



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/OR.91

11 October 1993

GENERAL Distr.

Original: ENGLISH

THIRTY-SEVENTH (1993) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE NINETY-FIRST MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna
on Wednesday, 29 September 1993, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. POSTA (Hungary)

CONTENTS

Item of the
agenda*

Paragraphs

14	Measures to strengthen international co-operation in matters relating to nuclear safety and radiological protection (continued)	1 - 117
----	---	---------

[*] GC(XXXVII)/1085.

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

93-03817 (II)

Abbreviations used in this record

INWAC	International Radioactive Waste Management Advisory Committee
RADWASS	Radioactive Waste Safety Standards
WATRP	Waste Management Assessment and Technical Review Programme

MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN MATTERS RELATING TO NUCLEAR SAFETY AND RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION (continued) (GC(XXXVII)/INF/320, GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/124 and 130, GC(XXXVII)/1066)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, during the initial discussion on the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/124, entitled "Measures to resolve international radioactive waste management issues", the Norwegian delegation had proposed a number of amendments to preambular paragraph (b) and operative paragraph 2. The sponsors had also proposed the addition of a new phrase in operative paragraph 3.

2. He understood that, following consultations, agreement had been reached on amendments to operative paragraphs 2 and 3 alone. The new text of paragraph 2 would read

"Invites the Board of Governors and the Director General to maintain the emphasis given to radioactive waste management, especially with regard to RADWASS, and to consider what further measures should be taken to enhance international co-operation activities in this field, including assessing the impact of the land and sea dumping of wastes; and ..."

The new text of paragraph 3 would read

"Requests the Board of Governors and the Director General to report on the implementation of this resolution to the Conference at its thirty-eighth regular session under an agenda item entitled 'Measures to resolve international radioactive waste management issues'".

3. Mr. OKONKWO (Nigeria), expressing support for the draft resolution before the Committee, said that the Secretariat should be given every encouragement in implementing the Agency's radioactive waste management programmes.

4. Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America) said his delegation supported the draft resolution and agreed that additional emphasis should be placed on radioactive waste management activities. As to the proposed amendment to paragraph 3, he did not think it necessary to have a separate item on the agenda for the General Conference's session.

5. Mr. LIU (China), expressing appreciation of the Secretariat's efforts in the area of radioactive waste management, said that the safe management and disposal of radioactive waste was important for the development of nuclear power and nuclear technology. International co-operation and assistance in the management and disposal of

radioactive waste arising in the nuclear power, medical, industrial and research sectors was necessary in order to ensure that people and the environment were protected from the hazards associated with radioactive waste.

6. Thanking the Secretariat and INWAC for the progress made with the formulation of the radioactive waste safety standards, he said that those standards would be valuable as references for countries in formulating their own norms. The Secretariat had provided assistance to developing countries in radioactive waste management, and China welcomed that assistance.

7. The idea, referred to in Attachment 5 to document GC(XXXVII)/INF/320, of providing Member States which had radioactive waste management programmes in place with peer review services within the framework of WATRP was a good one, and he hoped the Secretariat would continue its efforts along those lines.

8. China had gained considerable experience in the field of radioactive waste management and would be pleased to make the expertise of its waste management specialists available to other Member States.

9. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) said that, like the representative of the United States, he did not think that a separate item should be added to the agenda for the General Conference's next session. He could go along with the draft resolution as it stood.

10. Mr. KOSTENKO (Ukraine) said that a few years before Ukraine had seen the issue of radioactive waste management transformed from a domestic one into a truly international one. That was why he welcomed the draft resolution's emphasis on the international aspects of radioactive waste management. On the basis of his own country's experience, he believed that the internationalization of radioactive waste management was more crucial now than ever before.

11. In recent years the Secretariat had been making major efforts relating to radioactive waste management programmes, and his country hoped those programmes would receive the necessary financial support.

12. His delegation thought the phrasing of paragraph 1 was entirely appropriate. Regarding the proposed amendment to paragraph 3, its position was flexible. There were established procedures whereby Member States could request the inclusion of items in the Conference's agenda, but, if most delegations wanted the Conference to decide already now to include a separate item on waste management in the agenda for its next session, his delegation would go along with that.

