an interregional basis in 1994 and 1996, and at the regional level in the other years. The educational courses should as a matter of principle be given at the interregional level in order to ensure uniformity of the basic knowledge required for full benefit to be derived from specialized training courses. However, in view of the need for educational courses in as many languages as possible and in view of the current financial situation, it seemed reasonable to alternate the languages in which the interregional courses were given.

62. Mr. RAZAK (Indonesia) said that the implementation of resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/584 was extremely important for developing countries. A human resources development programme improving weak infrastructures and mitigating skilled manpower shortages would be particularly beneficial to them. Indonesia was very interested in the activities - including the education programme - to be started in 1994 and implemented at the regional level until 1998; it hoped that the programme would be reviewed every two years.

63. Mr. HELLAL (Algeria), recalling that his country had welcomed the programme for education and training in radiological protection and nuclear safety presented to the Board of Governors in June 1993, said that the document under consideration was also entirely satisfactory. The content of the proposed Standard Syllabus was of high quality, varied and comprehensive; he wondered, therefore, whether the proposed course duration of 18 weeks was sufficient for meeting all the stated objectives.

64. Algeria had been providing similar training at its Radiological Protection and Safety Centre since 1983; the training, offered in modular form over four semesters, was intended for graduates - particularly engineers - and led to a master's degree. With the experience, manpower, infrastructure and training facilities available to it, Algeria was therefore ready to host the regional course for Africa planned for 1996; he referred to paragraph 2 of resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/584 in support of that proposal.

65. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico) welcomed the programme for education and training proposed in the document under consideration. He attached particular importance to the Standard Syllabus developed for postgraduate courses in radiological protection, which seemed excellent. The teaching materials needed for implementation of the Standard Syllabus should be made available in all languages, including Spanish, as the programme would be a regional one which could be implemented in various Spanish-speaking countries.

66. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America) supported the implementation of international education and training programmes to strengthen national infrastructures related to radiation protection and nuclear safety. Such programmes were particularly welcome as the use of ionizing radiation in medicine and industry, agriculture and research was expanding and nuclear power was increasingly necessary. The United States was actively supporting the Agency's efforts to teach skills and strengthen education programmes in specialized areas. However, it believed that education and training in radiation protection and nuclear safety were primarily a national responsibility. In enhancing its programme, the Agency should avoid duplicating the general education opportunities traditionally provided by universities and other institutions in Member States. Similarly, in the interests of cost-

effectiveness the Agency should take advantage of existing courses in Member States through the fellowship programme and technical co-operation activities.

67. The United States supported a programme for education and training that was consistent with the conclusions reached in 1993 by the working group of the Advisory Committee on Training in Nuclear Power and Nuclear Safety. He would like the Director General to present the Board of Governors with a report on that programme after two years of operation; the report should include a breakdown of costs (indicating, for example, the cost per student of the courses held) and explain the selection policies applied. The Board of Governors could use the report in determining the future direction of the programme.

68. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece) said that courses for the education and training of physicists and medical doctors in the field of radiation protection were under preparation in his country, so that document GC(XXXVII)/1067 - and particularly the information it contained about the Standard Syllabus - was of great interest to his delegation. Greece was ready to co-operate with the Secretariat in carrying out activities described in the Director General's report and subscribed to regional co-operation as a means of assisting developing countries, in line with what was envisaged in resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/584.

69. Mr. RESHETNYAK (Ukraine) said that the Secretariat had done a great deal in education and training in radiation protection and nuclear safety and that the activities in question should continue. Ukraine was particularly grateful to the Agency for the assistance it had provided in that area, especially in 1993, and had noted the Agency's plans for the next few years with great interest as it was concerned to mitigate the consequences of the Chernobyl accident and to prevent further accidents. In that context, he believed that the training programme should be based primarily on national and regional needs.

70. In paragraph 23 of the document under consideration it was stated that the Secretariat would continue to take into account the identified needs and priorities of Member States; he hoped that the Secretariat would pay careful attention to the situation in his country and note Ukraine's special interest in all aspects of nuclear safety.

71. Mr. DICKSON (United Kingdom) welcomed the work undertaken by the Director General pursuant to resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/584 and supported the proposals

contained in the document under consideration. The Director General and the experts advising him had reached the conclusion that such action on the part of the Agency was particularly necessary in the field of medical research and in other areas where personnel were perhaps less conscious of the need for high standards of radiological protection than their counterparts in the nuclear industry. The proposed activities would help them to improve their working methods and their safety culture. To be of maximum benefit, the courses should have a high practical content. Several countries had offered their facilities: the institutions selected should have well-established contacts with industry in order to provide students with practical, hands-on training.

