



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(41)/COM.5/OR.4
16 October 1997
GENERAL Distr.

Original: ENGLISH

FORTY-FIRST (1997) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna
on Wednesday, 1 October 1997, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. STRATFORD (United States of America)
Later: Mr. ŠTULLER (Czech Republic)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
20 Article VI of the Statute (continued)	1 - 45
22 International initiative for the Chernobyl sarcophagus (resumed)	46 - 49
14 Strengthening of the Agency's technical co-operation activities	50 - 55
16 Extensive use of isotope hydrology for water resources management (resumed)	56 - 60
17 Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system	61 - 92
18 Measures against illicit trafficking in nuclear materials and other radioactive sources	93 - 108
19 Personnel questions	109 - 129
(a) Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat	}
(b) Women in the Secretariat	
17 Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system (resumed)	130 - 131

[*] GC(41)/28.

Abbreviations used in this record

GS	General Service category (staff)
SSAC	State System of Accounting for and Control of Nuclear Material

ARTICLE VI OF THE STATUTE (continued)

(GC(41)/11 and Add.1-2, GC(41)/23, GC(41)/24, GC(41)/COM.5/12, GC(41)/COM.5/14, GC(41)/COM.5/15)

1. The CHAIRMAN, drawing the Committee's attention to the draft resolution in document GC(41)/COM.5/15 submitted by Brazil on behalf of the Group of 77, said that it replaced the draft resolution in document GC(41)/COM.5/14, which had been withdrawn.
2. Mr. EL FADHEL KHALIL (Tunisia), welcoming the unity and constructive spirit being displayed by the Group of 77, said that the Board expansion question and the regional group composition question were clearly distinct questions; the former had been referred to the previous year in resolution GC(40)/RES/20 and the latter in decision GC(40)/DEC/14. Furthermore, in paragraph 4 of its report contained in document GC(41)/23, the Board had stated that, while it was the view of the Chairman of the Open-ended Consultative Group that the Board expansion question, the regional group composition question and the designation criteria question were interrelated, the two latter questions were not within the purview of the Group's mandate.
3. While his delegation had nothing against addressing the regional group composition question as such, now was not the time to do it. In the memorandum contained in Appendix I.B to document GC(41)/11, the Chairman of the Board had said that Israel would undertake not to seek Board membership for four years after the "Chairman's package" took effect. Acceptance of the "Chairman's package" by two thirds of the Agency's Member States as foreseen in Article XVIII.C(ii) of the Statute would - if ever achieved - take at least four years, so that the Chairman of the Board had been referring to some time at least eight years ahead. By contrast, the Board expansion question could be solved immediately.
4. A further point to bear in mind was that membership of a regional group did not automatically mean a seat on the Board. In fact, 31 Member States had never been Board members.

5. While resolution of the regional group composition question seemed to be dependent upon the achievement of peace in the Middle East, much progress had been made regarding expansion of the Board. The Canadian proposal and the African Group proposal were very similar. For its part, the African Group was in favour of conciliation and consensus, not confrontation; although it would never accept the placing of all three questions on an equal footing, it would welcome further discussion with a view to arriving at a consensus based on equality, equity and balance.

6. Mr. BORCHARD (Germany) said that in his delegation's view the "Chairman's package", although not perfect, represented a reasonable way of simultaneously solving three interrelated questions.

7. As it was proving difficult to come to an agreement on a formula acceptable to all, his delegation welcomed the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia in document GC(41)/COM.5/12.

8. Mr. GARÓFALO LAYA (Venezuela) said that, as a member of the Group of 77, his country shared the concerns which had been expressed by the representatives of Tunisia, Sudan and India and by others who had spoken in support of the draft resolution submitted by Tunisia on behalf of the African Group in document GC(41)/COM.5/14.

9. Mr. MACKINNON (Canada) said, with regard to the Board expansion question, that his country - with its unquestioned commitment to the United Nations and to multilateralism in general - attached great importance to operational efficiency. Bigger was not better. Thus, Canada was in favour of the Board's being expanded by only one or - at most - two seats, which it believed should be designated seats.

