

General Conference

GC(54)/COM.5/OR.6

Issued: December 2010

General Distribution

Original: English

Fifty-fourth regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Sixth Meeting

Held at the Austria Center Vienna on Thursday, 23 September 2010, at 7.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr GARCÍA REVILLA (Peru)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹		Paragraphs
15	Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities	1–58

¹ GC(54)/1.

Abbreviations used in this record:

OIOS	Office of Internal Oversight Services
SAGTAC	Standing Advisory Group on Technical Assistance and Cooperation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

15. Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities (GC(54)/COM.5/L.11) (resumed)

1. Mr ORTIGÃO de SAMPAIO (Brazil), speaking as chairman of the informal working group that had been examining the draft resolution contained in document GC(54)/COM.5/L.11, said that the working group had reached agreement on a number of amendments.
2. In paragraph (b), “request-based” should be replaced by “needs-based”. A paragraph reading as follows should be inserted after paragraph (b): “Further recalling the Board of Governors’ requirement in GOV/1931 of 12 February 1979 that all Member States receiving technical assistance from the IAEA should have signed the Revised Supplementary Agreement (RSA) concerning the provision of technical assistance by the IAEA”. In paragraph (i), the phrase “with Agency and Member States’ support” should be replaced by “with the Agency’s support”. In paragraph (m), the words “and realistic” should be deleted and the last part should be amended to read: “... taking into account not only the growing needs of Member States but also funding capabilities”. Paragraph (u) — “Expressing concern that some Member States do not contribute their full TCF target shares or do not contribute to the TCF at all”— should be deleted. In paragraph (x), the words “and the thematic approach” should be inserted after: “... carrying out Country Programme Frameworks (CPFs)”. In paragraph 7, “Encourages” should be replaced by “Urges”.
3. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA suggested the insertion of the following paragraph after paragraph (bb): “Noting that the 2010 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons achieved a substantive outcome in the form of a Final Document, including an action plan adopted by consensus”.
4. The representative of INDIA, supported by the representative of PAKISTAN, proposed the following wording for the suggested new paragraph: “Noting the substantive outcomes of the 2010 Review Conference relating to the Agency’s Technical Cooperation activities”.
5. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, accepting that proposal, withdrew his suggestion.
6. The representative of the CZECH REPUBLIC, supported by the representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, proposed the insertion of the words “radiation and radiotracer” in paragraph (cc) so that it would read “... the use of nuclear, radiation and radiotracer technologies ...”.
7. She proposed the insertion of the words “build and” and “and regulatory framework” in paragraph (dd), so that it would read “... to build and enhance the basic infrastructure and regulatory framework in this field ...”.
8. Mr ORTIGÃO de SAMPAIO (Brazil) proposed the insertion of the words “education and training” in paragraph (dd), so that it would read “... nuclear knowledge management, education and training ...”.
9. The representative of the CZECH REPUBLIC proposed that, for easier readability, paragraph 3 be divided into two, with the first one beginning “Stresses the need ...” and the second one beginning “Looks forward to the implementation of the decision of the Board of Governors of 11 June 2010 ...”.
10. She also proposed that the Board decision of 11 June 2010 be quoted in the second paragraph.

11. Supported by the representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, she suggested that in paragraph 8 “enhance” be replaced by “improve”, the words “as well as the transparency” be added after “effectiveness and efficiency”, the words “requests and” be deleted and a second part be added, so that the paragraph would read “... to continuously improve the effectiveness and efficiency as well as the transparency of the TC programme in accordance with the needs of Member States in all areas of concern and emphasizes that a TC project should be managed according to international quality standards, have well-defined, achievable and measurable outcomes and should continue to focus on areas where nuclear technologies have a comparative advantage”.

12. The representative of the PHILIPPINES said that she had doubts about the suggested addition of the words “as well as the transparency”. A call for improved transparency of the TC programme might be taken to imply a lack of faith in the management of Agency technical cooperation projects.

13. Also, it was unclear to her which “international quality standards” were relevant to the management of such projects.

14. The representative of the CZECH REPUBLIC said that the informal working group was close to an agreement on wording relating to transparency.

15. The representative of ITALY, supporting the suggestion that a reference to “the transparency of the TC programme” be added to paragraph 8, said that the need for greater transparency had been highlighted in reports by OIOS on its evaluations of Agency technical cooperation activities.

16. The representative of FRANCE said that greater transparency of the technical cooperation programme would especially benefit the Member States receiving technical assistance through the Agency. He therefore supported the proposed wording.

