

General Conference

GC(58)/COM.5/OR.3

Issued: January 2015

General Distribution

Original: English

Fifty-eighth regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Third Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Wednesday, 24 September 2014, at 10.15 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr STUART (Australia)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹		Paragraphs
16	Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications	1–41
15	Strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities	42–80
17	Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards	81–93

¹ GC(58)/22.

Abbreviations used in this record:

FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
HEU	high-enriched uranium
PACT	Programme of Action for Cancer Therapy
TC	technical cooperation
TCF	Technical Cooperation Fund
WGFAA	Working Group on Financing the Agency's Activities

16. Strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications

(GC(58)/18; GC(58)/INF/4 and Additional Information; GC(58)/INF/6 and Corr.1; GC(58)/COM.5/L.4, L.6, L.7, L.8, L.10, L.11 and L.12;)

1. The CHAIRPERSON invited the Committee to take up consideration of the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.4, entitled "Nuclear power applications".
2. The representative of FRANCE, introducing section 1 of the draft resolution ("General"), said that it was an updated version of the corresponding section in the previous year's resolution GC(57)/RES/12, involving some redistribution of paragraphs.
3. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, introducing section 2 ("Agency activities in the development of innovative nuclear technology"), said that it was a logical continuation of the same section in resolution GC(57)/RES/12.
4. The representative of CANADA, introducing section 3 ("Nuclear knowledge management"), said that it included language which had been strengthened in comparison with that of the same section in resolution GC(57)/RES/12.
5. The representative of FRANCE proposed three amendments to the text. In section 1, paragraph (o), "Secretariat" in the last line should be changed to "Agency", and in paragraph 20 of the same section, "aimed at minimizing" should read "working to minimize". In section 3, paragraph (n), "at" in the last line should read "in hosting".
6. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA proposed that in section 1, paragraph (s), "due to" should be replaced with "arising from". In paragraph 18 of the same section "aspects" should be deleted from the second line and "waste management of" in the third line should be replaced with "waste management issues associated with".
7. The CHAIRPERSON took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.4 with those amendments.
8. It was so decided.
9. The CHAIRPERSON invited the Committee to take up consideration of the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.6, entitled "Non power nuclear applications".
10. The representative of INDIA pointed out two typographical errors: there were two paragraphs (q) and in paragraph 13, "direction" should read "direct".
11. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed the deletion of "non-HEU-based" in the fifth line of paragraph (p) and the deletion of its last phrase beginning "and aware of" and ending "monitoring activity". Paragraph (q) should be made broader and more comprehensible with the deletion of "in Europe and elsewhere" in the second line and "non-HEU-based" in the fourth line. In paragraph 13, the words "upon request" should be inserted after "provide" in the first line, and "where technically and economically feasible" added at the end. As for paragraph 14, his delegation did not perceive a threat from xenon radioisotopes or consider that the paragraph added any value; it was superfluous and should be deleted.

12. The representative of BELGIUM, supported by the representatives of FRANCE and the NETHERLANDS, asked why the text of paragraph 14 had been changed from that of the previous year, with deletion of the phrase “such as the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization”. It would be preferable to retain that specific reference.

13. The representative of KAZAKHSTAN considered that the words “non-HEU-based” should be retained in paragraphs (p) and (q). His delegation supported the proposed addition to paragraph 13 of the phrase “where technically and economically feasible”.

14. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said the Agency had always been an independent international organization that took no orders from countries on technical matters and whose recommended findings and conclusions, including those related to the production of medical isotopes, were based on independent discussion. The Agency’s task was not to implement directives formulated outside its confines. The draft resolution should make clear that the production of isotopes, including on the basis of HEU, did not automatically entail some kind of threat. HEU had not been outlawed, and was used legitimately by many countries. Emphasis should not be placed on non-HEU-based production technologies; they were simply options to be considered and exploited where economically warranted and technically feasible.

15. The representative of AUSTRALIA suggested that the draft resolution should indicate in greater detail why there was concern regarding the release of xenon radioisotopes. He did not understand, however, the objection that had just been expressed concerning the issue of HEU-based and non-HEU-based production; certainly the Agency had been working on transitioning from the former towards the latter, but the draft resolution referred only to new facilities, not to existing ones.

16. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA expressed support for the addition in paragraph 13 of the phrase “where technically and economically feasible”.

17. The representative of INDIA also had no objection to that phrase being added to paragraph 13, but said that informal consultations would be needed on the issue regarding non-HEU-based production, which had security implications. As for why the text of paragraph 14 had been changed since the previous year, he said it was felt that “relevant international organizations” alone was much broader than a specific reference to the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization; in any event, it was the sponsors’ understanding that that particular organization would probably not be able to help minimize the generation and release of xenon radioisotopes at the source. The proposal by the representative of the Russian Federation that paragraph 14 be deleted would also need to be considered in informal consultations.

