

General Conference

GC(54)/COM.5/OR.7

Issued: December 2010

General Distribution

Original: English

Fifty-fourth regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Seventh Meeting

Held at the Austria Center Vienna, on Friday, 24 September 2010, at 10.50 a.m.

Chairman : Mr GARCÍA REVILLA (Peru)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹		Paragraphs
15	Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities <i>(continued)</i>	1–29
21	Elections to the Agency's Staff Pension Committee	30–32

¹ GC(54)/COM.5/1.

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

1. The CHAIRMAN, inviting the Committee to resume its consideration of the draft resolution contained in document GC(54)/COM.5/L.11, requested Mr Ortigão de Sampaio of the delegation of Brazil, who was chairing the working group that was considering the draft resolution in detail, to report further on the group's deliberations.
2. Mr ORTIGÃO de SAMPAIO (Brazil) said that the working group had reached agreement on this insertion, after paragraph 27, of a paragraph reading “Requests that the actions called for in this resolution that are not directly related to the implementation of TC projects be undertaken subject to the availability of resources”.
3. Regarding paragraph 16, the working group recommended the deletion of the second and third clauses — starting: “welcomes the extrabudgetary contributions...” and “and encourages those States to show more flexibility...”, — and the addition, following it, of a paragraph reading “Welcomes all extrabudgetary 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, encourages all States in a position to do so to make additional contributions, and also encourages those States to show flexibility in the use of their contributions in order to enable the implementation of more footnote-a/ projects”.
4. With regard to the additional paragraph proposed by the representative of the United States of America for inclusion after paragraph 14, several delegations were of the view that the most important element of the proposed text was the requested provision of information well in advance of its consideration by TACC and the Board and that the sentence starting “Such information should...” could be deleted.
5. The representatives of CANADA, the UNITED KINGDOM and SOUTH AFRICA expressed themselves in favour of that deletion.
6. The representative of MALAYSIA, having also expressed herself in favour of the deletion, said that “greater information” and “well in advance” were somewhat subjective. She proposed amending the remaining text to read “...provide Member States with the draft proposed technical cooperation programme in advance of its consideration by the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Committee...”.
7. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA disagreed. With that formulation, the Secretariat would merely be requested to do something it already did.
8. The present practice of providing information about the proposed technical cooperation projects only about two weeks before the meetings of TACC gave Member States very little time in which to study that information and draw conclusions about — inter alia — the technical feasibility and the funding of the proposed projects.
9. His delegation, which had repeatedly raised the issue with the Secretariat, was grateful that in 2010 the information on proposed projects was to be provided six weeks in advance, but in its view there was room for still further improvement.

10. That having been said, he was open to proposals regarding alternatives to “greater information” and “well in advance”.

11. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC said that the information on proposed technical cooperation projects that was submitted to TACC and the Board reflected lengthy consultations, sometimes lasting as long as 18 months, between, on one hand, the requesting Member States and, on the other, the Secretariat. In the course of those consultations, the Secretariat satisfied itself as regards — inter alia — the technical feasibility and the funding of the proposed projects.

12. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that, if consultations between the Secretariat and requesting Member States could last as long as 18 months, it was unreasonable to expect experts in other Member States to properly assess the resulting information within two to six weeks.

13. Also, his Government would appreciate it if the Secretariat could provide Member States with more comprehensive technical information about proposed projects.

14. The representative of INDIA proposed replacing “well in advance” by “sufficiently in advance”.

15. The representatives of FRANCE, the UNITED KINGDOM and the NETHERLANDS endorsed that proposal.

16. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC proposed replacing “greater information”, which was a rather subjective concept, by “relevant information”.

17. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that “relevant information” was an equally subjective concept. He proposed replacing “greater information” by “adequate information”.

18. The representative of the SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC enquired about basis on which it would be decided that the information provided was “adequate”.

19. The representative of MEXICO suggested the inclusion of a reference to the logical framework methodology.

20. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF PROGRAMME SUPPORT AND COORDINATION, DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION suggested the formulation “adequate information on project development according to the logical framework methodology”.

21. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of the Czech Republic whether any progress had been made in informal consultations regarding the proposal made by her for amending paragraph 8.

22. The representative of the CZECH REPUBLIC said that the European Union would still like the paragraph to read as proposed by her.

23. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of the Czech Republic whether any progress had been made in informal consultations regarding the proposal made by her for amending paragraph 13.

24. The representative of the CZECH REPUBLIC, having thanked the delegation of the Philippines for its assistance in the informal consultations that had taken place, suggested that the words “continue ensuring that safety, security and safeguards standards are complied with” in the text proposed by her on behalf of the European Union be replaced by “continue ensuring that safety standards, security guidelines and safeguards measures are complied with”.

25. Mr ORTIGÃO de SAMPAIO (Brazil), supported by the representative of CUBA, said that in his view the suggested new formulation was not an improvement on the original one.

26. The representative of MEXICO said that, when a Member State proposed a technical cooperation project, it agreed to accept the conditions set out in the project document.

27. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, welcoming the comment made by the representative of Mexico, recalled that the Revised Supplementary Agreement, the signing of which by a State should be a precondition for the provision of technical assistance to that State, contained an article entitled "Safety Standards and Measures" and an article 3 entitled "Peaceful Use Undertaking and Safeguards". If the Secretariat ensured that all Member States receiving technical assistance through the Agency signed the Revised Supplementary Agreement (and she believed that some had not), that would be a way of continuing to ensure that the safety standards, security guidelines and safeguards measures were complied with by all technical cooperation projects.

28. The representatives of MALAYSIA and the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that their delegation could not accept language implying preconditions for the provision of technical assistance through the Agency.

29. The CHAIRMAN requested the working group chaired by Mr Ortigão de Sampaio de SAMPAIO, of the delegation of Brazil, to continue its in-depth consideration of the draft resolution contained in document GC(54)/COM.5/L.11.

21. Elections to the Agency's Staff Pension Committee

30. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the General Conference was represented on the Agency's Staff Pension Committee by two members and two alternates. Vacancies existed for two alternate positions and, following consultations, he had been asked to propose that Ms Silva of the delegation of Angola and Ms Cáceres Escalante of the delegation of Peru be elected as alternate members to fill them.

31. He took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that Ms Silva of the delegation of Angola and Ms Cáceres Escalante of the delegation of Peru be elected as alternate members to represent the General Conference on the Agency's Staff Pension Committee.

32. It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.