

# General Conference

**GC(53)/COM.5/OR.7**

Issued: December 2009

**General Distribution**

Original: English

---

**Fifty-third regular session**

## Committee of the Whole

### Record of the Seventh Meeting

*Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Thursday, 17 September 2009, at 8.10 p.m.*

**Chairman:** Mr SMITH (United Kingdom)

---

### Contents

Item of the agenda <sup>1</sup>	Paragraphs
18      Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications ( <i>continued</i> )	1–93

---

<sup>1</sup> GC(53)/COM.5/1.

**Abbreviations used in this record:**

GIF	Generation IV International Forum
GNEP	Global Nuclear Energy Partnership
INPRO	International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactors and Fuel Cycles
NGO	non-governmental organization

## **18. Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications (continued)** (GC(53)/COM.5/L.11 and GC(53)/COM.5/L.9)

1. The representative of JAPAN, introducing the draft resolution entitled “Nuclear power applications” and contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.11, said that more and more Member States were thinking of embarking on nuclear power programmes or of expanding their existing nuclear power programmes.
2. The demand for Agency assistance in that connection was increasing rapidly, and it was critical that the Agency respond adequately, in the interest not only of the requesting Member States, but of all Member States.
3. The drafters of the text now before the Committee had consulted widely on the preliminary draft well before the current session of the General Conference and had integrated a large number of constructive comments into that draft.
4. He drew particular attention to the references, in paragraph (j) and paragraph 2, to the success of the Beijing International Ministerial Conference on “Nuclear Energy in the 21st Century”, held in April 2009, and pointed out that paragraph 4, which was otherwise identical with paragraph 3 of resolution GC(52)/RES/12.B.1, contained the phrase “as a priority”.
5. The representative of EGYPT requested clarification of the phrase “noting various initiatives” in paragraph l.
6. The representative of FRANCE said in response that the drafters of the text under consideration had been thinking of initiatives such as GIF, INPRO and the GNEP.
7. The representative of INDIA, having expressed the hope that the draft resolution would receive strong support, said that his country attached great importance to nuclear power and considered that for a large country like India it would have a major role to play in the immediate future and in the long-term future as regards sustainable development. Also, India believed that nuclear power could help substantially in addressing the issue of climate change.
8. The representatives of AUSTRIA and the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN expressed support for the draft resolution.
9. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that in paragraph (l) the word “radioactive” should be inserted before the word “waste”.
10. The CHAIRMAN proposed amending paragraph 10 by inserting “and” before “for the sustainable development of nuclear power.”
11. The representative of JAPAN, speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, proposed the deletion of “notes with interest the view expressed at the Beijing Conference by several participants that nuclear energy should have an important role to play in post-Kyoto flexibility mechanisms, further” in paragraph 13.
12. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend adoption of the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)COM.5/L.11 with the insertion of “radioactive” before

“waste” in paragraph (1), the insertion of “and” before “for the sustainable development of nuclear power” in paragraph 10 and the deletion of “notes with interest the view... mechanisms, further” in paragraph 13.

13. It was so agreed.

14. The representative of CANADA, introducing the draft resolution entitled “Approaches to supporting nuclear power infrastructure development” and contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.9, said that there had been extensive consultations on the text, which reflected many of the comments received by his delegation.

15. He said that in paragraph 2 “vendor countries and recipients” should be replaced by “Member States”.

16. The representative of FRANCE said that the draft resolution was important for the many Member States interested in nuclear power.

17. In France’s view, all interested countries should have access to nuclear power provided that their programmes were conducted in a responsible manner.

18. The representative of AUSTRALIA proposed amending paragraph (b) to read “Recalling its previous resolutions on approaches...”, instead of listing the previous resolutions individually.

19. The representative of the PHILIPPINES, having noted that her country was considering the introduction of nuclear power, proposed the addition, after paragraph 6, of a paragraph reading “Further calls on the Secretariat to continue facilitating the participation of personnel from Member States in training programmes to enhance their capabilities in addressing the different aspects of their national infrastructure requirements”.

