
Fifty-third regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Ninth Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Friday, 18 September 2009, at 2.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr SMITH (United Kingdom)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹		Paragraphs
17	Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities	1–106
19	Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and application of the Model Additional Protocol <i>(resumed)</i>	107–113
17	Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities <i>(resumed)</i>	114–132
16	Nuclear security — measures to protect against nuclear terrorism <i>(resumed)</i>	133–136
19	Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and application of the Model Additional Protocol <i>(resumed)</i>	137–140

¹ GC(53)/COM.5/1.

Abbreviations used in this record:

CPF	Country Programme Framework
GRULAC	Latin American and Caribbean Group
LDC	least developed country
NPCs	national participation costs
TC	technical cooperation
TCF	Technical Cooperation Fund

17. Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities (GC(53)/INF/4 and Supplement, GC(53)/COM.5/L.1 and L.16/Rev.1)

1. The representative of HAITI said that his delegation had withdrawn the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.1 and entitled “Strengthening of technical assistance to least developed countries in the peaceful applications of nuclear energy”.
2. The representative of EGYPT, introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/ L.16/Rev.1 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the text incorporated elements of the draft resolution which the delegation of Haiti had withdrawn.
3. He apologized for the draft resolution’s late submission, which had been due to the need for extensive consultations among members of the Group of 77.
4. The representative of BRAZIL urged the Committee to take a positive attitude towards the draft resolution, which was well balanced.
5. The representative of HAITI said that his delegation was grateful to the Chairmen of the Group of 77 and GRULAC for their openness and flexibility with regard to the particular problems of LDCs. However, it was not entirely satisfied with the changes made to the text in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.16 in arriving at the revised text now before the Committee. It therefore proposed the insertion, after paragraph 19 , of a paragraph reading “Requests the Secretariat to examine in depth the specific characteristics and problems of the LDCs with respect to the peaceful applications of nuclear energy in consultation with the Member States”.
6. The representative of CANADA said that his country was a strong supporter of the Agency’s technical cooperation activities and one of the biggest contributors to the TCF.
7. Canada, which had welcomed Haiti’s initiative in submitting the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.1, believed that there should be a strong focus within the Agency on the needs of LDCs. His delegation therefore endorsed the proposal just made by the representative of Haiti and it hoped that the envisaged in-depth examination of the specific characteristics and problems of LDCs would be completed before the next regular session of the General Conference.
8. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that his country, which was a very active participant in the Agency’s technical cooperation activities, contributed its full TCF target share in a timely manner and had made extrabudgetary contributions in support of those activities.
9. Regarding paragraph (u) of the draft resolution under consideration, he said that it was important to make the relationship between the Regular Budget and the Agency’s technical cooperation activities clear. He proposed that the phrase “the appropriate use of the Regular Budget in supporting and implementing those activities” be amended to read “the appropriate use of the Regular Budget in supporting the implementation of those activities”.
10. Regarding paragraph (x), he suggested that “recalling that they are” be replaced by “stressing also that up-to-date CPFs are an important mechanism”.
11. Regarding paragraph (bb), he proposed that the last phrase read “recognizing also in this regard the role of the National Liaison Officers and the Programme Management Officer (PMO)”. In his view, there was no need to go into detail about the PMO’s role.

12. Regarding paragraph 4, he said that he was in favour of deletion of the phrase “inter alia allocating resources from the Regular Budget”.

13. He proposed the insertion, after paragraph 8, of paragraph 9 of resolution GC(52)/RES/11, which read “Requests the Secretariat to ensure that the commencement of projects within a national programme will take place upon the receipt of at least the minimum payment of the NPCs and, in this regard, that preparatory activities will not be affected before this occurs and that, in the event of a failure to pay any second instalment falling due during a biennium, funding for a core project in the next biennium will be suspended until full payment is received”.

14. Noting that both paragraph 9 and paragraph 12 began with the phrase “Stresses the need to strengthen TC activities”, he said that paragraph 9 appeared to be redundant.

15. Paragraph 17 of resolution GC(52)/RES/11 spoke of the General Conference requesting the Director General “to ensure the coordination and optimization of complementary activities, and to ensure that they are regularly informed about the developmental impact of the TC programme”, whereas the corresponding part of paragraph 17 of the text under consideration read “to seek funding for all TC projects so that none are relegated to TC footnote-a/ projects”. In his view, the earlier wording was preferable, because paragraph 15 of the text under consideration spoke of the General Conference requesting the Secretariat “to play a more proactive role in seeking resources to implement footnote-a/ projects” and of encouraging Member States “to show more flexibility in the use of the extrabudgetary contributions in order to enable the implementation of more footnote-a/ projects”.