13. Mr. EKECRANTZ (Sweden) said his delegation shared the view of the United States representative concerning the proposed amendment to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. On the other hand, it could accept the proposed amendment to paragraph 2.

14. Mr. COOK (New Zealand) said his country was very concerned about radioactive waste, and particularly the dumping of such waste at sea. He therefore supported the proposed addition in paragraph 2 of a reference to the assessment of the impact of the land and sea dumping of wastes. Any such assessment must also take account of developments outside the Agency, and in particular the current process of amending the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter (London Convention 1972) in such a way as to prohibit the dumping of all nuclear waste at sea.

15. His delegation had an open mind regarding the proposed amendment to paragraph 3: the issue should certainly be discussed at the next session of the General Conference, but his delegation had no strong views as to whether that should happen under a separate agenda item.

16. Mr. ISASHIKI (Japan), expressing support for the initiative of the Group of 77, said that sound radioactive waste management was a prerequisite to the promotion of nuclear energy use. He welcomed the proposal to incorporate in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution a reference to marine dumping. Regarding the proposed amendment to paragraph 3, his delegation was flexible.

17. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria), welcoming the draft resolution, said that the proposed amendment to paragraph 2 was acceptable to his delegation. With regard to the proposed amendment to paragraph 3, his delegation was not normally in favour of adding

items to the agendas for future Conference sessions in the manner envisaged. In the present case, however, it did not think it was a bad idea to add an item on waste management to the agenda for the Conference's next session, with a view to enabling the Director General to report to the Conference on progress in elaborating a convention on safety in the field of radioactive waste management.

18. Mr. MANNINEN (Finland) said that, while his delegation could go along with the original wording of the draft resolution, he would have liked to see a reference to the International Arctic Seas Assessment Project and WATRP.

19. At the request of his Government, the Agency had reviewed the Finnish nuclear waste management programme within the context of WATRP. The excellent qualifications of the experts chosen by the Agency had been greatly appreciated in Finland. The review, carried out in August 1993, had covered the research and development programmes of both industry and the Government, with the main emphasis on spent fuel management.

20. The preliminary information provided by the review team had not pointed to any particular need to change the approach of the Finnish Government to its nuclear waste management programme. The results and proposals for improvement, to be incorporated in the final report, would be utilized in planning for future research and development. Finland believed it was especially valuable for countries approaching the implementation stage in the field of nuclear waste management to have a tool like WATRP. That was why he would have liked WATRP to be mentioned in the draft resolution.

21. Mr. PAPANIMITROPOULOS (Greece), welcoming the initiative taken by the Group of 77 in submitting the draft resolution, said that Greece attached great importance to radioactive waste management and to the internationalization of the issues involved. Greater Secretariat emphasis on those issues would be appreciated, although he had the impression that they were already receiving a fair amount of attention within the framework of the Agency.

22. His delegation liked the draft resolution with the proposed amendment to paragraph 2. It did not favour the proposed amendment to paragraph 3 however; before placing a separate

item on the agenda for the General Conference's next session, one should wait and see how the situation developed.

23. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) said he could join in a consensus against the proposed amendment to paragraph 3 as he saw no need for the inclusion of a separate item on radioactive waste management in the agenda for the General Conference's next session. Everyone agreed about the importance of radioactive waste management, and he was sure that the Secretariat would pay sufficient attention to it.

24. Mr. MOHAN (India) said he saw the point of those who were hesitating about the proposed amendment to paragraph 3. However, radioactive waste management was an important subject that ought to be specifically covered in the agenda. He therefore appealed to delegations to accept the proposed amendment.

25. Mr. TABET (Algeria) endorsed the draft resolution and the amendments proposed thereto.

26. Mr. FITZGERALD (Ireland) said his delegation liked the draft resolution in its original form and also the proposed amendments. In the proposed new paragraph 2, however, the phrase "the land and sea dumping of wastes" should perhaps be changed to read "the land and sea disposal of wastes"; it would then cover any means by which material was placed outside the control of an operator, thereby becoming no longer amenable to remedial action to prevent damage.

