

General Conference

GC(57)/COM.5/OR.5

Issued: October 2013

General Distribution

Original: English

Fifty-seventh regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Fifth Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Thursday, 19 September 2013, at 10.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr STRATFORD (United States of America)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹		Paragraphs
18	Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications (<i>continued</i>)	1–9
17	Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities	10–56

¹ GC(57)/24.

18. Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications (continued) (GC(57)/COM.5/L.14 and L.15)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up the draft resolution contained in document GC(57)/COM.5/L.14, entitled "Renovation of the Agency's Nuclear Applications Laboratories at Seibersdorf".
2. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA, introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said it described progress made regarding the Project for the Renovation of the Nuclear Applications Laboratories in Seibersdorf (the ReNuAL project). The target date for breaking ground was in September 2014, and Member States were invited to make financial commitments and contributions and in-kind contributions in order to allow the project to be completed as soon as possible.
3. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(57)/COM.5/L.14.
4. It was so agreed.
5. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up the draft resolution contained in document GC(57)/COM.5/L.15, entitled "Plan for producing potable water economically using small and medium-sized nuclear reactors".
6. The representative of EGYPT, introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that shortages of potable water were of growing concern in many countries, particularly developing ones.
7. The draft resolution, which focused on seawater desalination, reflected most of the comments made by the representatives of interested Member States not belonging to the Group.
8. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(57)/COM.5/L.15.
9. It was so agreed.

17. Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities (GC(57)/INF/4 and Supplement; GC(57)/COM.5/L.13)

10. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up the draft resolution contained in document GC(57)/COM.5/L.13, entitled "Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities".
11. The representative of PAKISTAN, introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said it was essentially the same as resolution GC(56)/RES/11, with updates based mainly on the Technical Cooperation Report for 2012.

12. The representative of CANADA proposed that paragraph (b) of Section 1 be split into three separate paragraphs.

13. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee accepted Section 1 of the draft resolution as orally amended.

14. It was so agreed.

15. The representative of UKRAINE, supported by the representatives of BELARUS and EGYPT, requested that paragraph 5 of Section 2 of resolution GC(56)/RES/11 (“Requests the Secretariat to continue, within the framework of the TC Programme, to work actively to render assistance and radiological support to the most affected countries in mitigating the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster and rehabilitating the contaminated territories”) be inserted between paragraphs 4 and 5 in Section 2.

16. The representative of AUSTRALIA proposed that in paragraph 5 of Section 2 the phrase “particularly in the light of the lessons learned from the Fukushima accident” be replaced by “to identify and implement the lessons learned from the Fukushima accident”.

17. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee accepted Section 2 of the draft resolution as orally amended.

18. It was so agreed.

19. The representative of CANADA proposed that the words “and the roles and responsibilities of donor countries” be added at the end of paragraph (a) of Section 3.

20. The representative of EGYPT said that she did not understand the logic of that proposal.

21. The representative of CANADA said that his country considered TC projects to be a shared responsibility of recipient Member States and donor countries.

22. Perhaps paragraph (a) could be placed in square brackets for the time being.

23. The representative of AUSTRALIA, noting that paragraph (e) was new text, asked why it was in Section 3 and not Section 4 (Technical Cooperation Programme Resources and Delivery). In any event, his delegation had problems with the idea of recognising “the importance of aligning the number of Agency staff with the needs of Member States”.

24. The representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union, expressed support for the comments made by the representative of Australia and proposed that the phrase “within available resources”, which appeared in paragraph 2, be inserted also in paragraph (e).

25. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA, noting that paragraphs (e) and 2 were linked, said that paragraph (e) was in Section 3 because, in the opinion of the Group of 77 and China, the effectiveness of technical cooperation programme implementation depended on the capacity of Agency staff.

26. The CHAIRMAN suggested that paragraphs (e) and 2 of Section 3 be placed in square brackets.

27. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, supported by the representative of ITALY, speaking on behalf of the European Union, proposed the insertion of “continuing” before “efforts of the Secretariat to rationalize the number of TC projects” in paragraph 3.

28. The representative of CANADA proposed, with respect to paragraph (a) of Section 4, the replacement of the words “the financing of TC should be in line with the concept of shared responsibility” by “TC projects should be undertaken in line with the concept of shared responsibility”

and said that, if that proposal were acceptable to the Committee, he would withdraw his proposal relating to paragraph (a) of Section 3.