16. The representative of NAMIBIA said that the problems facing LDCs were being experienced by all developing countries and proposed the insertion of “developing countries and” in paragraph 19 between “particularly” and “LDCs”, of “in developing countries” in paragraph 22 between “IT infrastructure” and “, particularly in LDCs” and of “developing countries and” between “problems of the” and “LDCs” in the paragraph proposed by the representative of Haiti.

17. The representative of AUSTRIA said that technical cooperation was a fundamental element of the Agency's work and that his country had consistently paid its full TCF target share in a timely manner and intended to do so in the future.

18. Regarding paragraph 4 of the text under consideration, he said that, like the representative of Australia, he was in favour of deletion of the phrase “inter alia allocating resources from the Regular Budget”.

19. With regard to operative paragraph 17, Austria did not believe that the Director General should be requested “to seek funding for all TC projects so that none are relegated to TC footnote-a/ projects”. Like the representative of Australia, he preferred the wording used in the corresponding part of paragraph 17 of resolution GC(52)/RES/11.

20. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, having expressed regret with regard to the late submission of the draft resolution under consideration, said that her country was a strong supporter of the Agency's technical cooperation activities.

21. Referring to paragraph (aa), she said that the United Kingdom was a strong supporter of the “Delivering as One” approach and that her delegation would like to see the phrase “may have a possible impact on the TC programme” replaced by “may have a positive impact on the TC programme”.

22. Her delegation did not see the need for paragraph 1, which was absent from resolution GC(52)/RES/11.

23. With regard to paragraph 4, her delegation also believed that the phrase “inter alia allocating resources from the Regular Budget” should be deleted.
24. Her delegation endorsed the proposal by the representative of Australia that paragraph 9 of resolution GC(52)/RES/11 be inserted in the text under consideration after paragraph 8.
25. With regard to paragraph 17, her delegation favoured the deletion of the words “to seek funding for all TC projects so that none are relegated to TC footnote-a/ projects”.
26. Her delegation greatly appreciated the decision of the delegation of Haiti to withdraw the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.1 and fully endorsed its proposal for an additional operative paragraph.
27. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee examine the draft resolution paragraph by paragraph.
28. It was so agreed.
29. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA suggested that in paragraph (d) the words “the main vehicle” be replaced with “one of the vehicles”, to reflect the integrated manner in which different Agency departments operated.
30. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that he favoured the original wording — “the main vehicle”.
31. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the phrase “one of the main vehicles” might be acceptable.
32. The representative of AUSTRALIA suggested the words “a major vehicle”.
33. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN reiterated his preference for the words “the main vehicle”.
34. The representative of CANADA said that he could accept either the Chairman’s suggestion or that of the representative of Australia.
35. The representative of MALAYSIA said that in his view the suggestion made by the representative of Australia would be an acceptable compromise.
36. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation would accept the suggestion made by the representative of Australia, although in its view the original wording was more appropriate. He hoped that other delegations would display similar flexibility.
37. The representative of the PHILIPPINES suggested replacing the words “for executing this function” at the end of the paragraph by the phrase “through which different departments of the Agency execute this function”, so as to reflect the integrated manner in which different Agency departments operated and thereby meet the wish of the representative of the United States of America.
38. The representative of CANADA, querying the wording suggested by the representative of the Philippines, said that many Agency activities in developing countries were not channelled through the technical cooperation programme.
39. The representative of the PHILIPPINES said that her suggested wording accurately described the situation within the Agency — the words “the main vehicle” implied that other vehicles also existed.
40. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the wording suggested by the representative of Australia be accepted and paragraph (d) be otherwise left unchanged.

41. It was so agreed.

42. The representative of FRANCE, referring to paragraph (f), suggested that the phrase “, and of the need for sustainable development” be amended to read “and for contributing to sustainable development”.

43. The representative of EGYPT expressed support for that suggestion.

44. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished paragraph (f) to be amended as suggested by the representative of France.

45. It was so agreed.

46. The representative of CANADA, supported by the representative of FRANCE, suggested that in paragraph (g) the words “and recommendations for security” be added after “internationally recognized standards of safety”.

47. The representative of EGYPT, supported by the representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, pointed out that the paragraph was identical with paragraph (h) of resolution GC(52)/RES/11 and urged that it be kept unchanged.

48. The representative of BRAZIL, echoing the comments made by the representatives of Egypt and the Islamic Republic of Iran, said that it was not clear which recommendations for security were being referred to in the wording suggested by the representative of Canada.