18. The CHAIRPERSON suggested that the sponsors hold informal consultations on the draft resolution with interested parties and report back to the Committee.

19. It was so agreed.

20. The CHAIRPERSON invited the Committee to take up consideration of the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.7, entitled “Support to the African Union’s Pan African Tsetse and Trypanosomosis Eradication Campaign (AU-PATTEC)”.

21. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA, introducing the draft resolution, said that it had been updated to reflect the in-field experience of the Secretariat over the past year.

22. The CHAIRPERSON said he took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.7.

23. It was so decided.

24. The CHAIRPERSON invited the Committee to take up consideration of the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.8, entitled “Plan for producing potable water economically using small and medium-sized nuclear reactors”.

25. The representative of MOROCCO, introducing the draft resolution, said that it reflected developments since the previous session of the General Conference, namely the increased interest among Member States in using nuclear power for seawater desalination and the expansion of the activities of the Technical Working Group on Nuclear Desalination. A new paragraph (l) had been added, referring to the new coordinated research project on the application of advanced low temperature desalination systems to support nuclear power plants and non-electric applications, which had been launched in 2014. There was a new paragraph 4a requesting the Director General to encourage and facilitate technical meetings between technology users and developers to assess and evaluate cogeneration options for using nuclear power for seawater desalination. A new paragraph 7 had also been added, in which the Director General was requested to report on the progress made in the implementation of the resolution to the Board of Governors and to the General Conference at its sixtieth regular session in 2016.

26. Lastly, she drew attention to an error in paragraph (b) in the English version of the draft resolution: “twenty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly” should read “twenty-fourth session of the Human Rights Council of the United Nations General Assembly”. The error would be corrected forthwith.

27. The CHAIRPERSON said he took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.8, as amended.

28. It was so decided.

29. The CHAIRPERSON invited the Committee to take up consideration of the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.10, entitled “Strengthening the support to Member States in food and agriculture”.

30. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA, introducing the draft resolution, said that it was an updated version of resolution GC(56)/RES/12.A.4, worked upon by her country and China, with the support of FAO and the Agency Secretariat.

31. The CHAIRPERSON said he took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.10.

32. It was so decided.

33. The CHAIRPERSON invited the Committee to take up consideration of the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.11, entitled “Renovation of the Agency’s Nuclear Applications Laboratories at Seibersdorf”.

34. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA, introducing the draft resolution, said that resolution GC(57)/RES/12.A.6 had been updated to reflect the developments of the past year relating to the new strategy for the renovation of the nuclear sciences and applications laboratories in Seibersdorf and the addendum thereto.

35. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA proposed that, in paragraph (k), the phrase “where appropriate” should be added after the phrase “the Project Management Team will be drawn”. In paragraph 1, he proposed that the word “adaptive” should be added before “R&D activities”.

36. The CHAIRPERSON said he took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.11, as amended.

37. It was so decided.

38. The CHAIRPERSON invited the Committee to take up consideration of the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.12, entitled “Development of the sterile insect technique for the control or eradication of malaria-, dengue- and other disease-transmitting mosquitoes”.

39. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA, introducing the draft resolution, said that the title was different from that of previous resolutions in that it referred not only to malaria, but also to dengue and other diseases, with the aim of highlighting concerns about the increasing problem posed by the latter diseases. Corresponding changes had also been made in the relevant paragraphs of the draft resolution.

40. The CHAIRPERSON said he took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.12.

41. It was so decided.

15. Strengthening of the Agency’s technical cooperation activities (GC(58)/INF/5 and Supplement; GC(58)/COM.5/L.9)

42. The CHAIRPERSON invited the Committee to take up consideration of the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.9, entitled “Strengthening of the Agency’s technical cooperation activities”.

43. The representative of ARGENTINA, introducing the draft resolution, said that a number of substantive updates had been introduced in comparison with resolution GC(57)/RES/11, adopted at the previous session of the General Conference. Section 2 included a new paragraph (g) referring to the fact that PACT had been relocated to the Department of Technical Cooperation in 2014, with an acknowledgement of the Secretariat’s effort to integrate PACT into the TC programme. Section 4 included a new paragraph (b) referring to the report of the WGFAA, including to examine the ways and means to render resources for the TCF sufficient, assured and predictable, and a new paragraph 14 calling upon Member States and the Secretariat to take the necessary actions on the recommendations made by the WGFAA.