72. Mr. OMRAN (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the need for training in radiation protection and nuclear safety was growing from year to year, particularly in the developing countries, where the use of nuclear materials for peaceful purposes was constantly increasing. More than ever, those countries needed qualified technical staff who knew how to use such materials while respecting the criteria relating to nuclear safety. The Agency's training activities were remarkable, and he hoped that they would continue and be extended to more countries.

73. Mr. LIU (China) greatly appreciated the activities of the Agency with regard to training, and particularly its work on producing a Standard Syllabus, on the basis of which China had set up university courses for training in radiation protection and nuclear safety and also specialized courses or seminars and programmes of fellowships and scientific visits. All those activities were indispensable for helping Member States to train their experts in radiation protection. Basic education in that area was very expensive, however, and should be the responsibility of Member States. The basic education activities referred to in the document under consideration should therefore be gradually moved from the interregional level to the regional and then the national level, through the training of teachers, the provision of teaching materials and the establishment of educational facilities: Member States would thus be provided with the resources to set up their own educational structures. At the national level, it was also important to help decision-makers to enhance radiation protection and nuclear safety. Finally, China had already acquired some capacity for education and

training in radiation protection and nuclear safety and was ready to make its contribution to international and regional co-operation in that area.

74. Mr. PEREZ-MARTIN (Cuba), aware of the advantages of having a Standard Syllabus for training in radiation protection and nuclear safety in order to ensure uniform quality of the teaching provided, supported the proposal contained in the document under discussion. Cuba wished to place its facilities and experts at the disposal of the Agency for the organization of courses, workshops, seminars or other training activities.

75. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) said that his country was no longer able to benefit from the Agency's training programmes because technical assistance to Iraq had been discontinued, although such assistance had nothing to do with the implementation of Security Council resolution 687. Denying the Iraqis access to training courses with humanitarian and preventive aims in areas such as medicine and agriculture meant that they were being prevented from familiarizing themselves with problems and progress in those areas. He supported the steps taken to implement resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/584 and called on Member States to allow the Iraqis to benefit from the Agency's training programmes.

76. The CHAIRMAN assumed that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it take note of the information contained in document GC(XXXVII)/1067.

77. It was so agreed.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOLUTION GC(XXXVI)/RES/585: LIABILITY FOR NUCLEAR DAMAGE (GC(XXXVII)/1078)

78. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) said that the report of the Standing Committee on Liability for Nuclear Damage once again highlighted how difficult it was to reach agreement on such important issues as supplementary compensation and State liability. Italy had always held the view that the aim of the exercise, begun in 1987, should be the establishment of a comprehensive liability regime which would either replace the Vienna Convention or supplement it with a new instrument dealing specifically with State liability. The conservative approach of the Vienna Convention - elaborated 30 years previously at a time when experience of nuclear energy was very limited and when its development had to be

promoted through preferential treatment - was no longer valid. It was essential that the Convention be brought into line with modern concepts already embodied in other international instruments.

79. A supplementary compensation convention might improve - to some extent at least - the regime established by the Vienna Convention, but it was difficult to express a view on the matter until a final text was available. For that reason Italy was opposed to pursuing the revision of the Vienna Convention without the simultaneous elaboration of a convention on supplementary compensation. His country therefore endorsed what was envisaged in paragraph 5 of the document under consideration and urged the Standing Committee to continue its work on that basis. Finally, he hoped that the Standing Committee would refrain from setting a date for convening the diplomatic conference until agreement had been reached on all issues.

80. Mr. ORNSTEIN (Argentina) commended the progress made by the Standing Committee on Liability for Nuclear Damage with regard to various questions. He was concerned, however, about the unyielding positions taken by a few Member States on certain controversial matters and called on them to exercise greater flexibility. Revision of the Vienna Convention was undoubtedly closely linked with the elaboration of a convention on supplementary compensation, and it would be expedient to consider both issues at the same diplomatic conference. However, revision of the Vienna Convention should not be delayed unduly. He hoped therefore that a diplomatic conference would be convened in the near future - if possible to consider both issues but, if not, to deal with the revision of the Vienna Convention alone.