10. Care should be taken when comparing the proposal for amending Article VI submitted by Canada and that submitted by Sudan on behalf of the African Group. Canada's proposal was an inseparable part of the "Chairman's package".

11. It was clear from the discussions in the Board of Governors and the Committee of the Whole that no consensus on the Article VI issue would be reached at the current

General Conference session. His delegation therefore favoured adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

12. Mr. AL-ERYANI (Yemen) said that linking of the Board expansion question with the regional group composition question and the designation criteria question in the “Chairman’s package” was not conducive to resolving the Article VI issue. The regional group composition question, which in his view could be settled only after lasting peace had been achieved in the Middle East, should be dealt with separately.

13. Mr. ZAIDE (Philippines) said that at present the non-designated members of the Far East Group had, on average, a chance of being on the Board one year out of every two or three. With the “Chairman’s package” and the Article VI amendment proposal submitted by Sudan on behalf of the African Group, it would be at best one year out of every four. Nevertheless, his delegation was going along with the Group of 77 consensus reflected in the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/15. At the same time, his country intended to continue exercising its right to protect its interests as regards membership of the Board.

14. Mr. ALLOTEY (Ghana) said that the Board expansion question should not be linked with other questions and welcomed the efforts being made to expand the Board and thereby ensure more equitable representation for areas such as Africa, the Middle East and South East Asia, and Latin America.

15. The under-representation of Africa would increase further as more African countries joined the Agency, and his delegation was therefore pleased that the Group of 77 was backing the amendment proposal submitted by Sudan on behalf of the African Group.

16. Mr. BERTONCELJ (Slovenia) expressed support for the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia and associated himself with those speakers who had drawn attention to the under-representation of the Eastern Europe Group in the Board.

17. Slovenia could support the “Chairman’s package”, which pointed the way to a well-balanced, lasting solution of the Article VI issue.

18. Ms. ALEMAYEHU (Ethiopia) said that expansion of the Board was necessary in order to end the acknowledged under-representation of Africa in the Board.

19. The efforts of the Chairman of the Board to address the Article VI issue had been highly commendable, but the “Chairman’s package” was not without drawbacks, and the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia appeared to be a retrograde step. Her delegation therefore welcomed the idea of a contact group meeting.

20. Mr. Chan Ho HA (Republic of Korea) said that more time was clearly needed in order to resolve the Article VI issue; that was very regrettable. His delegation, which had supported the “Chairman’s package”, was disappointed that one element - connected with the political situation in one part of the world - had prevented it from enjoying wider support and wondered whether that element should be retained in the “Chairman’s package”.

21. Ms. DORAN (Ireland) said that in her delegation’s view the “Chairman’s package” offered the best way of taking into account the different concerns of Member States. The present divergence of opinion, however, would clearly not allow a consensus to be achieved at the current General Conference session and her delegation therefore favoured adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

22. Mr. LISWANISO (Namibia), expressing concern about the under-representation of Africa in the Board, said that the Board expansion question should be dealt with on its own merits and not linked to other questions. Referring to the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/15, he thanked the Group of 77 for supporting the African standpoint.

23. Ms. MALLIOTIS (Cyprus), associating herself with the statement made at the previous meeting by the representative of Luxembourg on behalf of the European

Union, said that in her delegation's view the "Chairman's package" struck a very good balance. It was obvious, however, that further discussion was needed, and her delegation therefore favoured adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

24. Mr. YAMANAKA (Japan) said his country had long held the view that a small increase in the number of Board members was in order, but that the Board expansion question could not be resolved in isolation from related questions. It therefore supported the "Chairman's package".