44. The representative of CANADA said that, during the prior consultations, his delegation had proposed a new preambular paragraph and a new operative paragraph which had been discussed but had not been included in the version of the draft resolution before the Committee. He therefore proposed two modified amendments, taking into account the comments made in the consultations. First, his delegation wished to propose a new paragraph (j bis) in section 4 of the draft resolution, reading “Recalling that the Agency’s resources for technical assistance shall be allocated primarily to meet the needs of developing countries and recognizing that Member States may transition away from receipt of technical assistance funded from the Technical Cooperation Fund”. Second, it wished to propose a corresponding new paragraph 14 bis, also in section 4, reading “Welcomes previous decisions of Member States, announced to the Agency’s Board of Governors, that they would no longer receive technical cooperation from the IAEA and urges other Member States in a position to transition away from the receipt of technical assistance funded from the Technical Cooperation Fund to do so in order to make available more Technical Cooperation Fund resources for developing countries, in particular least developed countries”.

45. The representative of ITALY, referring to section 3, paragraph 2, questioned the inclusion of the word “adequate” in relation to the Agency’s staff, which had not appeared in the corresponding paragraph in resolution GC(57)/RES/11. Such wording might imply low quality of the Agency’s technical cooperation staff. He therefore proposed that the wording from the previous year’s resolution should be used, namely “Requests the Secretariat, within available resources, to enhance TC project implementation capacity through ensuring that staff are appropriately allocated at all levels”.

46. With regard to section 3, paragraph 3, his delegation would have preferred to keep the word “rationalize”, as used in GC(57)/RES/11, instead of replacing it with “optimize”. Although reducing the number of projects was not the only dimension of efforts to improve efficiency, it was an important one, and the previous year’s wording acknowledged the Secretariat’s efforts in that regard. However, his delegation could accept the word “optimize” if it were followed by “the quality, the number and the impact of TC projects”.

47. Lastly, in section 4, paragraph (e), only the first part of the corresponding paragraph in resolution GC(57)/RES/11 had been kept; the acknowledgement of the Secretariat’s increased workload in connection with footnote-a/ projects had been omitted. His delegation therefore proposed that the following phrase should be added at the end of the paragraph: “which also results in an increased workload on the Secretariat in terms of project planning and design review”. It was based on the previous year’s wording but was more specific; its addition would make the paragraph more balanced.

48. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA said that the word “adequate” in section 3, paragraph 2 had been intended to refer not to the ability but to the number of Secretariat staff: it was important to ensure that enough staff were appropriately allocated at all levels.

49. The representative of the REPUBLIC OF KOREA said that her delegation supported the Canadian proposal. The Republic of Korea had benefited from the Agency’s technical assistance in the past but since 2010 had been a donor to the TC programme, and her Government would like to see other countries follow suit. Technical cooperation should be focused on those countries with greatest need.

50. The representative of SLOVAKIA said that his delegation could not accept the Canadian proposal.

51. The representative of ARGENTINA, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, although the text proposed by the representative of Canada incorporated some minor adjustments compared with the version discussed during the informal consultations, the substance remained unchanged. The Group was not in a position to endorse its inclusion in a resolution on strengthening of the Agency’s technical cooperation activities.

52. Speaking on behalf of her own country, she noted that, while the Agency’s Statute called for due consideration to be given to the needs of the underdeveloped areas of the world, it also made clear that technical cooperation was open to every Member State. Any decision to relinquish technical cooperation was a matter for the individual country concerned and was not required by any provision of the Statute.

53. She said that the word “adequate” in section 3, paragraph 2, was intended as a reference to the number of staff, not their abilities. However, her delegation recognized the potential ambiguity of the current wording and was willing to work on an alternative formulation.

54. The word “optimize” in section 3, paragraph 3, was intended precisely to convey the idea that a reduction in the number of TC projects should be accompanied by an increase in efficiency. It therefore seemed unnecessary to add the phrase “in quality and number”.

55. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that resource prioritization was critical and thus commended the Republic of Korea for illustrating how the principle of transitioning away from receipt of technical assistance could work in practice. To help achieve consensus, he proposed adding “voluntarily” or “on a voluntary basis” to the two new paragraphs proposed by the Canadian representative.

56. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that the Canadian proposal, especially as amended by the United States of America, was not questioning the rights of States under the Statute to receive technical assistance funded from the TCF. Rather, it was suggesting that States might periodically review whether they still needed such assistance and, if not, they could transition away from it.

57. The representative of ZIMBABWE suggested changing the formulation of section 3, paragraph 2 to read “through ensuring that adequate staff are appropriately allocated at all levels”, to remove ambiguity.