20. The representative of EGYPT, having noted that his country also was considering the introduction of nuclear power, proposed amending paragraph 1 by replacing “as well as the establishment of” with “and notes the establishment of”, for the reason that it was rather early to be commending the Director General and the Secretariat on the recent establishment of the Integrated Nuclear Infrastructure Review (INIR) service.

21. He proposed amending paragraph 3 by deleting the words “and budget”, given the fact that paragraph 4 of the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/11, whose adoption the Committee had agreed to recommend, included the phrase “subject to the availability of resources”. For the same reason, the words “and subject to the availability of resources” could be deleted in paragraph 6.

22. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, having expressed the hope that the draft resolution would receive strong support, said that his country considered the nuclear power infrastructure development support activities of the Agency to be among the Agency’s most important contributions to the responsible introduction of nuclear power.

23. The representative of JAPAN expressed support for the additional paragraph proposed by the representative of the Philippines.

24. The representative of BRAZIL proposed amending paragraph 3 by deleting “innovative nuclear technologies and” on the grounds that such a reference to innovative nuclear technologies did not belong in a draft resolution on infrastructure development.

25. He proposed the introduction, after paragraph 5, of a paragraph reading “Welcomes the publication of the NE Series Guide NG-G-2.1, entitled *Managing Human Resources in the Field of*

*Nuclear Energy*, which provides a strategic framework for human resource development for new and expanding nuclear power programmes, and looks forward to the publication of an NE series report on workforce planning”.

26. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, recalling the proposal of the representative of Egypt for the deletion of “and budget” in paragraph 3 and of “and subject to the availability of resources” in paragraph 6, proposed the insertion, after paragraph 7, of a paragraph reading “Requests that the actions of the Secretariat called for in this resolution be undertaken subject to the availability of resources”.

27. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, having noted that his country was embarking on a nuclear power programme, questioned the appropriateness of the reference to “secure regulation” in paragraph (d).

28. The representative of MALAYSIA, having noted that his country was exploring the possibility of introducing nuclear power for electricity generation in the 2020s, expressed support for the proposals made by the representatives of Brazil, Egypt and the Philippines.

29. The representative of AUSTRALIA, responding to the comment made by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran about paragraph (d), proposed that the paragraph be amended to read “...for ensuring – inter alia – safe and secure operation”.

30. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that, since the draft resolution dealt with the development of nuclear power infrastructure prior to the operation of nuclear power plants, a reference to “operation” in paragraph (d) would be premature. Also, it was not clear to him why the words “and secure” were necessary.

31. The representative of CANADA pointed out that paragraph (d) of the draft resolution was identical with paragraph (d) of resolution GC(52)/RES/12.B.2, adopted in 2008.

32. The CHAIRMAN — following interventions by the representatives of INDIA, FRANCE, the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, CANADA, the PHILIPPINES and JAPAN, and an intervention by the PROGRAMME LIAISON OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF NUCLEAR ENERGY — suggested that further discussion of paragraph (d) be deferred.

33. It was so agreed.

34. The representative of FRANCE, recalling the proposal made by the representative of Egypt with regard to paragraph 1, proposed that, in order to express the idea that the establishment of the Agency’s INIR service was welcome, the words “as well as the establishment of” be replaced with “and notes with satisfaction the establishment of”.

35. The representative of EGYPT said that he would prefer “and notes with interest the establishment of”.

36. The CHAIRMAN proposed the wording “and supports the establishment of”.

37. The representatives of EGYPT and FRANCE said that the Chairman’s proposal was acceptable to them.

38. The CHAIRMAN proposed, following comments by the representative of AUSTRALIA and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, that consideration of the proposed deletion of “and budget” in paragraph 3 and “and subject to the availability of resources” in paragraph 6 be deferred until consideration of the proposal by the representative of the United States of America for the insertion of

an additional paragraph — with the phrase “subject to the availability of resources” — after paragraph 7.

39. It was so agreed.

40. The representative of CANADA, referring to the proposal by the representative of Brazil that “innovative nuclear technologies and” be deleted in paragraph 3, called for the retention of those words.

