



IAEA

60 Years

Atoms for Peace and Development

General Conference

GC(60)/COM.5/OR.8

Issued: December 2016

General Distribution

Original: English

Sixtieth regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Eighth Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Thursday, 29 September 2016, at 2.40 p.m.

Chair: Mr CSERVENY (Hungary)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹	Paragraphs
14 Nuclear security (<i>continued</i>)	1–98

¹ GC(60)/COM.5/1.

Abbreviations used in this record:

CPPNM	Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material
NPT	Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
NSF	Nuclear Security Fund

14. Nuclear security (continued)

(GC(60)/11; GC(60)/INF/9; GC(60)/COM.5/L.11 and Add.1)

1. The CHAIR invited the Committee to consider the paragraphs in draft resolution GC(60)/COM.5/L.11 that had not yet been discussed.
2. The representative of NAMIBIA expressed support for the amendment to paragraph (q) proposed by the representative of South Africa.
3. The representative of CANADA, echoing the comments made on paragraph (q) by the representatives of the United States of America and the Russian Federation, said that, while Canada agreed to include references to the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, it could not agree to insert direct quotations therefrom.
4. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, echoing the comments made by the representative of Canada, objected to paragraph (q) and suggested that the Member States should instead look forward to the next NPT review cycle.
5. The representative of POLAND said that, although his country was in favour of the amendment proposed by the representative of Switzerland, it could not support its inclusion in the draft resolution because it did not fall within the remit of the Agency's Statute. If proposed at a suitable forum in Switzerland, Poland could then support the text.
6. Poland was not in favour of the amendment proposed to paragraph (q).
7. The representative of PAKISTAN said that his country could not agree to the proposal by the representative of South Africa to insert wording drawn from the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference into paragraph (q). If it were inserted, Pakistan would insist on the deletion of the entire paragraph.
8. The representative of SWITZERLAND, in an endeavour to achieve consensus on the amended paragraph proposed by his country, requested that "by relevant States" be inserted after "encouraging voluntary measures" in order to refer to the responsibility of the State in that regard.
9. He supported the amendment to paragraph (q) proposed by the representative of South Africa, and called for further discussions on paragraph (f).
10. The representative of EGYPT, referring to paragraph (s), proposed that "to provide and allocate" be replaced by "to consider providing and allocating", given the nature of the funding sought for the Agency's nuclear security activities.
11. Egypt supported the calls to delete paragraph (t), as the wording used therein would disturb the balance between the Agency's promotional and non-promotional activities and between the three pillars of its mandate.
12. Egypt was in favour of reinstating in paragraph (y) the wording used in the 2015 resolution, for the changes proposed in the current draft resolution were at variance with the considerable efforts made in previous years in formulating that draft resolution.
13. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, referring to paragraph (v), stressed the need to separate the reference to the Amendment to the CPPNM from the reference to the Nuclear

Security Recommendations on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and Nuclear Facilities out of concern that “graded approach” and “the ongoing work by the Agency on further guidance” seemed to apply also to the Amendment. He proposed that the reference to States’ obligations under the Amendment be moved to paragraph (m).

14. Turning to paragraph (y), he called for the wording used in paragraph (v) of the previous year’s resolution to be reinstated. Questioning the unprecedented use of the expression “alternative nuclear technologies”, he stressed that efforts to promote such technologies should not detract from the Agency’s performance of its duties in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear technology.

15. The representative of MALAYSIA supported the amendment to paragraph (q) proposed by the representative of South Africa and the reinstatement in paragraph (s) of the wording used in paragraph (q) of the previous year’s resolution because it reflected Member States’ commitments more accurately.

16. The representative of the SUDAN supported the amendment to paragraph (q) proposed by the representative of South Africa.

17. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA endorsed the views expressed by the representative of Egypt on paragraphs (s), (t) and (y).

18. With regard to paragraph (y), South Africa supported the reinstatement of the compromise wording achieved after protracted discussions on the previous year’s resolution, and endorsed the related comments by the representative of the Russian Federation.

19. The representative of BRAZIL, referring to paragraph (s), supported the reinstatement of the wording used in paragraph (q) of the previous year’s resolution. Brazil considered that the connotation of “allocate” in the draft resolution was unclear and that adoption of the proposed paragraph could lead to undue interference in the distribution of technical, human and financial resources.

20. Brazil considered paragraph (t) to be unnecessary, for there were no similar provisions on other aspects of the Agency’s statutory work and there was therefore no reason to give special priority to nuclear security.