49. The representative of FRANCE, supported by the representative of CANADA, said that there was no reason to treat technical cooperation differently from other areas as regards the mentioning of safety and security in conjunction.

50. In response to the point raised by the representative of Brazil, he suggested that “Agency” be inserted before “recommendations” in the wording suggested by the representative of Canada.

51. The representative of MALAYSIA suggested that the words “and Agency recommendations for security to be taken into account” be inserted after “to be applied” in paragraph (g).

52. The representative of CANADA said that, in a spirit of compromise, he would go along with the suggestion of the representative of MALAYSIA.

53. The representative of PAKISTAN, supported by the representatives of BRAZIL and the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, said that, if reference to security were to be introduced into the paragraph, he would propose an additional preambular paragraph to the effect that safety and security measures should in no way be allowed to hamper technical cooperation.

54. The representative of the PHILIPPINES suggested that amending paragraph (g) to read “Also conscious of the need for the safe and secure use of nuclear technology in order to protect mankind and the environment” might avoid the introduction of a new paragraph into the preamble.

55. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA said that the existence of internationally recognized standards of safety was important, and the lack of a reference to them in the wording suggested by the representative of the Philippines was therefore a matter for concern.

56. The representative of FRANCE, echoing the view expressed by the representative of South Africa, suggested that the words “and the implementation of relevant standards and recommendations” be inserted after “technology” in the wording suggested by the representative of the Philippines.

57. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that there should be a reference in paragraph (g) either to internationally agreed or to Agency standards of safety and recommendations for security.
58. The representative of BRAZIL expressed the view that the suggestion made by the representative of France complicated the issue and that the Committee should focus on the suggestion made by the representative of Malaysia
59. The additional preambular paragraph envisaged by the representative of Pakistan would contribute to the overall balance of the draft resolution.
60. The representative of the PHILIPPINES said that her delegation could go along with the suggestion made by the representative of Malaysia.
61. The representatives of BRAZIL, the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, ARGENTINA and CANADA expressed support for the wording suggested by the representative of Malaysia.
62. The representative of EGYPT, supported by the representative of PAKISTAN, suggested that paragraph (g) simply be deleted.
63. The representatives of CANADA, BELGIUM, FRANCE, AUSTRIA, MALAYSIA and ITALY opposed that suggestion.
64. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee accept, for the time being, the following wording for paragraph (g): “Also conscious of the need for internationally recognized standards of safety to be applied and Agency recommendations for security to be taken into account in all uses of nuclear technology in order to protect mankind and the environment”.
65. It was so agreed.
66. The representative of PAKISTAN proposed the insertion, after paragraph (g), of a paragraph reading “Emphasizing that measures to strengthen nuclear safety and security should not be allowed to hamper international cooperation in the field of peaceful nuclear activities, the production, transfer and use of nuclear and other radioactive materials, and the promotion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy”.
67. The representative of CANADA suggested deferring discussion of the proposed new paragraph until all delegations had duly considered the proposed amended version of paragraph (g).
68. The CHAIRMAN asked whether that suggestion was acceptable to the Committee.
69. It was so agreed.
70. The representative of FRANCE, referring to paragraph (j), proposed the deletion of the last part — “and noting that the Director General has issued a report entitled “TC Programme Resources — Sufficient, Assured and Predictable””. The report in question had been referred to in 2008 in resolution GC(52)/RES/11 and a further reference to it seemed superfluous.
71. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN objected to that proposal.
72. The representative of CANADA, supporting the proposal, pointed out that the title of the report — “... — Sufficient, Assured and Predictable” — contained words used earlier in paragraph (j) — “sufficient, assured and predictable”.
73. The representative of EGYPT, supported by the representative of BRAZIL, said that many Member States attached great importance to the report and he saw no harm in referring to it.

74. The representative of CANADA, following comments by the representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and BRAZIL, proposed including a reference to the year of publication of the report.

75. The CHAIRMAN proposed the insertion of “in 2007” before “a report”.

76. It was so agreed.

77. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, referring to paragraph (l), proposed deleting the words “been rising and”, since the number of countries requiring technical support had been stable over the past year.

78. The representative of CANADA supported that proposal.

79. The representative of FRANCE, drawing attention to the phrase “the Technical Cooperation Fund (TCF) target should be set at an adequate and realistic level”, said that it was well balanced. He proposed that the balance be maintained through the insertion of “and funding capabilities” after “growing needs”.

80. The representative of PAKISTAN objected to that proposal. The paragraph as a whole was sufficiently well balanced as it stood.

