



GC

GC(45)/COM.5/OR.3  
November 2001

International Atomic Energy Agency  
**GENERAL CONFERENCE**

GENERAL Distr.  
Original: ENGLISH

---

**FORTY-FIFTH (2001) REGULAR SESSION**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

RECORD OF THE THIRD MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna  
on Wednesday, 19 September 2001, at 10.00 a.m.

Chairperson: Ms. HERNES (Norway)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
17	Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications (continued)	1 - 24
-	Draft resolution entitled "Agency activities in the development of innovative nuclear technology" (continued)	1 - 24
16	Strengthening of the Agency's technical co-operation activities (resumed)	25 - 70

---

[\*] GC(45)/28.

---

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(45)/INF/17/Rev.2.

For reasons of economy, this document has been printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their own copies of documents to meetings.

Abbreviations used in this record

INPRO	International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles
TCF	Technical Co-operation Fund

STRENGTHENING THE AGENCY'S ACTIVITIES RELATED TO NUCLEAR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND APPLICATIONS (continued)

- Draft resolution entitled "AGENCY ACTIVITIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF INNOVATIVE NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY" (continued)  
(GC(45)/COM.5/L.8)

1. The CHAIRPERSON recalled that, at the end of the previous meeting, the representative of India, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, had proposed that preambular paragraph (c) of the draft resolution in document GC(45)/COM.5/L.8 be amended to read "Recalling its resolutions GC(44)/RES/21 and GC(44)/RES/22 and inviting all interested Member States to combine their efforts under the aegis of the Agency in considering the issues of the nuclear fuel cycle, in particular by examining innovative, safe, economically competitive and proliferation-resistant nuclear technology for sustainable development".
2. The representatives of BULGARIA and TURKEY expressed strong support for the draft resolution and the proposal for amending preambular paragraph (c).
3. The representative of GERMANY, having said that his delegation could go along with that proposal, suggested that in preambular paragraph (d) the words "a number of" be inserted after "the progress achieved in", in preambular paragraph (e) the word "importance" be replaced by "progress", in operative paragraph 4 the word "interested" be inserted before "Member States" and in operative paragraph 5 the words "to take further measures, within available extrabudgetary resources," be deleted.
4. The representative of SWITZERLAND, endorsing the suggestions made by the representative of Germany, said that his delegation attached particular importance to operative paragraph 3.
5. The representative of CANADA suggested the addition of the words "and their fuel cycles" after "innovative reactors" at the end of operative paragraph 2 and the replacement of "technical expertise" by "technical and other relevant experts" at the end of operative paragraph 4.
6. The representative of SWEDEN, having endorsed the suggestions made by the representatives of Germany and Canada, proposed replacing "safeguardability questions" by "safeguards and safety questions" in operative paragraph 2.
7. The representative of AUSTRALIA, having also endorsed the suggestions made by the representatives of Germany and Canada, suggested that in operative paragraph 2 "safeguardability questions" be replaced by "safeguards, safety and environmental questions".
8. The representative of AUSTRIA, having endorsed the suggestions made by the representatives of Germany and Australia, said that the phrase "within available

extrabudgetary resources” in operative paragraph 5 was a rather unusual one - the usual phrase was “within available resources”.

9. The DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL FOR MANAGEMENT said that, if the word “extrabudgetary” were deleted, the resulting phrase would be the one which the Secretariat would like to see replaced by “subject to the availability of resources” in a number of draft resolutions. The Secretariat had no problems with the formulation “within available extrabudgetary resources”.

10. The representative of the PHILIPPINES, supported by the representatives of AUSTRALIA and FRANCE, said that he was in favour of retaining the words “within available extrabudgetary resources” since INPRO had thus far been funded by extrabudgetary contributions.

11. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that his delegation, which had no problems with the draft resolution or with most of the amendments suggested, could go along either with the phrase “within available extrabudgetary resources” or with a phrase on the lines of “subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources”.

12. The representative of INDIA said that there seemed to be broad endorsement of the draft resolution, which would suggest that many Member States attached great importance to the development of innovative reactors. That being so, his delegation would like to see at least some funding for INPRO being provided from the Regular Budget.

13. The representative of the PHILIPPINES said that, given the current strain on the Regular Budget, he would still prefer the words “within available extrabudgetary resources” to be retained.

14. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, having commended the draft resolution, said that his delegation likewise favoured retaining those words.

15. The representative of INDIA expressed the hope that at the General Conference’s next session the Committee would consider the possibility of funding INPRO from the Regular Budget.

16. The representative of AUSTRIA said that he could not go along with the proposed addition of the words “for sustainable development” at the end of preambular paragraph (c).