81. Mr. FITZGERALD (Ireland) said that for many years his country had been drawing attention to the limitations of the existing liability conventions; those limitations had prevented Ireland from acceding to them. The Standing Committee on Liability for Nuclear Damage had been trying to resolve the problems involved and bring the process of revising the Vienna Convention to a satisfactory conclusion. Ireland nevertheless considered that there was also a strong need to make provision for compensation measures, with recognition of some degree of State liability and with supplementary funding, since the liability of operators might not cover all the damage arising from an accident.

82. Ireland felt that the question of supplementary compensation should be considered in the process of revising the Vienna Convention and that such compensation should be a part of any future liability regime. Simultaneous consideration of those two issues should therefore continue without delay, as envisaged in paragraph 5 of the document under discussion and paragraph 14 of the report of the Standing Committee. He hoped that it would be possible to hold a single diplomatic conference on the two issues in 1994. That would be a way of building public confidence and ensuring the future of the nuclear industry.

83. Mr. DUFVA (Sweden) said his Government accorded high priority to the work of the Standing Committee and hoped that it would be completed soon so that a diplomatic conference could be held early in 1994. He reiterated Sweden's appeal to Member States which had not yet done so to become parties to the Vienna Convention and the Joint Protocol; several States with nuclear power plants and also their neighbouring States were still not parties to those instruments, and international efforts to upgrade the safety of reactors built to earlier standards would be facilitated by the accession of all States concerned.

84. Mr. ZEILEISSEN (Austria) said that, with regard to the ongoing negotiations on a new regime of liability for nuclear damage, the prospects were not particularly good. While it might be true that substantial progress had been made in the formulation of certain texts, on the main issue in the negotiations as far as Austria was concerned - namely improvement of the legal and material situation of the victims of transboundary effects of a nuclear accident - not much progress had been made. That issue was of special interest to countries which, although they had no major nuclear installations within their territories, faced the risk of damage from nearby nuclear installations. Under a civil law regime of nuclear liability like the system established by the Vienna and Paris Conventions, with only modest compensation provided for, only the most seriously affected victims would benefit and compensation would mostly go to nationals of the State in which the installation in question was sited. Thus, any nuclear liability regime covering transboundary damage and thereby ensuring compensation for victims in other countries should be based on the responsibility under public international law of the State where the installation in question was located or, within the framework of a civil law regime, include a supplementary funding

mechanism providing for an adequate amount. If - as they ought to be - the present negotiations were focused on the victims, progress should be made in one or the other direction. In his delegation's view, a supplementary funding mechanism established in that context could concentrate on compensation for transboundary damage arising from a nuclear accident.

85. Mr. TABET (Algeria) reaffirmed his delegation's position, which was that the fundamental issues still under discussion should be dealt with globally. That was not incompatible with the objective of completion of the Standing Committee's preparatory work as soon as possible and the subsequent convening of a diplomatic conference in 1994.

86. Ms. CZOCH (Hungary) recalled that her country had been the first Central and East European State which, in acceding to the Vienna Convention on Liability for Nuclear Damage in 1989 and signing the Joint Protocol relating to the application of the Vienna and Paris Conventions, had committed itself to nuclear liability in a legally binding manner. Although her delegation shared the view that, by adopting the texts of draft amendments to the Vienna Convention, the Standing Committee had made some progress, it felt that there was increasing political urgency about finalizing the work and convening a diplomatic conference for the revision of the Vienna Convention.

87. Her delegation realized that there was a close relationship between the Vienna Convention and the adoption of an international convention on supplementary compensation for nuclear damage. However, it had the feeling - a feeling which had been reinforced during the seventh session of the Standing Committee - that the continued lack of a consensus on an acceptable solution to the complex issues of a supplementary funding convention might lead to a further delay in the urgent matter of revising the Vienna Convention. The inability to reach agreement on the details of a nuclear liability regime commanding broad support had discouraged a number of the newly democratic States in Europe from acceding to existing agreements and conventions and had contributed to further delays in the necessary revision of national legislation in that regard.

88. Finally, her delegation would continue to support the efforts being made by the Standing Committee to find early solutions to outstanding issues so that a revision conference

on the Vienna Convention could be convened. In view of the great diversity of political, economic and humanitarian factors and objectives involved, her delegation advocated a more cautious, step-by-step approach towards a universal liability regime. At the same time, it was confident that the revised Vienna Convention - and accession to it by States now waiting for the revision to be completed - would provide additional impetus to the negotiations on a supplementary compensation convention.