21. With regard to paragraph (y), it supported the reinstatement of the wording used in paragraph (v) of the previous year’s resolution, which was the result of a delicate compromise, and it voiced concern over the meaning of “alternative nuclear technologies”.

22. The representative of INDONESIA, referring to paragraph (s), said that there was no reason to change “consider providing” to “provide and allocate”, as proposed in the draft resolution. As an NSF contributor, Indonesia was of the view that Member States had contributed sufficient resources to enable the Agency to carry out its nuclear security activities.

23. Indonesia supported the deletion of paragraph (t), noting that some areas of the Agency’s work had no bearing whatsoever on nuclear security.

24. Referring to paragraph (y), Indonesia supported the reinstatement of the wording used in the previous year’s resolution, considering that the Agency should not be promoting alternative technologies.

25. The representative of CUBA shared the concerns voiced over paragraphs (s) and (t).

26. In regard to paragraph (j), Cuba supported the reinstatement of the wording used in the previous year’s resolution.

27. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, while wishing to retain paragraph (s) as submitted, proposed that “appropriate” be replaced by “reliable and sufficient”.
28. He echoed the concerns expressed by other Member States about paragraph (t) and proposed that, in paragraph (u), “any nuclear safety or security emergency” be replaced by “any nuclear or radiological emergency”.
29. He stressed that the aim of paragraph (y) was to promote technical exchanges, not technologies. In the light of the concerns expressed, he proposed that “alternative nuclear technologies” be replaced by “alternative technologies within the IAEA’s purview”.
30. The representative of GUATEMALA, referring to paragraph (s), called for the agreed wording used in the previous year’s resolution to be reinstated because “allocating” implied that resources would be transferred from other programmes, to which Guatemala could not agree, as the Agency had a zero nominal growth budget. Guatemala supported the amendment proposed by the representative of the United States of America on condition that “provide” was retained, and it considered that the same wording should be used for all of the Agency’s programmes.
31. Guatemala supported the reinstatement in paragraphs (t) and (y) of the agreed wording used in the previous year’s resolution in each case.
32. The representative of SINGAPORE, referring to paragraph (s), supported the reinstatement of the wording used in paragraph (q) of the previous year’s resolution.
33. The representative of SWITZERLAND, referring to paragraphs (s) and 8, supported the reinstatement of the wording used in the previous year’s resolution in each case.
34. The representative of ALGERIA, referring to paragraph (s), supported the reinstatement of the wording used in the previous year’s resolution.
35. He called for paragraph (t) to be deleted and questioned the rationale behind its inclusion, as it seriously threatened the alienable right of all States party to the NPT to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.
36. The representative of CANADA was in favour of retaining paragraph (s) as submitted, for it was appropriate to ensure that the Agency had sufficient resources at its disposal to perform its nuclear security work. Canada would therefore consider supporting the proposal submitted by the representative of the United States of America.
37. Canada supported the ideas contained in paragraph (y) and considered that the proposal submitted by the representative of the United States of America could provide a suitable solution to the concerns expressed by other representatives.
38. The representative of INDIA was in favour of retaining paragraph (s) as submitted, stressing the importance of nuclear security and the need for the Agency’s resources to be sufficient, predictable and reliable.
39. India was in favour of deleting paragraph (t), as it would be difficult and time-consuming for the Agency to reassess all of its technical programmes, and of retaining paragraph (y) as submitted. India would consider the proposal submitted by the representative of the United States of America.
40. The representative of CHILE, referring to paragraphs (s) and (y), called for the wording used in the previous year’s resolution to be reinstated in both cases and considered that the proposals made by the representative of the United States of America could provide suitable solutions.
41. Chile was in favour of deleting paragraph (t).

42. The representative of MOROCCO, referring to paragraph (s), supported the reinstatement of the wording used in the previous year's resolution, which would obviate the need for paragraph (t).

43. The representative of ECUADOR, referring to paragraphs (s), (y) and 8, was in favour of reinstating the wording used in the previous year's resolution in each case.

44. Ecuador called for paragraph (t) to be deleted because the resolution was no place for such specific management issues.

45. The representative of JAPAN was in favour of retaining paragraph (s) as submitted and pointed out that "allocate" and "relocate" were not necessarily synonymous. He supported the proposal submitted by the representative of the United States of America on the subject.

46. As "alternative nuclear technologies" in paragraph (y) was ambiguous, Japan supported the clarifying proposal made by the representative of the United States of America.

47. The representative of NIGERIA, referring to paragraph (s), supported the reinstatement of the wording used in the previous year's resolution, which was clearer.