17. The representative of IRELAND said that, since his Government was not in favour of promoting an expansion of nuclear power generation, he had some difficulty with the phrase “Commends the Director General and the Secretariat for the efforts undertaken to develop the activities in these areas ...” in operative paragraph 1. He suggested that “Commends” be replaced by “Notes”.

18. The representative of INDIA appealed to the representative of Austria to reconsider his position.

19. The representative of AUSTRIA regretted that it would not be possible to compromise on the issue given the firm conviction of all of Austria's political parties - supported by the majority of the general public - that nuclear power did not contribute to sustainable development. He requested time to consult with the relevant Austrian authorities.
20. The representative of DENMARK said her position was similar to that of the Austrian representative.
21. The representative of IRELAND said that he too had concerns regarding preambular paragraph (c) and also would like to consult with his national authorities.
22. The representative of INDIA urged the representatives of Austria, Denmark and Ireland to show flexibility.
23. The CHAIRPERSON suggested that the Committee defer further consideration of the draft resolution to allow the representatives of Austria, Denmark and Ireland to consult with their national authorities on the subject of preambular paragraph (c).
24. It was so agreed.

STRENGTHENING OF THE AGENCY'S TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES  
(resumed)  
(GC(45)/INF/4, GC(45)/COM.5/L.7)

25. The representative of EGYPT, introducing the draft resolution in document GC(45)/COM.5/L.7 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it had been drafted along the lines of resolution GC(44)/RES/18; the only new elements were references to the reduction of greenhouse gas and other pollutant gas emissions.
26. The representative of FRANCE, referring to the second part of preambular paragraph (f), questioned the appropriateness of the reference to "electron beam (EB) technology for other pollutant gas emissions".
27. The representative of SWEDEN suggested the deletion of the second part of preambular paragraph (f), starting with "and recognizing ...", and said that, with the deletion of the reference to "electron beam (EB) technology for other pollutant gas emissions" in that paragraph, it would be logical to delete "and, similarly, EB technology for other pollutant gas emissions" in operative paragraph 7. Also, he proposed that in operative paragraph 7 "essential inputs" be replaced by "factual input".
28. The representative of GERMANY, supported by the representatives of AUSTRIA, DENMARK and IRELAND, suggested that in preambular paragraph (f) the phrase "in a number of countries" be moved to before "including climate protection" and the words "important contribution" be amended to read "potential contribution".
29. The representative of INDIA requested the Secretariat to give figures for the "contribution of nuclear energy in reducing greenhouse gases".

30. The DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL FOR MANAGEMENT said it was generally accepted that about 17% of the world's electricity was currently being generated by nuclear power reactors and that, if all nuclear power reactors were replaced by fossil-fuelled or hydro power plants, the emission of greenhouse gases would increase by approximately 8%.

31. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, having expressed strong support for the draft resolution, said that her delegation could go along with changes to preambular paragraph (f) suggested by the representative of Germany.

32. The representative of ECUADOR suggested that the word "important" before "contribution" in preambular paragraph (f) simply be deleted - not replaced by "potential".

33. The representative of GERMANY said that his delegation could go along with that suggestion.

34. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, referring to preambular paragraph (o), sought clarification of what was meant by "national nuclear entities" and asked in what sense they were "major clients and beneficiaries of technical co-operation programmes".

35. The representative of MALAYSIA explained that the words "national nuclear entities" had been used in order to cover not only nuclear research institutes but also institutions such as hospitals. It was "national nuclear entities" in that sense which were responsible in Member States for technical co-operation with the Agency.

36. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA proposed the deletion of "including the provision of sufficient resources" in preambular paragraph (m), since the question of resources was already covered in preambular paragraph (h).

37. Regarding preambular paragraph (o), he said - with support from the representative of AUSTRALIA - that the ultimate recipients of Agency technical assistance were not only national nuclear entities, but also ministries of agriculture, health and the environment.

38. The representative of AUSTRIA said that his country looked forward to a gradual phasing-out of nuclear power generation and that, consequently, in his delegation's view neither the deletion of "important" in preambular paragraph (f) nor its replacement by "potential" was appropriate.

39. The representative of EGYPT, supported by the representative of the PHILIPPINES, said that he would prefer the words "including the provision of sufficient resources" in preambular paragraph (m) to be retained.

40. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that he would like to see at least the word "sufficient" deleted.

41. The CHAIRPERSON suggested that in preambular paragraph (o) the words "relevant national institutions" be substituted for "national nuclear entities".

42. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that he would prefer to reserve judgement on that suggestion until the Committee came to deal with operative paragraph 10.
43. The representative of the NETHERLANDS, referring to preambular paragraph (j), said that the phrase “an appropriate balance between the promotional activities and other statutory activities of the Agency” was meaningless since there was no general agreement among Member States as to what the “appropriate balance” should be.
44. He proposed that preambular paragraph (j) be replaced by a preambular paragraph reading “Emphasizing the importance of the promotional activities of the Agency, the financing of which should be guaranteed by, inter alia, results-based budgeting, flexibility between budgets and the appropriate use of the Regular Budget in managing and supporting those activities”.
45. The DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL FOR MANAGEMENT, referring to the phrase “flexibility between budgets” in the text proposed by the representative of the Netherlands, said that the Secretariat had the authority to move money within individual appropriation sections of the Regular Budget but not from one appropriation section to another; for that, the approval of the Board was required. Also, it had the authority to carry money over from the budget for the first year in a biennium to that for the second year. It did not have any authority to transfer money from the Regular Budget to the Technical Co-operation Fund.
46. The CHAIRPERSON, noting that there was not yet consensus on the preambular part of the draft resolution, invited comments on the operative part.
47. The representative of IRELAND, referring to operative paragraph 5, proposed that the words “with particular emphasis on radiation protection and nuclear safety standards” be added after “effective programmes”.
48. The representative of the NETHERLANDS, supported by the representatives of JAPAN and ITALY, said that in his view the phrase “especially major donors” should be deleted from operative paragraph 3; it was the major donors who made the Agency’s technical co-operation activities possible.
49. The representative of EGYPT said that some of the major donors were among those Member States which did not “pay in full and on time their voluntary contributions to the TCF”. The major donors which did “pay in full and on time” should not feel that the phrase applied to them.
50. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that in his delegation’s view the singling-out of major donors was unfair. He urged a return to the formulation used in operative paragraph 4 of resolution GC(44)/RES/18 - namely, “Urges all Member States to make every effort to pay in full and on time their voluntary contributions to ...”.

51. The representatives of FRANCE, SWEDEN and CANADA endorsed the comments made by the representatives of the Netherlands, Japan and the United States of America regarding operative paragraph 3.
52. The representative of EGYPT proposed that the beginning of operative paragraph 3 be amended to read “Urges Member States to pay in full and on time their voluntary contributions to ...”.
53. The representative of HUNGARY said he could go along with that proposal, although he would have preferred the phrase “which have not done so” to appear after “Member States”.
54. The representative of ITALY endorsed the proposal made by the representative of Egypt.
55. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee wished to accept operative paragraph 3 with the deletion of “, especially major donors, to make every effort”.
56. It was so agreed.
57. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, recalling his delegation's comments regarding preambular paragraph (m), proposed the deletion of the word “sufficient” in operative paragraph 4.
58. Regarding operative paragraph 10, he proposed that consultations be held with a view to improving the wording.
59. The representative of AUSTRALIA supported the proposals made by the representative of the United States of America.
60. The representative of the PHILIPPINES said he was strongly in favour of retention of the word “sufficient” in operative paragraph 4. It appeared in the corresponding paragraph - operative paragraph 1 - of resolution GC(44)/RES/18.
61. Regarding the proposal made by the representative of Ireland for the insertion of a reference to radiation protection and nuclear safety standards in operative paragraph 5, he considered the insertion of such a reference to be unnecessary.
62. The representative of ALGERIA endorsed the comment made by the representative of the Philippines about operative paragraph 4. Deletion of the word “sufficient” would divest the paragraph of all meaning.
63. The representative of EGYPT proposed, in response to a comment made by the representative of Germany, that in operative paragraph 2 the phrase “with regard to resolution GC(44)/RES/8” be deleted and the phrase “in accordance with resolution GC(44)/RES/8” be added after “to make timely payments to the TCF”.

64. The representative of GERMANY said his delegation would consider that proposal and give its reaction later.
65. The representative of INDIA, referring to operative paragraph 5, called on the representative of Ireland to withdraw its proposal.
66. The representative of MALAYSIA suggested that the concerns of the representative of Ireland might be met by the insertion of the word “regulated” before “applications”, so that the part of operative paragraph 5 in question would read “peaceful, safe and regulated applications”.
67. The representative of IRELAND said that, in a spirit of compromise, he would go along with the suggestion made by the representative of Malaysia.
68. The representative of AUSTRALIA suggested an editorial change: the transposition of “(a)” from before “peaceful” to before “food and agriculture”.
69. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee accepted operative paragraph 5 with the addition of “regulated” and the transposition of “(a)” as suggested.
70. It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.