27. Expressing support for the proposed amendment to paragraph 3, he said that radioactive waste management merited very full discussion at future sessions of the General Conference.

28. Mr. McRAE (Canada) said his delegation endorsed the objectives of the draft resolution and welcomed the proposed amendment to paragraph 2. Regarding the proposed amendment to paragraph 3, his delegation was on balance in favour of it.

29. Mr. GOESELE (Germany), referring to his previous statement, said that his opposition to the proposed amendment to paragraph 3 did not mean that he considered

radioactive waste management to be unimportant; he simply did not think there was a need for a separate agenda item for every important question faced by the Agency.

30. Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil) said his delegation could be flexible about the proposed amendment to paragraph 3.

31. Mr. RUIZ (Spain) said his delegation supported the draft resolution and the proposed amendment to paragraph 2. Regarding the proposed amendment to paragraph 3, he agreed with what had just been said by the representative of Germany.

32. Mr. DICKSON (United Kingdom) said his delegation had some doubts as to whether there was a need for the inclusion, in the proposed amendment to paragraph 2, of the phrase "land and sea"; however, it would not press for the removal of those words.

33. With regard to the proposed amendment to paragraph 3, he thought it best not to place a separate item on the agenda for next year's session of the General Conference.

34. Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation) said his delegation was prepared to join the consensus that appeared to be emerging on the draft resolution, although it had some doubts about the proposed amendments to paragraphs 2 and 3.

35. Mr. HARBITZ (Norway) said his delegation strongly supported the proposed amendment to paragraph 2 with - as suggested by the representative of Ireland - the replacement of "dumping" by "disposal". Regarding paragraph 3, his delegation could accept either the original version or the proposed new one.

36. The CHAIRMAN said he assumed that the Committee could accept the preamble and paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

37. It was so agreed.

38. The CHAIRMAN said he also assumed that the Committee could accept the proposed amendment to paragraph 2 with the replacement of "dumping" by "disposal".

39. It was so agreed.

40. Mr. CHO (Republic of Korea) said that, having noted the reluctance of several delegations about including a separate item on radioactive waste management in the agenda

for the next General Conference session, his delegation wished to propose - as a compromise - that the topic be discussed under a separate sub-item of the agenda. That would still take account of the feeling of many delegations that there was a need to follow up on the Secretariat's response to the adopted resolution.

41. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) said he could agree to the compromise proposal put forward by the representative of the Republic of Korea.

42. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the last part of paragraph 3 be amended to read

"... regular session under an agenda item entitled 'Measures to strengthen international co-operation in matters relating to nuclear safety and radiological protection'."

43. Mr. CHO (Republic of Korea) suggested that it be amended to read

"... regular session under an agenda item entitled 'Measures to strengthen international co-operation in matters relating to nuclear safety and radiological protection' as a sub-item entitled 'Measures to resolve international radioactive waste management issues'."

44. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee could go along with that suggestion.

45. It was so agreed.

46. The CHAIRMAN assumed that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/124 as amended.

47. It was so agreed.

48. The CHAIRMAN, recalling that there had already been a general discussion under agenda sub-item 14(a)(iv), "The preparation of a nuclear safety convention", drew attention to the draft resolution on that subject in document (GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/130 and he invited the representative of Belgium to introduce it.

49. Mr. OUVRY (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the member countries of the European Community and a number of other interested countries, said that the new draft text

referred to in paragraph 12 of the Attachment to document GC(XXXVII)/1066 had only recently been distributed and that the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/130 was not in any way intended to prejudge the outcome of discussions at the October meeting of the Group of Experts, which was referred to in paragraph 13. The main aims of the resolution were to lend political impetus to the Group's proceedings and express support for the envisaged scope of the nuclear safety convention, for probable follow-up in the form of a waste convention and for work on other aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle.

50. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico), on a point of order, said it was his understanding that pursuant to Rule 63 of the Conference's Rules of Procedure draft resolutions could be considered by the Committee only if they had been submitted 24 hours in advance. He asked whether that was in fact the case and whether, if it was, the Committee should be considering the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/130, which had been distributed that day.