25. Clearly, however, agreement was not going to be reached on a "finalized formula" at the Conference's current session, owing to the complex nature of the Article VI issue rather than to a lack of enthusiasm. His delegation therefore also favoured adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

26. Mr. KNYAZHNITSKY (Ukraine), expressing support for the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, said his delegation, which favoured an expansion of the Board in order to reflect recent fundamental changes in the world order, would like to see all regional groups fairly represented in the Board and - at the same time - due account taken of the specialized nature of the Agency.

27. The "Chairman's package" and the associated Canadian proposal for amending Article VI represented a step in the right direction, but a long-term solution of the Article VI issue could be achieved only through consensus.

28. Mr. PECSTEEN (Belgium), expressing support for the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, said that his country had on numerous occasions advocated a small increase in the Board's membership. The African Group proposal for amending Article VI did not, however, attract his delegation as it would not ensure an improvement in the representation of those countries with significant nuclear programmes which were currently under-represented in the Board. Neither would the Canadian proposal if it were adopted in isolation from the other elements of the "Chairman's package".

29. Ms. SABLJAKOVIĆ (Bosnia and Herzegovina), expressing support for the “Chairman’s package” and the associated Canadian proposal, said that in her view the Committee should recommend adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

30. Mr. BELLELLI (Italy) said that in his delegation’s view any increase in the Board’s membership should be small, so as not to have an adverse effect on the functioning of the Board, and balanced, so that all regional groups were fairly represented.

31. His delegation was also of the view that membership of the Board should be open to all Member States and that an equitable solution should therefore be found for the regional group composition question.

32. As no consensus on the Article VI issue appeared to be emerging at the Conference’s current session, the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia probably offered the best basis for pursuing the issue further. His delegation hoped that in the year to come a formula acceptable to all Member States would be worked out.

33. Mr. WANGURU (Kenya) urged the Committee to recommend adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Brazil on behalf of the Group of 77.

34. Mr. AGEV (Nigeria) said that his delegation, which continued to believe that Africa was under-represented in the Board, would like the Board expansion question to be solved without delay, which would be possible through adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Brazil on behalf of the Group of 77.

35. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece), expressing support for the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, said that over the past 40 years the Agency had, through its Board of Governors, resolved numerous problems relating to both the promotion and the security of nuclear energy. The structure of the Board, based on the areas listed in Article VI, had been designed to serve the needs of an organization with a very special role within the United Nations system.

36. Despite the positive experience of the past 40 years, however, his delegation recognized that there was now a need for an expansion of the Board. In its view, the “Chairman’s package” took proper account of the needs of under-represented countries and would therefore be the best basis for an expansion.

37. Mr. de OURO-PRETO (Brazil) said that in his delegation’s view the increase in Board membership envisaged in the proposal for amending Article VI submitted by Sudan on behalf of the African Group was perfectly compatible with continued efficiency in the deliberations of the Board. In addition, his delegation was of the view that decisions regarding the membership of regional groups should be left to the groups themselves.

38. Mr. TWAL (Jordan) said that the question of Board expansion was a serious one which had been the subject of extremely protracted negotiations. For that reason, his delegation had reservations about the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, which did not reflect the progress made so far regarding that question.

39. The draft resolution submitted by Brazil on behalf of the Group of 77 was more balanced and did reflect the progress which had been made.

40. Mr. RAJA ADNAN (Malaysia) said that his delegation was not opposed to any reasonable expansion of the Board that would put an end to under-representation of certain regional groups; nor was it opposed to the proposed designation criteria. However, it believed that decisions regarding the composition of regional groups should be left to the members of the individual groups.

41. Mr. MUTRU (Finland), expressing support for the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, said he hoped that the envisaged contact group would find a way to complete the work of the Committee under agenda item 20 without unduly long discussions.

42. Mr. CONSTANTIN (Romania), having associated himself with the statement made by the representative of Luxembourg on behalf of the European Union at the previous meeting, said that in his delegation's view the "Chairman's package", although not ideal, offered a good compromise solution and that his delegation favoured adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

43. Mr. HOBEICA (Lebanon) said that his delegation, which was in favour of an expansion of the Board, believed that the Board expansion question should not be linked to questions like that of the composition of regional groups. He hoped that the envisaged contact group would help the Committee to reach a consensus solution.