58. The representative of BRAZIL said that any decision to transition away from the receipt of technical assistance funded from the TCF would be a voluntary one made at each country’s discretion. The inclusion of that concept in a resolution aiming to strengthen the Agency’s technical cooperation activities would fail to reflect the position of most countries. Lengthy and complex discussion of that same issue within the WGFAA had failed to produce a consensus, resulting in its omission from the WGFAA’s outcome document.

59. The representative of PAKISTAN said that the decision to receive technical assistance or transition away from it was the prerogative of each State. The draft resolution under discussion was designed to strengthen the Agency’s TC activities; the Canadian proposals acted against that and therefore did not warrant inclusion.

60. The representative of EGYPT noted with appreciation the sovereign decision of some Member States not to draw on the TCF, but stressed that calls to take such decisions should only be expressed from national points of view.

61. She noted the ambiguity in the language of section 3, paragraph 2 and, for clarity’s sake, proposed the formulation “Requests the Secretariat, within available resources, to enhance TC project implementation capacity through ensuring that the TC department is adequately staffed and that staff are appropriately allocated at all levels”.

62. The representative of the NETHERLANDS said that Member States should do everything possible to increase TC transparency and efficiency and make sure that as much of the TCF as possible was available to least developed countries. Countries and economies grew; once they had reached a certain stage, though still in need of technical cooperation from the Agency, those countries did not require funding from the TCF. It was difficult to understand how some delegations could object to that notion and dismiss it out of hand. It should certainly be reflected in the draft resolution and warranted further discussion.

63. The representative of ITALY reiterated his call to return to the formulation of section 3, paragraph 2 in resolution GC(57)/RES/11. The language crafted in 2013 reflected the careful consideration of various aspects, including the adequacy of staff from a quantitative point of view.

64. The representative of THAILAND expressed support for the formulation proposed by the representative of Egypt for section 3, paragraph 2. Regarding the proposals made by the representatives of Canada and the United States of America, her delegation felt that the issue had been appropriately covered in section 4, paragraph (a) rendering the proposals unnecessary.

65. The representative of ARGENTINA said that the formulation proposed by the representative of Egypt for section 3, paragraph 2 of was very reasonable and well crafted, and asked the representative of Italy to clarify the nature of his concerns regarding that paragraph. The proposed wording did not imply a request for better or increased staffing; purely that it be adequate. Adequate staffing of the Department of Technical Cooperation was a prerequisite for strengthening TC activities.

66. In response to the comments made by the representative of the Netherlands, she said that in drawing up the draft resolution set out in GC(58)/COM.5/L.9, the Group of 77 and China had actively avoided the selective quoting of recommendations from the WGFAA's report. That was a sound approach which should apply not only to the contents of the report but also to issues which had not been included therein owing to a lack of consensus. Canada, supported by the Netherlands, had made a proposal within the WGFAA that had involved increasing the efficiency of the TC programme by concentrating available resources among a smaller group of countries. Although the proposal had been discussed extensively, it had thus far failed to gain consensus. Discussion of the Canadian proposal for the draft resolution in question would likewise require long and complex negotiations. The Group of 77 would not be joining consensus on the proposed language.

67. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that the proposals made by the representative of Canada were not acceptable within the context of a discussion on the strengthening of the Agency's TC activities.

68. The representative of CUBA said that the two paragraphs proposed by the representative of Canada implied a limitation or reinterpretation of the legitimate right of Member States to benefit from technical cooperation, which ultimately weakened the text of the Statute as regards technical assistance. The inclusion of the proposed paragraphs in the draft resolution would not provide any added value, as Member States would decide for themselves whether to participate in the TC programme.

69. Regarding section 3, paragraph 2, he recognized the possible ambiguity in the wording. It should not be difficult to agree upon alternative wording.

70. The representative of LATVIA, in reference to the proposals made by the representative of Canada, said that they went against the Agency's Statute and were therefore unacceptable.

71. The representative of ITALY, said that the current wording of section 3, paragraph 2 carried with it an implicit suggestion that there was a need to increase the number of staff. He therefore proposed amending the paragraph to read as follows: "Requests the Secretariat, within available resources, to enhance TC project implementation capacity by ensuring that staff are adequately and appropriately allocated at all levels".

72. The representative of GERMANY expressed a preference for the wording used in section 3, paragraph 2 of resolution GC(57)/RES/11, agreed upon in 2013 as a compromise.

73. The representative of HUNGARY said that his country could not support the Canadian proposal, which failed to take into account the consensus report of the WGFAA.

74. The representative of COLOMBIA said that her delegation could not accept the Canadian proposal as presented, but was prepared, in the spirit of cooperation, to discuss revised language.

