



GC

GC(45)/COM.5/OR.7  
November 2001

International Atomic Energy Agency  
**GENERAL CONFERENCE**

GENERAL Distr.  
Original: ENGLISH

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

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

RECORD OF THE SEVENTH MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna  
on Friday, 21 September 2001, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairperson: Ms. HERNES (Norway)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
15 Measures to strengthen international co-operation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety (resumed)	1 - 19
(c) Transport safety (resumed)	1 - 19
- Organization of work	20 - 27

---

[\*] 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.

GC(45)/COM.5/OR.7  
page 2

MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN NUCLEAR, RADIATION, TRANSPORT AND WASTE SAFETY (resumed)

(c) TRANSPORT SAFETY (resumed)  
(GC(45)/13 and GC(45)/COM.5/L.3/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRPERSON said that the open-ended sub-group which, under the Chairmanship of Ambassador Hughes of Australia, had been examining the draft resolution in document GC(45)/COM.5/L.3 in detail, had completed its work, and the draft resolution in document GC(45)/COM.5/L.3/Rev.1 was the result.
2. The representative of NEW ZEALAND, introducing the draft resolution in document GC(45)/COM.5/L.3/Rev.1, said it was the outcome of two days of intensive and difficult negotiations. The text was a finely balanced package, containing certain elements which the sponsors did not altogether like and certain elements which the transport States did not altogether like. The package represented the best that could be achieved, and she urged the members of the Committee to show the same spirit of co-operation that had prevailed in the open-ended sub-group so that the draft resolution could be recommended by consensus for adoption by the General Conference.
3. The representative of CHILE said that his delegation, one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, was not fully satisfied with the text, but it realized that some concessions inevitably had to be made in the course of negotiations. The consensus achieved was a fair one, and he did not think any purpose would be served by putting the draft resolution to the vote. Chile would do all it could to ensure that the draft resolution - after adoption - was implemented.
4. The representative of PERU, expressing the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus and without change, said that it struck an appropriate balance between the interests of the different parties involved. It would not only strengthen the role of the Agency in ensuring the safety of the transport of radioactive materials, but also mark a first step towards international co-operation between States shipping such materials and States concerned about the possible effects of shipping operations.
5. The representative of ARGENTINA said that the draft resolution, which his delegation would like to co-sponsor, was the result of strenuous efforts on the part of many delegations to resolve an issue which had both technical and political aspects.
6. The representative of ECUADOR said that in his delegation's view the draft resolution was the best that could be achieved through the consensus process.
7. His country was - along with Chile, Colombia and Peru - a member of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, which had the task of protecting the South Pacific ecosystem, and his delegation had therefore played a very active part in the negotiations. It was grateful for the flexibility shown by those who held a different position.

8. The representative of JAPAN said that the draft resolution was a balanced one which his delegation could support.
9. His country was fully aware of the concerns of coastal States, and stood ready to engage in dialogue with them.
10. The representative of IRELAND welcomed the draft resolution and expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus and without change.
11. The representative of BRAZIL said that the draft resolution was well balanced and thanked the representatives of the transport States for their co-operation.
12. The representative of AUSTRALIA, in reply to a suggestion by the representative of UKRAINE that in operative paragraph 4 bis the word “conventions” be replaced by “instruments”, said that there had been a long discussion on that issue and that such a change would reopen a number of questions. He hoped that the representative of Ukraine would go along with the consensus text.
13. The representatives of SINGAPORE, NORWAY, the PHILIPPINES, POLAND, INDONESIA, AUSTRALIA and SLOVENIA expressed the wish to co-sponsor the draft resolution.
14. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that she was waiting to hear from her authorities whether, in their view, preambular paragraph (d) and operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution implied that actual economic loss in the event of an accident with no release of radioactivity should be insured against.
15. The CHAIRPERSON suggested that the meeting be suspended.

The meeting was suspended from 10.55 a.m. to 11.35 a.m.
16. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that, having consulted with her authorities, she was now able to join in the consensus in favour of adoption of the draft resolution.
17. The representative of FRANCE said he could also join in the consensus, which took account of the legitimate concerns of the various Member States concerned.
18. The CHAIRPERSON, noting that all speakers had commended Ambassador Hughes for the manner in which he had chaired the open-ended sub-group, took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution in document GC(45)/COM.5/L.3/Rev.1.
19. It was so agreed.

## ORGANIZATION OF WORK

20. The representative of CHILE said he was extremely dissatisfied with the fact that, despite repeated representations from Spanish-speaking delegations, the informal consultations in the open-ended sub-group had been conducted without interpretation into and from Spanish; that had placed the Spanish-speaking delegations at a serious linguistic disadvantage.

21. The Secretariat should not let such a situation arise again. At the very least, as a courtesy towards non-English-speaking delegations, it should ask them whether they would agree to dispense with interpretation. English was not the sole working language in the United Nations family, and, if the Secretariat could not provide for interpretation, it should say so openly.

22. He was not taking issue with the results of the negotiations in the open-ended sub-group, but for the Spanish-speaking delegations which had participated in them the effort involved had been particularly great owing to their having to use a language that was not their own.

23. From now on, before arranging informal consultations, the Secretariat should notify the delegations concerned if interpretation would not be provided. The point had been raised many times before by various delegations, which were prepared to go to the highest authority in order to gain satisfaction on that point.

24. The DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL FOR MANAGEMENT said that he had been unaware of any problem regarding lack of interpretation during the informal consultations in the open-ended sub-group.

25. The Secretariat endeavoured to facilitate such consultations, but it was also concerned about minimizing costs.

26. The representative of CHILE said that the question of interpretation into and from Spanish had been raised at the start of the informal consultations on the draft resolution in document GC(45)/COM.5/L.3; that could be substantiated by witnesses.

27. The CHAIRPERSON said that the Secretariat had taken note of the concerns expressed by the representative of Chile.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.