44. Mr. MAGNUSSON (Iceland), having expressed support for the "Chairman's package", said that more time was clearly needed in order to reach consensus on the Article VI issue and that he therefore favoured adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Australia, the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

45. The CHAIRMAN suggested that further consideration of the present item continue in the contact group.

INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVE FOR THE CHERNOBYL SARCOPHAGUS (resumed)
(GC(41)/COM.5/6)

46. The CHAIRMAN asked whether consultations had taken place on the proposal for amending preambular paragraph (d) made at the previous meeting by the representative of Luxembourg.

47. Mr. KAYSER (Luxembourg) said that they had and that the proposal had been accepted by the United States delegation.

48. The CHAIRMAN said he assumed that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/6 with the words "have committed" in preambular paragraph (d) replaced by "are committed to raise".

49. It was so agreed.

STRENGTHENING OF THE AGENCY'S TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES
(resumed)
(GC(41)/4, GC(41)/COM.5/3)

50. The CHAIRMAN invited Mr. Štuller, one of the Committee's Vice-Chairmen, to report on consultations which had taken place with regard to the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/3.

51. Mr. ŠTULLER (Czech Republic) said that, in the contact group meeting presided over by him in the morning and in subsequent consultations which he had held with a number of delegations, agreement had been reached on

- amending preambular paragraph (g) to read "... be assured, predictable and sufficient to meet the objectives mandated in Article II of the Statute";
- amending preambular paragraph (h) to read "... the need to maintain an appropriate balance between the promotional and other statutory activities of the Agency";
- amending operative paragraph 2 to read "... on Indicative Planning Figures (IPFs) which ... and requests the Board of Governors to initiate ..."; and
- amending operative paragraph 6 to read "Requests the Director General, in consultation with Member States, to identify regional centres of excellence so as to facilitate and enhance technical and scientific co-operation among developing countries, and further requests the Director General to report on progress achieved to the General Conference at its forty-second regular session".

52. Mr. MACINTOSH (Australia) said that his delegation, which had not been involved in the subsequent consultations, was unhappy about the wording of operative paragraph 6 just read out by the representative of the Czech Republic.

53. Mr. ŠTULLER (Czech Republic) apologized for not having included the Australian delegation in the subsequent consultations and said that he would be happy to discuss the matter further with that delegation.

54. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco), commending the efforts of the representative of the Czech Republic, said he could not understand why anyone should be unhappy about the agreed wording for operative paragraph 6.

55. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of the Czech Republic to consult further on that paragraph.

The meeting was suspended at 4.40 p.m. and resumed at 4.50 p.m.

Mr. Štuller (Czech Republic) took the Chair.

EXTENSIVE USE OF ISOTOPE HYDROLOGY FOR WATER RESOURCES
MANAGEMENT (resumed)
(GOV/2937-GC(41)/13 and GC (41)/COM.5/8)

56. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of India to introduce the draft resolution submitted by Brazil on behalf of the Group of 77 in document GC(41)/COM.5/8.

57. Mr. RAGHURAMAN (India), appealing to the Committee to recommend adoption of the draft resolution, pointed out that operative paragraph 5 envisaged a report by the Director General to the General Conference in 1999 - not 1998; that would allow more time for preparation of the report.

58. Mr. GASHUT (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) welcomed the progress reported in document GC(41)/13 and expressed the hope that the Committee would recommend adoption of the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/8.

59. The CHAIRMAN said he assumed that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it the adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/8.

60. It was so agreed.

STRENGTHENING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPROVING THE EFFICIENCY OF
THE SAFEGUARDS SYSTEM
(GC(41)/22 and GC(41)/COM.5/13)

61. Mr. KAYSER (Luxembourg), introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/13, said that in preambular paragraph (c) a reference to the Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone, which had entered into force at the beginning of 1997, should be added.