41. Following interventions by the representatives of BRAZIL, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and EGYPT and an intervention by the CHAIRMAN, he proposed that paragraph 3 be amended to read “... drawing on its work in all relevant areas, including on innovative nuclear technologies and”, with the deletion of “, in all relevant areas” later in that paragraph.

42. The representative of BRAZIL said that, although he was unhappy about the reference to “innovative nuclear technologies” in the wording just proposed by the representative of Canada, he would go along with that wording if “, inter alia,” were inserted between “including” and “on innovative nuclear technologies”.

43. The CHAIRMAN — following interventions by the representatives of EGYPT, FRANCE, CANADA and IRELAND — asked whether the wording “...and drawing on its work in all relevant areas, including, inter alia, on innovative nuclear technologies and...” was acceptable to the Committee.

44. It was so agreed.

45. The representative of EGYPT, referring to paragraph 5, proposed the deletion of the phrase “, including through the technical cooperation programme”.

46. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN expressed support for that proposal.

47. The representative of CANADA said that, although the role of the technical cooperation programme with regard to nuclear power infrastructure development was important, he would be prepared to go along with the deletion proposed by the representative of Egypt.

48. The CHAIRMAN said, following interventions by the representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and JAPAN, that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee could agree to the deletion of the phrase “, including through the technical cooperation programme” in paragraph 5.

49. It was so agreed.

50. The CHAIRMAN took it, following an intervention by the representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, that the Committee could agree to the addition, after paragraph 7, of a paragraph reading “Requests that the actions of the Secretariat called for in this resolution be undertaken subject to the availability of resources”, with the words “and budget” in paragraph 3 and “and subject to the availability of resources” in paragraph 6 deleted.

51. It was so agreed.

52. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume its consideration of paragraph (d).

53. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN proposed that paragraph (d) be amended to read “Taking note of the importance of adequate human resources for ensuring safe and secure operation and regulation of a nuclear power programme, and of the worldwide shortage of such resources in both developed and developing countries”.

54. The representative of CANADA proposed that “— inter alia — ” be inserted after “for ensuring” in that text.

55. The representative of FRANCE proposed that the word “effective” be inserted before “regulation”.

56. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN questioned the need for such an amendment.

57. The CHAIRMAN — following comments by the representatives of MALAYSIA, IRELAND and the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN — suggested that the paragraph (d) might read “Taking note of the importance of adequate human resources for ensuring — inter alia — safe and secure operation, and effective regulation, of a nuclear power programme and...”.

58. It was so agreed.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopted the draft resolution contained in document GC (53)/COM.5/L.9 with paragraph (b) reading “Recalling its previous resolutions on approaches...”, with paragraph (d) as just read out by him, with paragraph 1 amended to read “...a country’s infrastructure, and supports the establishment of...”, with “vendor countries and recipients” replaced by “Member States” in paragraph 2, with paragraph 3 reading “...its existing programmes, and drawing on its work in all relevant areas, including, inter alia, on innovative nuclear technologies and its existing programmes for promoting effective and sustainable national infrastructures, to undertake...”, with the deletion of “, including through the technical cooperation programme” in paragraph 5, with the addition, after paragraph 5, of the paragraph proposed by the representative of Brazil, with the addition, after paragraph 6, of the paragraph proposed by the representative of the Philippines, and with the addition, after paragraph 7, of the paragraph proposed by the representative of the United States of America.

60. It was so agreed.

61. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, introducing the draft resolution entitled “Agency activities in the development of innovative nuclear technology” and contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.12, said that the word “interested” should be inserted before “Member States” in paragraph (f).

62. He proposed the addition, after paragraph 6, of a paragraph reading “Encourages interested Member States, together with the Secretariat, to identify and explore innovative institutional and infrastructural solutions supporting the further deployment of innovative nuclear energy systems”.

63. The representative of AUSTRIA welcomed the inclusion of “interested” before Member States in paragraph (f).

64. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, in response to a question put by the representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN regarding the use of the word “more” in the phrase “more proliferation-resistant” in paragraph 6, said that efforts were being made to increase the proliferation resistance of reactor and fuel cycle technologies. Proliferation resistance was not an immutable state, so that it was reasonable to use the phrase “more proliferation-resistant”.

