
Fifty-third regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Tenth Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Friday, 18 September 2009, at 7.45 p.m.

Chairman: Mr SMITH (United Kingdom)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹		Paragraphs
17	Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities <i>(resumed)</i>	1–21
19	Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and application of the Model Additional Protocol <i>(resumed)</i>	22–30
16	Nuclear security — measures to protect against nuclear terrorism <i>(resumed)</i>	31–38

¹ GC(53)/COM.5/1.

Abbreviations used in this record:

CPF	Country Programme Framework
LDC	least developed country

17. Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities (resumed)

1. The representative of EGYPT, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China and introducing an informal version of the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.16/Rev.1, said that it included all proposed wording that had been broadly accepted during the Committee's ninth meeting; where there had been divergences of opinion, wording from resolution GC(52)/RES/11 had been used.
2. He thanked the delegation of Haiti for its collaboration during the preparation of the informal document.
3. Drawing attention to paragraph (l) in the informal document, he said that it was incorrect; it should be identical with paragraph (g) of resolution GC(52)/RES/11. Paragraph (g) in the informal document contained the correct wording.
4. The representative of CANADA expressed regret that there had not been time to consider the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.16/Rev.1.
5. Referring to paragraph 5 in the informal document, he called for the deletion of the phrase “, while ensuring a sufficient level of in-house managerial and scientific capabilities”; that phrase did not appear in the corresponding paragraph — paragraph 4 — of resolution GC(52)/RES/11.
6. The representatives of FRANCE and BELGIUM echoed the comments made by the representative of Canada.
7. The representative of EGYPT said that he personally would have no objections to deletion of that phrase.
8. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation needed more time in which to consider the question of deletion.
9. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, expressing disappointment that there had been insufficient time for consideration of the entire text contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.16/Rev.1, said that her delegation had not had the opportunity to propose new language regarding the strengthening of results-based management. She hoped that it would be able to do so during the fifty-fourth session of the General Conference.
10. The representative of EGYPT said that, following brief consultations, the Group of 77 and China agreed to the deletion of the phrase “, while ensuring ... capabilities” in paragraph 5.
11. The representative of AUSTRALIA welcomed the agreement on deletion of that phrase.
12. He hoped that the draft resolution submitted on behalf of the Group of 77 and China in 2010 would place greater emphasis on the value of up-to-date CPFs.
13. The representative of FRANCE welcomed the flexibility shown by the Group of 77 and China in agreeing to the deletion in paragraph 5.
14. The representative of CANADA said that the stronger emphasis on the problems of LDCs represented a step forward.

15. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA welcomed the fact that the informal document reflected the proposal made by her delegation with regard to paragraph (n).
16. Her delegation hoped that there would in future be more time to consider issues such as results-based management and the regular updating of CPFs.
17. The representative of the PHILIPPINES welcomed the recognition expressed by the representative of Canada for the efforts made by the Group of 77 and China to place stronger emphasis on the problems of LDCs.
18. The representative of SWEDEN thanked the delegation of Haiti for its role in the preparation of the informal document and said that stronger emphasis on the problems of LDCs was fully in line with European Union policy.
19. The CHAIRMAN said that the informal document would be reissued as a formal document with the correct version of paragraph (f) and the deletion of the phrase “, while ensuring a sufficient level of in-house managerial and scientific capabilities” in paragraph 5.
20. He took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in that formal document.²
21. It was so agreed.

19. Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and application of the Model Additional Protocol (resumed) (GC(53)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.1)

22. The CHAIRMAN said that, if it was acceptable to the Committee that the draft resolution contained in the document GC(53)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.1 be submitted to the General Conference, he proposed to inform the General Conference that agreement had been reached on all parts of it with the exception of paragraph 3, on which some delegations had expressed reservations in the working group chaired by Mr Casterton.
23. The representative of INDIA, referring to paragraph 3, said that he would like the Committee to consider the proposal made by his delegation in the working group that the word “concerned” be inserted before “States” into operative paragraph 1. There had been very few objections to the proposal in the working group.
24. The representative of EGYPT said that, in the working group, the representatives of many Arab Member States had made suggestions, some of which had been reflected in the text now before the Committee. That text represented a step in the right direction.
25. Regarding the comments made by the representative of India, the insertion of the word “concerned” before “States” in paragraph 3 of the text would, in his view, imply that certain States were not concerned about comprehensive safeguards. That contradicted the overall sense of the

² The formal document was issued as document GC(53)/COM.5/L.16/Rev.3.

resolution, which placed emphasis on achieving the universal application of Agency safeguards. His delegation would prefer that paragraph 3 be left as it stood.

26. The representative of BRAZIL said that his delegation could not accept the proposal made by the delegation of India.

27. The representative of INDIA, reiterating that there had been very few objections to the proposal in the working group, said that the proposal should have been reflected in the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.1.

28. The representative of EGYPT, supported by the representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, said that the working group had concluded that there was broad agreement on the draft resolution, so it would be inaccurate to tell the General Conference that agreement had been reached in working group on all parts of the draft resolution with the exception of paragraph 3, on which some delegations had expressed reservations.

29. The CHAIRMAN proposed that in his report to the General Conference he use the following wording: “there was broad agreement on the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.1, with the exception of one operative paragraph, on which some delegations expressed reservations”.

30. It was so agreed.

16. Nuclear security — measures to protect against nuclear and radiological terrorism (resumed) (GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.4)

31. The representative of FRANCE, introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.4, said that it reflected the fact that some progress had been made outside the Committee during consultations on the text contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.3.

32. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation regretted the fact that paragraph (i) still contained references to “the European Union strategy against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction” and “the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism” and paragraph 7 contained a reference to “the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism”. Those references should be deleted.

33. The representative of EGYPT said that, although some parts of the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev. 4 represented improvements on previous versions of the draft resolution, there was a need for further improvements.

34. He wondered why neither of the two versions of paragraph (n bis) in the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.3 had been included in the text now before the Committee.

35. The representative of BRAZIL said that, although the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.4 was an improvement on that contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.3, it still would not command a consensus.

36. He proposed the deletion of the phrase “combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and” in paragraph (g) and the insertion of “nuclear security measures contained in” before “the European Union strategy” in paragraph (i).

37. It was his understanding that the Committee had already agreed to the insertion of the words “related to nuclear security” in paragraph (j) after “non-binding international instruments”.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the lateness of the hour, he was obliged to close the meeting. He would report to the General Conference that the Committee had been unable to recommend adoption of the draft resolution entitled “Nuclear security, including measures to protect against nuclear and radiological terrorism” contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.4.³

The meeting rose at 8.45 p.m.

³ Following the comment made by the representative of Brazil about paragraph (j), the words “related to nuclear security” were added to that paragraph and the draft resolution was reissued in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.5.