62. Mr. KASEMSARN (Thailand), Ms. MOSLEY (New Zealand), Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation), Mr. BERTONCELJ (Slovenia) and Mr. KNYAZHNITSKY (Ukraine) expressed support for the draft resolution with the addition mentioned by the representative of Luxembourg.

63. Mr. RAGHURAMAN (India) said his delegation was disappointed with the draft resolution, which did not fully reflect the views expressed during negotiation of the Model Protocol. He urged the inclusion of preambular paragraph (e) of resolution GC(40)/RES/16, which read:

“Stressing that the strengthening of the safeguards system should not entail any decrease in the resources available for technical assistance and co-operation and that it should be compatible with the Agency’s function of encouraging and assisting the development and practical application of atomic energy for peaceful uses and with adequate technology transfer”.

64. In addition, he urged that in operative paragraph 2 the word “comprehensive” be inserted before “safeguards agreements”; in operative paragraph 4 the words “and universally” be deleted and the word “respective” inserted before “international commitments”; the wording of operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 be brought into line with the wording of the Foreword to the Model Protocol; and operative paragraph 8 be amended to read “Requests all nuclear-weapon States and States parties to comprehensive safeguards agreements to sign ...”.

65. Mr. GASHUT (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that in his country’s view universal application of the strengthened safeguards system was absolutely essential. At the

same time, the implementation of Programme 93+2 Part 2 measures in many States would have to await the passing of necessary legislation.

66. Mr. JAMEEL (Pakistan) said that the purpose of Programme 93+2 had been to enhance the Agency's ability to detect undeclared nuclear activities and facilities in States with full-scope safeguards agreements, so that the resulting measures were not applicable to States with INFCIRC/66-type safeguards agreements. Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should therefore be amended through the insertion of "comprehensive" or "full-scope" before "safeguards agreements".

67. He took the point made by the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya regarding universal application of the strengthened safeguards system, but in his country's view the "universe" to which the system should be applied was those States which had concluded comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency. By the same token, his delegation would like to see operative paragraph 4 amended through the insertion of the word "concerned" before "States".

68. Finally, operative paragraph 7 should be deleted since the "other States" to which it referred were presumably States with INFCIRC/66-type agreements, to which the strengthened safeguards system was not applicable.

69. Mr. TOWLER (United Kingdom) said that the nuclear-weapon States had together agreed that they could make a contribution to the aims and objectives of Programme 93+2; his delegation hoped that States with INFCIRC/66-type agreements would re-examine their positions in the light of that fact.

70. The representative of India was right in indicating that the wording of operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 should be brought into line with that of the Foreword to the Model Protocol.

71. As to operative paragraph 8, which followed logically from the three previous paragraphs, his delegation would like it to be kept as it stood because there were

contributions which all States and other parties to safeguards agreements with the Agency could make to the aims and objectives of Programme 93+2.

72. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece), referring to the comments made by the representatives of India and Pakistan, said that the discussions in the Committee on Strengthening the Effectiveness and Improving the Efficiency of the Safeguards System (Committee 24) had resulted in a compromise protocol; in his view, those discussions should not be reopened. The desirability of the strengthened safeguards system's being applied universally had been accepted by almost all States.

73. Mr. BOSKEN (United States of America) said that it had been emphasized during the Committee 24 discussions that there were actions which all States could take to strengthen the effectiveness and improve the efficiency of Agency safeguards as applied in furtherance of existing political commitments. His delegation hoped that States which did not have comprehensive safeguards agreements with the Agency would agree, for example, to provide to the Agency information on their nuclear co-operation with States which did have such agreements.

74. Mr. SABURIDO (Cuba), having commended the Secretariat's efforts leading up to the adoption of the Model Protocol, said that in his delegation's view there was no legal justification for trying to induce countries with INFCIRC/66-type safeguards agreements to accept Programme 93+2 measures. There were many diverse reasons why countries with INFCIRC/66-type agreements should exercise their sovereign right not to accept such measures. He accordingly agreed with the observations regarding that point just made by the representative of India.