75. The representative of PORTUGAL said that her delegation could not accept the proposal made by the representative of Canada. The Agency's Statute stated that the Agency was based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members, and that all members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, should fulfill in good faith the obligation assumed by them in accordance with the Statute. The proposed new paragraphs therefore carried with

them the very serious implication that not all States were acting in good faith with regard to the receipt of technical assistance.

76. The representative of CANADA said that his delegation's proposal was in no way, shape or form suggesting that Member States should not receive technical assistance from the Agency. Indeed, his country wholeheartedly encouraged all States to take advantage of the Agency's tremendous knowledge and experience. However, countries should not accept technical assistance funded from the TCF should they be in a position not to require it: an important distinction that his country wished to make. Nevertheless, it was very much a national prerogative and there was nothing to the contrary in the proposed paragraphs, which merely highlighted that accepting technical assistance funded from the TCF was not an obligation of membership and some Member States might elect not to accept it.

77. Regarding the deliberations of the WGFAA, he said that his delegation had participated very actively in discussions, in particular those regarding resource allocation. There had been no mention in any of its detailed contributions of the notion of transitioning away from receipt of technical assistance funded by the TCF.

78. Canada was not trying to reinterpret the Statute or undermine the rights of Member States; it therefore wholeheartedly supported the amendment proposed by the representative of the United States of America stressing that any transition would be undertaken strictly on a voluntary basis.

79. His delegation was willing to work constructively with Member States to achieve consensus on the proposed paragraphs; the concepts were important but the language was flexible.

80. The CHAIRPERSON requested that all interested parties undertake informal consultations on the unresolved issues and report back to the Committee later.

17. Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards (GC(58)/16 and GC(58)/COM.5/L.2)

81. The CHAIRPERSON invited the representative of Austria to introduce the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.2.

82. The representative of AUSTRIA said that the changes to the draft resolution as compared to the previous year's resolution GC(57)/RES/13 had been kept to a minimum. Besides the usual factual updates, the only change made had been to draft a new paragraph 21 on the State-level concept. The previous year's resolution had called for the Director General to produce a supplementary document to the Report on The Conceptualization and Development of Safeguards Implementation at the State Level (GOV/2013/38). That supplementary document had been issued as document GOV/2014/41 in August 2014 and had been taken up and acted upon by the Board of Governors. The new paragraph 21 of the draft resolution set out in document GC(58)/COM.5/L.2 took stock of that development and said that the General Conference looked forward to open and active dialogue between the Secretariat and the Member States on safeguards matters.

83. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, while expressing appreciation for the readiness with which representatives of the European Union took on the responsibility of preparing the initial draft resolution on safeguards each year, said that the current draft did not reflect the positions of all the Member States, but rather summed up the views of its co-sponsors. Since the draft resolution

reproduced the text of resolution GC(57)RES/13, it was difficult to comment on it as a whole without repeating the previous year's comments.

84. With regard to the new paragraph 21, he noted that although extensive discussions on the State-level concept had taken place over the preceding year, not much progress had been made; the request to the Director General to produce a report on the issue therefore still stood. He hoped that new provisions could be added to the draft resolution that would reflect the main outcomes of the discussions held and provide guidance to the Agency.

85. He suggested that the Committee begin with consideration of the operative paragraphs, thereby focusing on key issues and simplifying the work remaining on the preambular paragraphs.

86. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA suggested considering the familiar and agreed text of the compromise document from the previous year as a whole and then focusing on the new text.

87. The representative of INDIA noted that paragraph 21 was not the only paragraph open for discussion. For example, his delegation would like to make suggestions regarding paragraphs 5 and 6.

88. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that although the text had been acceptable for the previous year's resolution, it was insufficient in the context of the draft resolution now before the Committee. The Committee could not simply agree to the text previously used and focus only on the other parts.

89. The representative of BRAZIL said that starting the discussion with the operative paragraphs was justified, as there could be proposals for new paragraphs in that section.

90. The representative of AUSTRIA said that, considering that all of the issues likely to be raised in the discussion of the draft resolution related to the operative paragraphs, starting the discussion with that section made sense. She suggested proceeding page by page, so that representatives had the opportunity to comment on specific paragraphs.

91. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that, in view of the fact that preambular and operative paragraphs were often linked, the Committee could begin the discussion with the areas where there was proposed new text.

92. The CHAIRPERSON said that representatives should consider the associated preambular language when commenting on operative paragraphs in order to avoid reopening discussions of agreed text at a later stage. He took it that the Committee wished to begin its discussion of the draft resolution with the operative paragraphs, grouping them page by page.

93. It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.