29. The representative of CUBA noted that paragraph (a) of Section 4 of the draft resolution was identical with the corresponding paragraph in resolution GC(56)/RES/11 and said that she could not understand why the representative of Canada was proposing that it be changed.

30. The representative of CANADA said that, if his proposal in respect of paragraph (a) of Section 4 was not acceptable, he would maintain his proposal in respect of paragraph (a) of Section 3.

31. The representative of EGYPT said that in 2010 the Group of 77 and China had agreed, in a spirit of compromise, to the insertion of the words “as well as the transparency” after “the effectiveness and efficiency” in the paragraph corresponding to paragraph (a) of Section 3 of the resolution now under consideration. Consequently, her delegation would have great difficulty in accepting the addition to paragraph (a) of Section 3 proposed by the representative of Canada.

32. The CHAIRMAN requested the delegations of Egypt and Canada and other interested delegations to hold consultations on paragraphs (a), (e) and 2 of Section 3 and paragraph (a) of Section 4.

33. The representative of CUBA wondered whether the representative of Canada could accept the following wording for paragraph (a) of Section 4: “Recalling that TC projects, including their financing, should be undertaken in line with ...”.

34. The representative of COSTA RICA said that paragraph (a) of Section 3 represented a delicate balance achieved in difficult negotiations, and therefore his delegation did not want any changes to be made to it. Moreover, his delegation could not go along with the proposal made by the representative of Canada regarding paragraph (a) of Section 4.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that paragraph (a) of Section 3 and paragraph (a) of Section 4 would be placed in square brackets.

36. The representative of ITALY, supported by the representatives of BELGIUM, LATVIA, GERMANY and the NETHERLANDS, proposed that the word “welcoming” in paragraph (b) of Section 4 be replaced by “taking note of”.

37. The representatives of EGYPT, PAKISTAN, SOUTH AFRICA, BRAZIL and COLOMBIA called for retention of the word “welcoming”.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that paragraph (b) of Section 4 would be placed in square brackets.

39. The representative of GERMANY proposed that in paragraph (h) of Section 4 “Emphasizing” be replaced by “Bearing in mind” and “welcoming” by “taking note of”.

40. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that paragraph (h) of Section 4 should contain a reference to the relevant Board document.

41. The representative of PAKISTAN said that the relevant Board document would be document GOV/2011/37.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that paragraph (h) of Section 4 would be placed in square brackets.

43. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, referring to paragraph 6 of Section 4, proposed that the phrase “to ensure that TC activities are not hampered and project implementation is not delayed by denials of necessary equipment supply to Member States” be replaced by “to ensure that

prompt provision of information allows for timely decision-making on export control issues to prevent unnecessary delays in TC activities”.

44. The representative of ITALY, supported by the representative of AUSTRALIA, said that his delegation, which shared the concerns of the delegation of the United Kingdom regarding paragraph 6, would prefer that paragraph to be deleted.

45. The representative of EGYPT said that her delegation could not go along with the deletion of paragraph 6.

46. Denials of necessary equipment supply were a major concern for recipient countries whose technical cooperation projects, already initiated, were interrupted by delays in the supply of equipment that the Secretariat had cleared for delivery in accordance with Agency rules and regulations. More confidence should be placed in the Secretariat.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that paragraph 6 of Section 4 would be placed in square brackets.

48. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, referring to paragraph 10 of Section 4, proposed that the words “to continue” be inserted after “Secretariat” in the phrase “Requests the Secretariat to develop a formal process”.

49. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee accepted that proposal.

50. It was so agreed.

51. The representative of ITALY, referring to paragraph 13 of Section 4, said that it posed the same problem for his delegation as paragraph (b) of Section 4. In his delegation’s view, paragraph 13 should be deleted.

52. The representative of LATVIA proposed replacing “convening (or formulation)” in paragraph 13 by “establishing”, since the working group in question had not been established yet.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that paragraph 13 would be placed in square brackets.

54. The representative of BELGIUM, referring to paragraph (g) of Section 5, said that it spoke of “the IAEA’s contribution to health and prosperity through applications of nuclear energy”, whereas the text previously circulated had read “the contribution of the IAEA in nuclear applications for peaceful uses, health, and prosperity”. In his view, the latter wording was preferable.

55. The representative of ITALY expressed support for the comment made by the representative of Belgium.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that paragraph (g) of Section 5 would be placed in square brackets.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.