75. Mr. PECSTEEN (Belgium) said he believed that all Member States subscribed, in the light of their national circumstances, to the goal of strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards measures. If there were delegations having difficulties with operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, perhaps the insertion of the word "respective" before "international commitments" - as called for by the representative of India - would help.

76. Mr. ARAR (Turkey) said that his country hoped that all the nuclear-weapon States and all States with INFCIRC/66-type safeguards agreements would contribute to “the non-proliferation and efficiency aims of the Protocol”.

77. Mr. LI Yesha (China) said that his country was rigorously discharging its international responsibilities as an NPT party. It did not advocate nuclear weapons proliferation and did not help other countries to develop nuclear weapons.

78. As regards its nuclear exports, China imposed rigorous controls, and on 11 September it had promulgated control regulations designed to increase the transparency of its nuclear export procedures.

79. China had been a consistent supporter of Programme 93+2, and at the special session of the Board of Governors in May it had indicated those measures provided for in the Model Protocol which it would be prepared to adopt in the light of its obligations under Article I of the NPT. It was still committed to concluding the necessary legally binding agreement with the Agency.

80. As regards the draft resolution before the Committee, his delegation could support it with the insertion of a reference to the Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zone.

81. Ms. LETTS (Australia) said that in her view the insertion of the word “respective” in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution would be helpful.

82. As regards another change called for by the representative of India, her delegation could go along with the inclusion in the draft resolution of preambular paragraph (e) of resolution GC(40)/RES/16.

83. Mr. CASTERTON (Canada), having endorsed the suggestion made by the representative of Belgium with regard to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, said that his country would like to see all States accepting Programme 93+2 Part 1 and Part 2 measures in the interests of strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards.

84. Ms. GALLINI (United States of America) said that her country's written statement regarding the agenda item under consideration was very long and suggested that, rather than reading it out, she simply hand it to the Secretariat for inclusion in the summary record.

85. Mr. AYATOLLAHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) asked whether that was legally permissible.

86. Ms. ROCKWOOD (Legal Division) said that the Conference's Rules of Procedure were silent on the point at issue, on which the Committee itself would have to take a decision.

87. Ms. GALLINI (United States of America) said that she was perfectly willing to read out her country's written statement.

88. Mr. AYATOLLAHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that in his view it was likely that a contact group would meet to examine the suggestions made for amending the draft resolution before the Committee. Perhaps the United States representative could present the main points in her country's written statement at the contact group meeting.

89. Mr. BOUZOUITA (Tunisia), expressing strong support for the draft resolution, said that his country would like to see the safeguards system resulting from Programme 93+2 applied both in countries with comprehensive safeguards agreements and in countries with INFCIRC/66-type safeguards agreements.

90. As a signatory of the Treaty establishing the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone, Tunisia hoped that there would be a mass conclusion of additional protocols based on the Model Protocol.

91. Mr. TAKAOKA (Japan), referring to the statements made by the representatives of India and Pakistan, said that his country attached great importance to the principle of universality and hoped that the strengthened safeguards system would be applied universally - and with maximum efficiency.

92. The CHAIRMAN requested the representatives of Belgium, Luxembourg, India and Pakistan and other interested countries to consult together and try to come up with a compromise version of the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/13. He also requested the representative of Belgium to report to the Committee in due course on the consultations.

The meeting was adjourned at 6.10 p.m. and resumed at 6.15 p.m.

MEASURES AGAINST ILLICIT TRAFFICKING IN NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND OTHER RADIOACTIVE SOURCES
(GC(41)/21 and Add.1, GC(41)/COM.5/7)

93. Mr. BENINSON (Argentina), commenting on the report attached to document GC(41)/21, commended the Secretariat for its recognition of the fact that States had the prime responsibility for preventing and responding to incidents of illicit trafficking in nuclear materials and other radioactive sources.