17. Mr ORTIGÃO de SAMPAIO (Brazil), supported by the representative of PERU, suggested that, if “enhance” was going to be replaced by “improve” and the words “as well as the transparency” were going to be added in paragraph 8, “to continuously improve” be amended to read “to further improve”, so as to avoid giving the impression that there was currently no transparency at all in the technical cooperation programme.

18. The representative of MALAYSIA, calling for the retention of the words “requests and”, said that Member States identified their needs and then submitted requests on the basis of those needs.

19. The representative of Italy had referred to OIOS reports. It should be borne in mind that some of OIOS’s findings had been disputed by some Member States. As regards the reference to “international quality standards”, in her opinion the issue of technical cooperation programme quality was adequately covered in paragraph 17.

20. The representative of CUBA endorsed the remarks made by the representatives of the Philippines, Brazil and Malaysia.

21. The representative of the BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA called for the retention of the words “requests and” and said that he too had difficulties with the reference to “international quality standards”.

22. The representative of URUGUAY suggested that paragraph 8 be left as it stood except for the addition of a reference to transparency.

23. Mr ORTIGÃO de SAMPAIO (Brazil) said that he agreed with the representative of Malaysia that the issue of technical cooperation programme quality was adequately covered in paragraph 17, which spoke of “effective programmes with well-defined outcomes”.

24. The representative of CANADA, supported by the representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, proposed that in paragraph 12 the phrase “requests the Secretariat to continue to further refine the Technical Cooperation Strategy 2002 Review (GOV/INF/2002/8)” be amended to read “requests the Secretariat to revise the Technical Cooperation Strategy (GOV/INF/2002/8)”.
25. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, expressing support for the proposal, said that the expected advent of a new Deputy Director General for Technical Cooperation in 2011 would provide an ideal opportunity for revising the Technical Cooperation Strategy.
26. The representative of MALAYSIA expressed support for the amendment proposal made by the representative of Canada.
27. The representative of the CZECH REPUBLIC proposed that paragraph 13 be amended to read “Stresses that, when formulating the TC Programme, the Secretariat should adhere strictly to the provisions of the Statute, the guiding principles and policies contained in INFCIRC/267 and GOV/1931, the Medium Term Strategy 2006–2011 (GOV/2005/8), the Technical Cooperation Strategy, the 2002 Review (GOV/INF/2002/8/Mod.1), the Revised Supplementary Agreement Concerning the Provision of Technical Assistance by the IAEA to Governments, which contains an annex entitled “Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) between the recipient Government and the UNDP”, and General Conference TC resolutions and Board decisions which provide the guidance of Member States on a yearly basis, and requests the Secretariat to continue ensuring that safety, security and safeguards standards and provisions are complied with by all TC projects, to ensure that Member States adhere to and implement all relevant safety, security and safeguards-related standards prior to the provision of the Agency’s TC support, and to assist recipient countries in building or upgrading their appropriate national regulatory framework”.
28. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that expanding paragraph 13 in the manner proposed by the representative of the Czech Republic would only weaken it. The paragraph should be left unchanged.
29. The representative of the PHILIPPINES said that it was unclear what “safety, security and safeguards standards and provisions” were being referred to in the text proposed by the representative of the Czech Republic.
30. Mr ORTIGÃO de SAMPAIO (Brazil) said that he failed to see how the Secretariat could ensure that “Member States adhere to and implement all relevant safety, security and safeguards-related standards”, since most of the codes and other instruments in question were not legally binding.
31. The representatives of CUBA, ALGERIA and the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN expressed support for the comments made by the representatives of the Philippines and Brazil.
32. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, expressing support for the proposal made by the representative of the Czech Republic, said that, in his view, the proposed additional text was simply additional guidance regarding how Agency technical cooperation projects should be designed and implemented.
33. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to move on to subsequent paragraphs.
34. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM suggested that, in paragraph 14, the words “requests also that the supply of equipment to Member States” be deleted.
35. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, supported by the representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, proposed the insertion, after paragraph 14, of a paragraph reading “Requests that the Secretariat provide Member States with greater information on proposed technical

cooperation projects well in advance of their consideration by the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Committee and by the Board of Governors. Such information should provide Member States with the basis for concluding that proposed projects are feasible, well planned, and adequately funded and take into account relevant non-proliferation undertakings, international health and safety standards, and compliance with obligations vis-à-vis the Agency”.