81. The representative of CANADA endorsed the proposal.

82. The representative of EGYPT expressed concern that the amendment proposed by the representative of France might be interpreted as an open invitation for countries not to pay their TCF target shares.

83. The representative of BELGIUM proposed deleting the phrase “taking into account the growing needs of Member States”.

84. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN supported the views expressed by the representatives of Pakistan and Egypt.

85. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee could accept deletion of the words “been rising and”.

86. He proposed that the words “and funding capabilities” be placed in square brackets and that the Committee revert to the paragraph at a later stage.

87. It was so agreed.

88. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA proposed amending paragraph (n) to read “Taking note of the decision of the Board, which - inter alia - notes that the synchronization of the TC programme cycle with the budget cycle provides a framework beginning in 2012, to consider appropriate increases to the resources for the TC programme, including the TCF target where such adjustments would take into account the changes in the level of the regular operational budget from 2009 onwards, the price adjustment factor and other relevant factors as contained in document GOV/2009/52/Rev.1, and taking note of the decision of the Board on the “split contribution system” to protect the purchasing power of the fund as contained in document GOV/2009/52/Rev.1”.

89. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee consider the proposal made by the representative of the United States of America once it had been circulated in writing.

90. It was so agreed.

91. The representative of CANADA, referring to paragraph (p), proposed inserting, after “reaching the rate of 100%”, the phrase “as well as 100 % payment of NPCs” and the replacement of “which is central” by “which are central”.

92. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that the importance of NPC payments and that of TCF contributions were not comparable. He did not consider the payment of NPCs to be “central to reconfirming the commitment of Member States to the Agency’s (TC) programme” in the same way as contributions to the TCF.

93. The representative of MALAYSIA, pointing out that the issue of NPCs was addressed in paragraph (o), proposed inserting there a reference to the 100% payment of NPCs.

94. The representative of CANADA, supported by the representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, said that it might be useful to describe the NPC mechanism in some detail, as had been done in paragraph 9 of resolution GC(52)/RES/11. Perhaps that paragraph could be inserted into the draft resolution now under consideration.

95. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to revert to paragraphs (o) and (p) later.

96. It was so agreed.

97. The CHAIRMAN, recalling the proposal made by the representative of Australia with regard to paragraph (u), the replacement of “... in supporting and implementing those activities” by “...in supporting the implementation of those activities”, took it that the Committee wished to accept that proposal.

98. It was so agreed.

99. The representative of AUSTRALIA, referring to paragraph (x), reminded the Committee that he had earlier proposed that the phrase “recalling that they are” be replaced by “stressing also that up-to-date CPFs are an important mechanism”.

100. The representative of FRANCE supported the proposal.

101. The representative of AUSTRALIA, responding to a comment made by the representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, said that the Secretariat had been drawing attention to the large number of out-of-date CPFs which no longer served their purpose. Updating was crucial to ensuring the effectiveness of CPFs.

102. The representative of MALAYSIA said that, while he agreed with the representation of Australia, there was a danger that the updating of CPFs would consume an inordinate amount of time and resources.

103. The CHAIRMAN said that in his view the responsibility for ensuring that CPFs were updated as appropriate and that updating did not become an end in itself lay with the relevant actors at the Member State level.

104. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF PROGRAMME SUPPORT AND COORDINATION, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION, said, in response to a request for clarification made by the representatives of CANADA and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, that it was Secretariat policy to encourage Member States to join it in updating their CPFs whenever that was necessary.

105. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee suspend its discussion of the draft resolution.

106. It was so agreed.

19. Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and application of the Model Additional Protocol (resumed)

107. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, during its first meeting, the Committee had established a working group under the chairmanship of Mr Casterton of the delegation of Canada with a view to achieving consensus on the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.2.

108. He invited Mr Casterton to report on the deliberations of the working group.

109. Mr CASTERTON said that the working group had held its first meeting at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, 15 September and had held four subsequent meetings.

110. The result of its deliberations were reflected in the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.1, which was about to be distributed. In his understanding, the draft resolution enjoyed the broad support of the working group, although three working group participants had expressed reservations about paragraph 3.

111. He was grateful to those Member States representatives who had participated in the deliberations of the working group and to the Secretariat for its highly professional assistance.

112. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee consider the draft resolution contained in GC(53)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.1 once it had been distributed.

113. It was so agreed.

17. Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities (resumed) (GC(53)/COM.5/L.16/Rev.1)

114. The CHAIRMAN, inviting the Committee to resume its consideration of paragraph (x) of the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.16/Rev.1 and recalling the statement made by the Director of the Division of Programme Support and Coordination, Department of Technical Cooperation, proposed that the text be accepted as it stood.