94. Argentina considered it important to distinguish between radioactive sources on one hand and nuclear materials, particularly special fissionable materials, on the other. Accordingly, his delegation welcomed the fact that the structure of the report broadly reflected that distinction.

95. His delegation was pleased with the work which the Secretariat had done in preparing manuals and guides in the context of efforts to strengthen regulatory infrastructures - and particularly licensing, registration, notification and inspection systems.

96. Argentina believed that SSACs, backed by suitable physical protection measures, offered the best means of preventing the unauthorized removal and utilization of nuclear materials. As to radioactive sources, the most appropriate tool for preventing illicit trafficking was a satisfactory system of licensing, registration, notification and inspection.

97. For some time, Argentina had been taking practical steps to strengthen the capacity of its border posts for detecting radioactive materials. Close co-operation between the nuclear regulatory authority and the customs and security services had led to significant progress in the use of passive detection and active interrogation procedures. The training

of customs and security personnel was very important in that context, and Argentina intended to build on its successful experience at the national level by holding - in collaboration with Interpol - an international course on the prevention of illicit trafficking in the first quarter of 1998.

98. Referring to paragraph 29 of the report, he said that in his delegation's opinion a review of document INFCIRC/225/Rev.3 during 1998 would be useful.

99. Mr. RAGHURAMAN (India) said that his country fully recognized the importance of measures against illicit trafficking both in nuclear materials and in other radioactive sources and that the Secretariat was to be commended for its efforts to combat it.

100. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria), having commended the Secretariat on its role in co-ordinating the efforts of Member States to combat illicit trafficking, said that his Government had recently launched, in co-operation with the Austrian Research Centre at Seibersdorf, a pilot study to test border monitoring systems. On completion of the study, the results would be made available to the Agency as an in-kind contribution with a value of some US \$200 000.

101. Mr. TAKAOKA (Japan), referring to preambular paragraph (c) of the draft resolution before the Committee, pointed out that the word "Prevention" should read "Preventing" and proposed the insertion of the word "implement" after "their commitment to".

102. Mr. GERSTLER (Germany), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution before the Committee, agreed that "Prevention" should read "Preventing" in preambular paragraph (c) and said that the insertion of the word "implement" as proposed by the representative of Japan was acceptable.

103. Ms. GALLINI (United States of America) said that the United States, which placed great importance on dealing effectively with illicit trafficking, would continue to support the Agency's activities in that connection.

104. Mr. POSTA (Hungary) said that his country, which also placed great importance on dealing effectively with illicit trafficking, appreciated the Agency's efforts in that connection. It would continue to participate in the Secretariat's database programme.

105. Mr. ARAR (Turkey) said that in his delegation's view the recommendations contained in document INFCIRC/225/Rev.3 ("The Physical Protection of Nuclear Material") and the provisions of the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material needed to be supplemented by international legal instruments of a binding nature specifically related to the problems of illicit trafficking.

106. Mr. HREHOR (Czech Republic), thanking the Secretariat for its activities directed against illicit trafficking, said that his country would continue to support them.

107. The CHAIRMAN said he assumed that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/7 with preambular paragraph (c) reading "... their commitment to implement the "Programme for Preventing and Combating Illicit Trafficking in Nuclear Materials".

108. It was so agreed.

PERSONNEL QUESTIONS

(a) **STAFFING OF THE AGENCY'S SECRETARIAT**
(GOV/2943-GC(41)/18, GC(41)/COM.5/5)

(b) **WOMEN IN THE SECRETARIAT**
(GOV/2944-GC(41)/19, GC(41)/COM.5/11)

109. Mr. ABI-SAD (Brazil), introducing the draft resolution on "Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat" contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/5, said that the Group of 77 believed that more nationals of developing countries should be recruited to serve in the Secretariat, particularly at the Professional and executive levels.