51. Mr. STURMS (Director of the Legal Division) pointed out that Rule 63 provided that as a general rule no proposal could be discussed unless its text had been distributed to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting. The first question that arose, however, was whether Rule 63 applied to the Committee. In that connection he pointed out that Rule 82 stated that procedures governing the conduct of business in committees should conform as far as was appropriate to the rules governing the conduct of business at plenary meetings. In the light of Rule 82, he considered that it was for the Committee itself to decide whether it wished to apply Rule 63 to its own procedures.

52. The CHAIRMAN asked whether it was the Committee's wish to discuss the draft resolution in document GC(XXXVII)/COM.5/130 immediately.

53. Mr. McRAE (Canada) said that, in his view, Rule 63 should be applied flexibly. There had already been a discussion on the substantive issues underlying the draft resolution, which should therefore contain no surprises for Committee members.

54. Mr. MOHAN (India) said his delegation would have liked more time to study the draft resolution and to consult on it. However, if most of those present wished to discuss it now, he would go along with the majority view.

55. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico) said he too could agree to the Committee's taking up the draft resolution at once if that was the wish of the majority. However, the sponsors of draft resolutions should try to comply with the Rules of Procedure.
56. The CHAIRMAN called for general comments on the draft resolution.
57. Mr. IONESCU (Romania) said his delegation fully supported the draft resolution.
58. Mr. CAMPUZANO PIÑA (Mexico), expressing support for the draft resolution, said he understood that the envisaged convention would be the first of a "family" of conventions, covering all aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle. His delegation considered that military nuclear facilities were also a cause for concern from the nuclear safety point of view, and he reserved the right to comment on that issue later.
59. The CHAIRMAN, assuming that the Committee could accept preambular paragraph (a), called for comments on preambular paragraph (b).
60. Mr. MOHAN (India) said that his delegation believed that technical co-operation in the field of nuclear safety was very important. He therefore proposed that in preambular paragraph (b) the phrase "strengthening international co-operation" be amended to read "strengthening international technical co-operation".
61. Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil) supported that proposal.
62. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) said that, while he did not underestimate the importance of technical co-operation in the field of nuclear safety, he believed the existing wording was preferable. To refer to "technical co-operation" would be to limit the scope of the international co-operation that the envisaged convention was intended to promote.
63. Mr. FITZGERALD (Ireland), Mr. GIOVANSILY (France) and Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) also preferred the existing wording.
64. Mr. MOHAN (India) said he could accept the existing wording provided that the importance of technical co-operation in the field of nuclear safety was reflected somewhere in the draft resolution as ultimately recommended by the Committee.

65. Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil) suggested that a phrase such as "including technical co-operation" be inserted after the phrase "strengthening international co-operation".

66. Mr. QUAIYUM (Bangladesh) considered it preferable to omit any reference to particular forms of co-operation, whether technical, political or legal, since such a reference was bound to have a limiting effect.

67. Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil) said that, following the example of the representative of India, who had withdrawn his proposal relating to preambular paragraph (b) on the understanding that the importance of technical co-operation in the field of nuclear safety would be reflected elsewhere in the draft resolution, he was willing to withdraw his suggestion on the same understanding.

68. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee accepted preambular paragraph (b) in its original form.

69. It was so agreed.

70. Mr. PEREZ-MARTIN (Cuba), referring to preambular paragraph (c) of the draft resolution, said that he was not aware of the existence of any national conventions and that the word "international" was therefore redundant.

71. Mr. OUVRY (Belgium) agreed with the representative of Cuba.

72. Mr. RAMTANI (Algeria), agreeing with the two previous speakers, said that it might be necessary to delete the adjective "international" in the draft resolution wherever it applied to "nuclear safety convention".

73. Mr. OKONKWO (Nigeria) suggested deleting the words "the aim of".

74. Mr. OUVRY (Belgium) said he had no objection to that suggestion.

75. Mr. EL NAMMI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) suggested that the phrase "as soon as possible" be replaced by the word "soon".

76. Mr. JAMEEL (Pakistan) questioned the appropriateness of the word "significant" in paragraph (c). In itself, the entry into force of a nuclear safety convention could hardly be regarded as a significant step towards improving nuclear safety worldwide.