115. It was so agreed.

116. The representative of BELGIUM, supported by the representative of FRANCE, proposed that the phrase "noting with concern the low rate of implementation of the TC programme" be inserted into paragraph (y) or as a separate paragraph.

117. The representative of MALAYSIA, supported by the representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, said that, if that proposal was accepted, her delegation would call for the addition of the phrase "and also noting with concern that the TC programme implementation rate is not a true indicator of programme delivery".

118. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF PROGRAMME SUPPORT AND COORDINATION, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION, said, in response to a request for clarification made by the representative of CANADA, that the TC programme implementation rate related to expenditure and was not a good indicator of programme effectiveness.

119. The representative of EGYPT said that, in the light of the Secretariat representative's clarification, the words "with concern" in the phrase proposed by the representative of Belgium seemed inappropriate.

120. The representative of the PHILIPPINES suggested the following wording: "Noting the low rate of implementation of the TC programme, while further noting that the TC programme implementation rate is not a true indicator of programme delivery".

121. The representative of CANADA said that the wording suggested by the representative of the Philippines implied that TC programme implementation rate was of no value as an indicator.

122. He suggested that the paragraph might read "Noting with concern the low rate of implementation of the TC programme and its relationship to the setting of Technical Cooperation Fund (TCF) targets".

123. The representative of MALAYSIA asked for clarification from the representative of Canada: did he mean that, if the rate of implementation of the TC programme was low, the TCF target should be lowered?

124. The representative of CANADA said that he did not. The point he wished to make was that, at least as far as his delegation understood the process, the TC programme implementation rate were not adequately taken into account in the setting of TCF targets.

125. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM recalled that the Director of the Division of Programme Support and Coordination had said that the TC programme implementation rate was not a good indicator of programme effectiveness — not programme delivery.

126. She proposed wording on the following lines: "Noting with concern the low rate of attainment of TCF targets, while recognizing that other factors need to be taken into account when the effectiveness and efficiency of programme delivery are being considered".

127. The representative of PAKISTAN, supported by the representatives of the PHILIPPINES, the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN and BRAZIL, said that the rate of TC programme implementation depended on a number of factors, some of them were beyond the control of Member States — for example, natural disasters and security situations.

128. TC programme implementation rates and TCF targets should not be linked. A low TC programme implementation rate should not be involved as justification for a lower TCF target given the various factors influencing implementation rates and also given the fact that unspent money earmarked for a certain project and year could be carried over and used for that project in the following year, with the same benefit for the recipient State.

129. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee did not at present have time for a discussion on technical cooperation programme implementation, however interesting such a discussion might be. There seemed to be agreement on most preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution under consideration, but the Committee had not even started to consider the operative paragraphs.

130. He suggested that consideration of the draft resolution continue outside the Committee.

131. The representative of FRANCE urged that the Committee be given more time in which to consider the draft resolution. If Committee members kept their statements short, the Committee should manage to discharge its duty expeditiously.

132. The CHAIRMAN said that he sympathized with the view of the representative of France, but felt that to the Committee should postpone further consideration of the draft resolution.

The meeting was suspended at 5.20 p.m. and resumed at 5.25 p.m.

16. Nuclear security — measures to protect against nuclear terrorism (resumed) (GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.3)

133. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, during its eighth meeting, the Committee had considered the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.2, which had reflected the Committee's consideration of the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8 up to and including paragraph 10.

134. The draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.3 reflected the Committee's consideration of the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.2, starting with paragraph 11.

135. The representative of FRANCE said that unfortunately, despite very lengthy discussions outside the Committee, including discussions coordinated by the Arab League, on some parts of the text contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8/Rev.3 there was still no consensus.

136. The sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.8 had therefore decided to produce a fourth revised version, drawing on wording used in resolution GC(52)/RES/10.

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)

137. The CHAIRMAN, recalling the report given earlier in the meeting by Mr Casterton, pointed out that document GC(53)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.1 had now been distributed.

138. The representative of INDIA thanked Mr Casterton for informing the Committee that three working group participants had expressed reservations about paragraph 3 of the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.1. Those three working group participants had not only expressed reservations, however — they had suggested amending paragraph 3 through the replacement of "all States" by "all concerned States". There had not been major opposition in the working group to their suggestion, so it should have been reflected in the text now before the Committee.

139. The CHAIRMAN said that regrettably there was at present no more time for discussions on any draft resolutions.

140. He took it that the draft resolution contained in document GC(53)/COM.5/L.2/Rev.1 would be submitted directly to the General Conference for consideration in plenary session.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.