110. Ms. CLIFF (United Kingdom) proposed that in preambular paragraph (d) of the draft resolution the word “selected” be replaced by “considered” and that in operative paragraph 2 the word “suitably” be replaced by “well”.

111. Mr. CASTERTON (Canada), having endorsed the United Kingdom representative’s proposal regarding preambular paragraph (d), suggested that in operative paragraph 2 the phrase “to continue nominating their suitably qualified candidates for vacant positions” be amended to read “to continue encouraging well qualified candidates to apply for vacant positions”.

112. Mr. TAHER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that as regards staffing of the Agency’s Secretariat there were three categories of Member States: those which were over-represented in the Secretariat; those which were adequately represented; and those which were under-represented or not represented at all. Most developing Member States fell into the third category, and the Secretariat’s recruitment policies should be adjusted so as to rectify that situation.

113. Mr. HREHOR (Czech Republic) expressed support for the amendment to preambular paragraph (d) of the draft resolution proposed by the United Kingdom representative and the amendment to operative paragraph 2 proposed by the representative of Canada.

114. Mr. PAPADIMITROPOULOS (Greece) asked why operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution envisaged biennial - rather than annual - reporting by the Director General.

115. Mr. GOETHEL (Director, Division of Personnel) recalled that the Board of Governors had the previous week agreed that the Secretariat should in future report on the staffing situation (“Staffing of the Agency’s Secretariat” and “Women in the Secretariat”) only every two years.

116. Mr. ABI-SAD (Brazil) said that the Group of 77 could go along with the amendment proposal regarding operative paragraph 2 made by the representative of Canada

but not with the proposed replacement of “selected” by “considered” in preambular paragraph (d).

117. Ms. LETTS (Australia) suggested that preambular paragraph (d) be amended to read “considered and selected”.

118. Mr. ARAR (Turkey), Mr. ABI-SAD (Brazil) and Ms. CLIFF (United Kingdom) supported use of the phrase “considered and selected”.

119. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/5 with the replacement of “selected” by “considered and selected” in preambular paragraph (d) and the rewording of operative paragraph 2 to read “... to continue encouraging well qualified candidates to apply for vacant positions ...”.

120. It was so agreed.

121. The CHAIRMAN, inviting the Committee to take up agenda sub-item (b), “Women in the Secretariat”, said that in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/11 “biannually” should read “biennially”.

122. Mr. ARAR (Turkey), introducing the draft resolution, said that despite the Secretariat’s efforts, the percentage representation of women in the Professional and higher categories had increased from 18% to only 18.6% between 1 August 1996 and 1 August 1997 and their representation in scientific and technical areas was - at 10.6% - extremely low. In contrast, women accounted for 62.8% of the Agency’s GS staff.

123. There might be difficulties in recruiting women nuclear engineers and safeguards inspectors, but it should be possible to recruit more women from the research, technical co-operation and administrative sectors.

124. Mr. KEMPEL (Austria) said that Member States should do more to encourage well qualified females to apply for Agency positions.

125. Mr. CASTERTON (Canada), endorsing the comment made by the representative of Austria, commended the Secretariat's efforts to increase the number of well qualified female staff members from both developed and developing countries.

126. Ms. TOLLE (Kenya) expressed appreciation for the Secretariat's efforts to increase the number of women in senior Agency positions.

127. Mr. ABI-SAD (Brazil) expressed strong support for the draft resolution before the Committee.

128. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/11 with the word "biannually" corrected to read "biennially".

129. It was so agreed.

STRENGTHENING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPROVING THE EFFICIENCY OF THE SAFEGUARDS SYSTEM (resumed)
(GC(41)/22 and GC(41)/COM.5/13)

130. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Belgium to report on consultations regarding the draft resolution contained in document GC(41)/COM.5/13.

131. Mr. PECSTEEN (Belgium) said that, although agreement appeared to be in sight, some delegations needed to obtain instructions from their capitals. He hoped to be able to present a positive report to the Committee at its next meeting.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.