Genuine improvement depended on greater access to nuclear safety technology and know-how.

77. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) said he would not like to see the word "significant" dropped: finalization of the envisaged convention would represent the culmination of many years' intensive efforts, and the convention's entry into force would be a major event in international law.

78. Mr. GROGAN (Ireland) said that, having participated in the meetings of the Group of Experts, he believed that the word "significant" should be retained.

79. Mr. MANNINEN (Finland), Mr. ORNSTEIN (Argentina) and Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) supported the views expressed by the representatives of Germany and Ireland in favour of retaining the word "significant".

80. The CHAIRMAN appealed to the representative of Pakistan to accept the retention of the word "significant" in paragraph (c).

81. Mr. JAMEEL (Pakistan) said that his intention had not been to disrupt an emerging consensus, but merely to point out that, in addition to the entry into force of a nuclear safety convention, various practical measures would be necessary for a genuine strengthening of nuclear safety.

82. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee accept the following wording of paragraph (c):

"Considering that a nuclear safety convention coming into operation soon and adhered to by the greatest number of countries would constitute a significant step towards improving nuclear safety worldwide, and ...".

83. It was so agreed.

84. Mr. MEDINA VAILLARD (Mexico) said that a more formal procedure should be adopted for the drafting of a convention on the safety of waste management than that followed in the drafting of a nuclear safety convention and that the replacement of the phrase "broad international agreement" in paragraph 4 by "consensus" might reflect the desired degree of formality.

85. Mr. RAMTANI (Algeria) suggested moving paragraph 4 to the end of the resolution in order to prevent confusion between the envisaged convention on nuclear safety and that on the safety of waste management.

86. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) said he would like the words "broad international agreement" to be retained since it might prove necessary to reach a legal understanding without there being a consensus.

87. As to the position of paragraph 4 within the resolution, the present order of the operational paragraphs was intentional, reflecting the importance attached by the Group of Experts to including all the stages of the nuclear fuel cycle in their logical order - the safety of nuclear power plants being followed by the safety of waste management.

88. Mr. GROGAN (Ireland), agreeing with the representative of Austria as regards the position of paragraph 4, pointed out that the words "other parts of the fuel cycle" in paragraph 5 would become meaningless if paragraph 4 was moved to the end of the resolution.

89. Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil), referring back to preambular paragraph (c), in which the word "international" had been deleted, suggested that the same amendment might be made in operative paragraph 4.

90. As to the suggestion of the representative of Algeria that paragraph 4 be moved, he considered that there ought to have been a separate draft resolution on waste management safety.

91. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece) said that paragraph 4 should be kept in its present position in order to reflect the high priority accorded by the Group of Experts to the subject of waste management safety.

92. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) supported the views expressed by the representatives of Austria, Ireland and Greece concerning the order of the operative paragraphs in the draft resolution.

93. Mr. RAMTANI (Algeria) said that, in suggesting that paragraph 4 be moved to the end of the resolution, he had not intended to belittle the importance of waste

management safety. His concern had been a purely legal one, relating to the interpretation of the resolution: in its present position, paragraph 4 might create confusion about the meaning of paragraph 7, which might be wrongly construed as referring to the envisaged convention on waste management safety. In the interests of consensus, he would not press his suggestion.

94. Mr. MEDINA VAILLARD (Mexico) said that he would not press his suggestion regarding the replacement of "broad international agreement" by "consensus". He wished it to be noted, however, that he considered the procedure adopted for the development of safety fundamentals to be inappropriate in the case of waste management safety, where a greater degree of formality was required.

95. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee accepted the wording of operative paragraph 4 with the deletion of "international".

96. It was so agreed.

97. Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil), recalling the discussion on preambular paragraph (b), suggested that the Indian representative's wish might be accommodated by adding the phrase "and bearing in mind the importance of technical co-operation in this context" at the end of paragraph 6.

98. Mr. OUVRY (Belgium) said that, in his opinion, it would be wrong to emphasize one or other of the many elements which delegations hoped to find in the envisaged convention. He recognized the importance of technical co-operation in the field of nuclear safety, however, and therefore felt that further consideration should be given to the possibility of mentioning technical co-operation in preambular paragraph (b).