89. Mr. WOJCIK (Poland) said that his delegation commended the Standing Committee on the substantial progress it had made in preparing the revision of the Vienna Convention. Also, it supported the position adopted by the Committee at its most recent meeting - namely, that the work on supplementary compensation should be vigorously pursued and that an integrated approach should be taken with a view to a single diplomatic conference to consider both the revision of the existing Convention and the system for supplementary compensation. The Standing Committee should also consider the question of international State liability and its relationship to the civil liability regime.

90. Mr. MULTONE (Switzerland) said that document GC(XXXVII)/1078 clearly showed the impasse which had existed too long in the field of liability for nuclear damage. Under the present circumstances, his delegation felt it would be best to settle for a revised Vienna Convention which, although imperfect, had the support of the countries with nuclear activities.

91. Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation), expressing his delegation's satisfaction with the results obtained at the last session of the Standing Committee, said that the Russian Federation intended to take a constructive part in the preparation of an international liability regime for damage arising from a nuclear accident and felt there was a need for a comprehensive regime including State liability. National legislation on nuclear energy was currently being drafted in the Russian Federation; it would take account of nuclear liability issues.

92. Mr. LABROSSE (France) said that his delegation approved of document GC(XXXVII)/1078 on the whole but felt that the estimate of the progress made in revising the Vienna Convention was rather optimistic: in fact, the texts drawn up had not commanded

full consensus; in addition, the financial limit of the operator's liability had not yet been determined. The latter point was vital since the amount in question would be a determining factor for countries thinking of acceding to the revised Vienna Convention, and it should serve as a reference level for a convention on supplementary funding.

93. With regard to supplementary financing, the various proposals reflected major differences of principle. It was therefore difficult at the present stage to foresee rapid progress towards a consensus. France, which had wanted the revision of the Vienna Convention to be considered separately from the supplementary funding regime, feared that the decision of the Standing Committee to continue simultaneous consideration of the two issues would ultimately slow down the work as a whole.

94. Mr. RESHETNYAK (Ukraine) said that his delegation, which supported the Agency's efforts in the field of nuclear liability, was taking an active part in the work being undertaken. Noting the progress which had been made by the Standing Committee, in particular with regard to revision of the Vienna Convention, he expressed agreement with all those who had spoken in favour of completing the work rapidly and of convening a diplomatic conference as soon as possible.

95. The CHAIRMAN, noting that there were no more speakers on the item, assumed that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it take note with appreciation of the information contained in document GC(XXXVII)/1078.

96. It was so agreed.

#### DRAFT RESOLUTION GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/124

97. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to draft resolution GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/124 submitted by the Republic of Korea on behalf of the Group of 77 under item 14 as a whole.

98. Mr. CHO (Republic of Korea), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that draft resolution GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/124, the aim of which was to encourage the Secretariat to intensify its efforts to promote international co-operation in the field of radioactive waste management, was a response to document GC(XXXVII)/INF/320, of which

the Group took note with satisfaction. The Group, which commended the work of the Secretariat in that field, felt it was vital to ensure safe waste management in the context of the implementation of nuclear power programmes and programmes relating to nuclear applications in all Member States.

99. He expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus and indicated that, at the end of operative paragraph 3, the words "under an agenda item entitled 'measures to resolve international radioactive waste management'" should be added.

100. Mr. HARBITZ (Norway) said that his country was extremely interested in establishing sound practices for the safe management and disposal of all categories of radioactive waste and that it was also actively engaged in international co-operation aimed at assessing the dumping of radioactive waste in the Arctic seas. For that reason he wished to propose several amendments to the text submitted by the Group of 77: he would like to add "and the dumping of radioactive waste in the Arctic seas" after "(RADWASS)" in preambular paragraph (b) and ", including assessing the impact of the dumping of wastes at sea" after "field" in operative paragraph 2. It also seemed more logical to him that the middle of preambular paragraph (c) should read as follows: "... of ensuring the planning and implementation of sound practices for the safe management ...". His delegation would be prepared to co-sponsor the draft resolution if those amendments were included.

101. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy), supported by Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation), recalled that the previous day, when the Committee had considered the draft programme and budget of the Agency, the Italian delegation had voiced the opinion that, in the interests of economy, the policy-making organs of the Agency should exercise restraint when requesting the preparation of documents by the Secretariat. The draft resolution under consideration was very useful in the sense that it focused attention on an important matter, but the matter was in any case being dealt with fairly exhaustively by the Secretariat. Draft principles on waste management already existed, and a number of working groups were considering the issue. Consequently, he wondered whether there was a real need for a separate draft resolution. It might be enough if the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole stressed in his report to the General Conference that the issue was a vital one and that the Secretariat should continue the important work it was already doing. Certainly, the Agency's annual

report should contain - as it already did - a number of paragraphs on work relating to radioactive waste, but perhaps a special note could be added to the effect that the work in question had been carried out in response to a proposal made in the General Conference.