65. The PROGRAMME LIAISON OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF NUCLEAR ENERGY, endorsed the comments of the representative of the United States of America.

66. The representative of AUSTRALIA suggested changing paragraph (b) to read “Recalling resolution GC(52)/RES/12.B.3 and previous General Conference resolutions on the Agency’s activities in the development of innovative nuclear technology”.

67. The representative of FRANCE suggested that paragraph (b) simply read “Recalling its previous resolutions on the Agency’s activities in the development of innovative nuclear technology”.

68. The representative of MALAYSIA, supported by the representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, suggested inserting “, taking into account their economic competitiveness,” after “investigate” in paragraph 6.

69. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, supported by the representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, said that in investigating the availability of new, more proliferation-resistant reactor and fuel cycle technologies, one should take account not only of economic factors.

70. The representative of INDIA said that new, more proliferation-resistant reactor and fuel cycle technologies would not necessarily be more costly.

71. The representative of AUSTRIA said, following a comment by the representative of FRANCE, that, if a reference to economic competitiveness were inserted, his delegation would also want a reference to safety and security.

72. The CHAIRMAN proposed the wording “...investigate, taking into account, inter alia, the questions of economic competitiveness and safety and security, the availability of ...”.

73. The representative of MALAYSIA proposed the wording “investigate, taking into account, inter alia, economic, safety and security factors, the availability of ...”.

74. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.12 with paragraph (b) reading “Recalling its previous resolutions on the Agency’s activities in the development of innovative nuclear technology”, with the insertion of “interested” before “Member States” in paragraph (f), with paragraph 6 amended as just proposed by the representative of Malaysia, and with the addition, after paragraph 6, of the paragraph read out by the representative of the Russian Federation.

75. It was so agreed.

76. The representative of INDIA, introducing the draft resolution entitled “Small and medium-sized nuclear reactors — Development and deployment” and contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.14, said that his delegation had undertaken wide consultations in preparing it.

77. The representative of MALAYSIA requested clarification as to whether the “national legislation and respective international obligations” in paragraph (b) related to safety, security or safeguards.

78. The representative of EGYPT suggested inserting “and” between “safety” and “security” in paragraph (b).

79. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN suggested deleting the end of paragraph (b), from “consistent with” onwards, and replacing “safeguards” with “proliferation resistance”.

80. He suggested moving “and security” to after “safety” in paragraph 4.

81. Referring to paragraph 6, he said that his delegation would like “and non-governmental” to be deleted, because it was not clear which NGOs were intended.

82. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA pointed out that paragraph (b) was almost exactly the same as paragraph (m) of draft resolution GC(53)/COM.5/L.11. The paragraph should therefore be retained with its original wording or be deleted.

83. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN expressed support for the deletion of paragraph (b).

84. The representative of FRANCE suggested that paragraph (a) be amended to read “Recalling its previous resolutions on small and medium-sized nuclear reactors — development and deployment”.

85. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, supported by the representative of FRANCE, said that his country could not agree with the deletion of “and non-governmental” from paragraph 6, since the Agency benefited from consulting on technical aspects of small and medium-sized reactors with many technical NGOs.

86. The CHAIRMAN observed that the wording of paragraph 6 was very similar to that of paragraph 4 of resolution GC(51)/RES/14.B.2, adopted in 2007, which referred to “other relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations”, and he could not understand why that phrase was now problematic.

87. He proposed the deletion of “intergovernmental and non-governmental” so that the paragraph would read “...and other relevant organizations...”.

88. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, following comments by the representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN and the CHAIRMAN, said that Member States should trust the Secretariat to decide which organizations were relevant.

89. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation would consider the Chairman’s proposal that “intergovernmental and non-governmental” in paragraph 6 be deleted and give an answer the following day.

90. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee agreed that paragraph (a) should be amended to read as indicated by the representative of France, paragraph (b) should be deleted and the words “and security” should be moved to after “safety” in paragraph 4.

91. It was so agreed.

92. He proposed that the issue of the wording of paragraph 6 be left open until a later meeting.

93. It was so agreed.

**The meeting rose at 11.15 p.m.**