99. Mr. MOHAN (India) recalled the suggestion, made by the representative of Brazil, that a phrase such as "including technical co-operation" be added at the end of that paragraph; he supported the suggestion.

100. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) said that he was very much in favour of emphasizing nuclear safety within the framework of the Agency's technical co-operation

activities and of bilateral co-operation. However, nuclear safety and technical co-operation were separate issues, and he did not think that they should be compounded.

101. Mr. GIOVANSILY (France), agreeing with the representative of Germany, said that the envisaged nuclear safety convention would be an instrument negotiated among States, whereas technical co-operation aimed at improving nuclear safety was a matter for the Agency.

102. Mr. MOHAN (India) said that, in his opinion, a reference to technical co-operation in the convention would not compound two issues which should be kept separate.

103. The CHAIRMAN asked for the views of other sponsors of the draft resolution regarding the suggestion of the Brazilian representative that the phrase "and bearing in mind the importance of technical co-operation in this context" be added at the end of paragraph 6.

104. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece), supported by Mr. GOESELE (Germany), said that the suggested addition implied a condition, which he would not be able to go along with. He sympathized with the views of the Indian representative, but felt that they should be accommodated in some other way.

105. Mr. MOHAN (India) said he would like to see a reference to technical co-operation in the resolution not in order that technical co-operation in the field of nuclear safety might be strengthened, but because he felt that such technical co-operation would greatly help in achieving the objects of the convention.

106. Mr. WOJCIK (Poland) said that, although he had not consulted any other sponsors of the draft resolution, he felt that the addition of a phrase such as "including technical co-operation" at the end of preambular paragraph (b) might after all be the best solution.

107. Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil) agreed with the representative of India as to the purpose of mentioning technical co-operation. He also agreed with the view just expressed by the representative of Poland.

108. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) said that the introduction of a reference to technical co-operation would narrow down the concept of "international co-operation" which was

generally understood to mean international co-operation in developing enhanced safety standards and in reaching the safety levels set by the existing standards.

109. Mr. ECHAVARRI (Spain) said that, like the representative of India, he felt that technical co-operation would greatly help in achieving the objectives of the convention. However, the convention would cover many forms of international co-operation none of which was mentioned in the draft resolution. Consequently, the draft resolution did not exclude the provision of technical co-operation where appropriate, and he would like paragraph (b) as already accepted by the Committee and paragraph 6 in its present form to be retained.

110. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee accept operative paragraph 6 as it stood, on the understanding that the technical co-operation issue would be handled in the context of preambular paragraph (b) once all the operative paragraphs had been dealt with.

111. Mr. GOESELE (Germany) said that he was very much in favour of accepting operative paragraph 6 as it stood, but without such a condition. The preambular problem must be solved first.

112. Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil), supported by Mr. MOHAN (India), said that it was not a matter of imposing conditions but of finding an appropriate place for a reference to technical co-operation.

113. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) said that, in his opinion, technical co-operation was one form of the "international co-operation" referred to in preambular paragraph (b) and that it should not be singled out for special mention.

114. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece), supported by Mr. GOESELE (Germany), suggested that a phrase on the lines of "within the framework of the Agency's technical co-operation programmes" be inserted after "co-operation" in preambular paragraph (b).

115. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria), opposing that suggestion, said that the insertion of such a phrase would simply distort the draft resolution. He favoured the inclusion of

references to technical assistance in any instrument where they fitted, but the purpose of the envisaged convention was to enhance the safety of nuclear power plants and waste management facilities throughout the world - not to achieve an expansion of technical assistance.

116. Mr. ELYSEU FILHO (Brazil), agreeing with the Austrian representative as to the purpose of the convention, said that technical co-operation should nevertheless be mentioned in order to help ensure that all parties to the convention would be able to achieve the desired higher safety levels. Otherwise the exercise would not be feasible.

117. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy), also agreeing with the representative of Austria as to the purpose of the convention, said that he nevertheless felt that the addition of a phrase like "also when appropriate through technical co-operation" at the end of preambular paragraph (b) would do no harm.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.