36. The representative of the PHILIPPINES said that it was for the Secretariat, not Member States, to assess proposals for technical cooperation projects and determine whether they complied with the relevant requirements. Technical officers within the Secretariat had the expertise necessary for doing that.

37. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that many Member States also had the necessary expertise and that the authorities in his own country greatly valued the opportunity to assess technical cooperation project proposals and determine whether they complied with the relevant requirements. The earlier such proposals were made available to Member States, and the greater the information provided, the better that task could be performed and the more likely it was that all the proposals would be endorsed by the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Committee.

38. His proposal addressed one of the main recommendations made by the United States Government Accountability Office in its March 2009 report entitled “Nuclear Nonproliferation: Strengthened Oversight Needed to Address Proliferation and Management Challenges in IAEA’s Technical Cooperation Program”.

39. The representative of MALAYSIA expressed surprise at the proposal made by the representative of the United States. The Secretariat had often explained its procedures for assessing technical cooperation project proposals in accordance with comprehensive guidelines on safety, non-proliferation, requesting Member State priorities, etc. before submitting them to the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Committee. She hoped that the proposal was not intended to imply a lack of confidence in the Secretariat.

40. The representative of FRANCE, expressing support for the proposal, said that the earlier provision of greater information to Member States would enable the Board of Governors to fulfil its obligations under Article XI.E of the Statute.

41. The representative of ITALY, expressing support for the proposal, said that her country was concerned about the small amount of information received by it on technical cooperation project proposals.

42. Mr ORTIGÃO de SAMPAIO (Brazil) said that, in his view, information on proposed technical cooperation projects should be made available to Member States further in advance. However, he considered the amount of information now being provided to be sufficient.

43. The representative of CANADA said that the principal issue was that of timing.

44. The representative of CUBA said that any change in the amount of information to be provided to Member States would have to be agreed upon by prospective recipient Member States.

45. The representative of the BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA said that his country had full confidence in the ability of the Secretariat to properly assess technical cooperation project proposals.

46. The representative of ALGERIA said that the Secretariat already assessed technical cooperation project proposals against a range of criteria, relating to — inter alia — safety, security and safeguards.

47. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that his proposal was in no way intended to imply any lack of trust in the technical capabilities of the Secretariat.
48. His delegation had for some time been engaged in dialogue with Agency technical cooperation staff regarding how the contributions of the United States of America could best be used to the benefit of other Member States and promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy — an issue in which considerable interest was being shown by the United States Congress.
49. He proposed the insertion, after paragraph 16, of a paragraph identical with paragraph 6 of the recommended ‘general’ draft resolution on non-power applications of nuclear science, technology and applications (in document GC(54)/COM.5/L.3/Rev.1), which read “Welcomes all contributions announced by Member States, including the IAEA Peaceful Uses Initiative, which is designed to raise US\$ 100 million over the next five years as extrabudgetary contributions to IAEA activities, and encourages all States in a position to do so to make additional contributions”.
50. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN proposed the insertion in paragraph 16 of wording along the lines of “such extrabudgetary resources should be allocated to all Member States on a non-discriminatory basis”.
51. The representative of the CZECH REPUBLIC, referring to paragraph 23, said that the SAGTAC recommendations mentioned there were the subject of an internal Secretariat report not made available to Member States. She proposed that the words “and notes the recommendations of SAGTAC in this regard” be deleted.
52. The representative of MALAYSIA asked whether SAGTAC consisted of representatives of Member States.
53. The representative of the DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION said that the members of SAGTAC, an internal advisory body reporting to the Director General, acted in their individual capacities and not on behalf of Member States.
54. The representative of CANADA proposed the insertion, after paragraph 24, of a paragraph reading “Requests that the actions of the Secretariat called for in this resolution be undertaken subject to the availability of resources”.
55. The representatives of the UNITED KINGDOM and FRANCE expressed support for the proposal made by the representative of Canada.
56. The representative of the PHILIPPINES said that it was unclear which actions the representative of Canada had in mind.
57. The representative of CANADA said that he had in mind — for example — the provision of updates on the progress of technical cooperation programme implementation mentioned in paragraph 15.
58. Mr ORTIGÃO de SAMPAIO (Brazil), supported by the representative of the PHILIPPINES, proposed that the words “that all activities not directly related to the implementation of TC projects” be inserted after “in this resolution” in the additional paragraph proposed by the representative of Canada.

The meeting rose at 9.50 p.m.