102. Mr. CHO (Republic of Korea) said that the representative of Italy was right to emphasize that in a period of budgetary austerity it was perhaps best not to request the Secretariat to prepare too many additional documents. Nevertheless, the question of strengthening international co-operation in the field of waste management was extremely important, as the Director General himself had pointed that out in his statement to the General Conference.

103. The Group of 77 had examined the matter in depth. It had wanted to show its political will in encouraging the Secretariat to further intensify its efforts in the field of waste management. While respecting the point of view of the representatives of Italy and the Russian Federation, he hoped that the draft resolution under consideration would receive the support of the Committee and be adopted by consensus.

104. Mr. FITZGERALD (Ireland) said that, in view of the importance of the waste issue (particularly in the context of the continuation of work on the nuclear safety convention and its extension to waste management), his delegation supported initiatives aimed at encouraging the Secretariat's efforts in the waste management field. Consequently, it was prepared to support the draft resolution under consideration. He added that, if a decision were taken which would have the effect of increasing reprocessing activities in the vicinity of Ireland, the issue would become even more important for his country on account of the increase in the quantities of waste for disposal and the dumping which might result. It was therefore of paramount importance for his delegation that international co-operation in that vital area be as close as possible.

105. Mr. WOJCIK (Poland) recalled that, when the draft Agency budget for 1994 was being considered, Poland had expressed its support for the radioactive waste management programme and had indicated its satisfaction with the increased funds allocated to that programme compared with those originally foreseen. The Secretariat was now being encouraged to consider waste management as a high-priority programme. There did not

seem to be any disagreement on that point within the Committee of the Whole. He felt that a statement by the Chairman of the Committee to the General Conference would be more effective than a general draft resolution along the lines of that being proposed. In any case, all groups - including the Group of 77 - would have ample opportunity to express their views on the matter when the 1995-96 programme was being prepared.

106. Mr. NOGUERIA VIANA (Brazil) said that, while respecting the point of view of those who felt it would be preferable for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to make a statement on the issue of radioactive waste in his report to the General Conference, he felt that the draft resolution under consideration was a better vehicle for expressing the political will of the Group of 77.

107. Mr. FARAHAT (Egypt), supporting the representatives of the Republic of Korea and Brazil, said that the draft under consideration emphasized the importance attached to the radioactive waste issue in the Agency. With regard to the amendments proposed by Norway (the reasons for which he understood), he felt that, as interest in the issue was not limited to a single region, the draft should express the concerns of all Member States. It was his understanding that, while they would prefer the matter to be dealt with in the report of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to the General Conference, the representatives of Italy and the Russian Federation were not, as such, opposed to the adoption of a draft resolution.

108. Mr. DICKSON (United Kingdom) said he did not have any fixed preference for a report on the matter to the General Conference by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole or for a Committee recommendation regarding a draft resolution. In its present form the draft resolution under discussion presented no difficulties to the delegation of the United Kingdom.

109. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico), endorsing what had been said by the Republic of Korea on behalf of the Group of 77, reaffirmed that the draft resolution under discussion was of fundamental importance for the Group of 77. He shared Egypt's point of view and hoped that the draft would be adopted as submitted.

110. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) said that his country was certainly convinced of the great importance of radioactive waste management and appreciated the work being done by the Agency. He had noted that one of the changes made to the draft budget for 1994 had been to allocate additional funds to the waste management programme. Whether or not one decided to underline the political importance of the issue by adopting a draft resolution, the practical effects would be essentially the same. Recalling the numerous draft resolutions which had been adopted since 1987 on nuclear liability, he said that it had been clear from the report on that subject which the Committee had examined not long before just how much political impact those resolutions had had. The same was true of many other issues. Having said that, he fully endorsed the contents of the draft resolution. His only objection was that the procedure might entail expenditure on reports which were perhaps not really needed. Nevertheless, if the Group of 77 insisted on adoption of the draft he would have no objection so long as some amendments were made.

111. Mr. GIOVANSILY (France), endorsing the statements made by several other delegations and in particular that of the United Kingdom, said that the text as submitted presented no difficulty to France.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