48. Nigeria was in favour of deleting paragraph (t), which added nothing to the meaning of the resolution because the Agency was already cognisant of the need to take nuclear security into account when conducting its activities.

49. He supported the amendment to paragraph (q) proposed by the representative of South Africa, stressing the dire consequences of any nuclear security misadventure and need for the Agency and Member States to be cognisant of the possible humanitarian consequences.

50. The representative of PERU was in favour of the reinstatement in paragraphs (s) and (y) of the wording used in the previous year's resolution.

51. Peru called for paragraph (t) to be deleted.

52. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN proposed that "Nuclear Security Summits" be replaced by "nuclear security summits" in paragraph (k).

53. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that his country's comments on paragraph (f) also applied to paragraph 4.

54. The representative of ALGERIA said that his country's comments on paragraph (f) also applied to paragraph 4.

55. Algeria's comments on paragraph (t) also applied to paragraph 6 and it was in favour of reinstating the agreed wording used in the previous year's resolution. It proposed that paragraph 7 be deleted inasmuch as the measures for strengthening nuclear security could have an impact on the inalienable right of the States party to the NPT to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

56. The representative of BRAZIL, referring to paragraph 2, proposed that "all" be inserted before "nuclear and other radioactive material" to ensure consistency with paragraph (e).

57. Brazil's comments on paragraph (f) also applied to paragraph 4, which must, therefore, reflect any agreed changes made to paragraph (f).

58. Brazil was in favour of reinstating in paragraph 7 the wording used in the previous year's resolution inasmuch as the current draft resolution did not give any assurances that efforts to strengthen nuclear security would not hamper international cooperation.

59. Brazil supported the reinstatement in paragraph 8 of the wording used in the previous year's resolution.

60. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN supported the reinstatement in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of the wording used in the previous year's resolution.

61. Noting that the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism did not include all Member States and was therefore not genuinely global, he proposed that paragraph 16 be replaced by "Encourages the Secretariat to continue, in coordination with Member States to play its central role in nuclear activities among international organizations and initiatives, with their respective mandates and memberships, and request the Secretariat to keep the Member States informed in this regard;"

62. The representative of SWITZERLAND supported the amendment to paragraph 2 proposed by the representative of Brazil.

63. Switzerland proposed that "finally calls on the IAEA, as the depository of the CPPNM, to convene a conference of States Parties to review the implementation of the Convention and its adequacy in accordance with Article 16 of the Convention" be inserted at the end of paragraph 9.

64. The representative of EGYPT supported the comments made on paragraphs 2, 7 and 8 by the representative of Brazil, as the wording used in the previous year's resolution sufficed in all three cases.

65. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, referring to paragraphs (f) and 4, proposed that the text of paragraph (f) be replaced by "Recognizing that challenges to nuclear security are evolving and acknowledging the need to remain aware of the positive and negative implications for nuclear security of new and existing technologies," and that paragraph 4 be replaced by "Encourages the Secretariat to assist Member States, upon request, in assessing potential positive and negative implications for nuclear security of new and existing technologies".

66. The United Kingdom objected to the amendment to paragraph 2 proposed by the representative of Brazil, noting that the issue was covered by paragraphs (e) and (n).

67. It also objected to the amendment to paragraph 9 proposed by the representative of Switzerland, considering that it was premature to call for a conference on the matter; efforts should focus, rather, on full implementation of the Amendment to the CPPNM.

68. The representatives of SINGAPORE, IRELAND, NEW ZEALAND and MEXICO supported the amendment to paragraph 2 proposed by the representative of Brazil and called for the wording used in the previous year's resolution to be reinstated in paragraph 8.

69. The representative of SOUTH AFRICA supported the amendment to paragraph 2 proposed by the representative of Brazil.

70. South Africa's comments on paragraph (f) also applied to paragraph 4, but it would also consider the other proposals.

71. South Africa was in favour of reinstating in paragraph 7 the wording used in the previous year's resolution, for the draft resolution, as currently worded, weakened the message that all States were under an obligation to ensure that measures to strengthen nuclear security did not hamper international cooperation.

72. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION objected to paragraph 9, which lacked clarity as currently worded, and thus added no value.

73. The Russian Federation was in favour of reinstating in paragraph 13 the wording used in the previous year's resolution. It had strong concerns about "achieving a suitable balance" inasmuch as the Agency programmes differed so much that it would be inappropriate to strive for balance between them. It cautioned against exaggerating the importance of nuclear security, which was but a subset of programmes in the Department of Safety and Security. Furthermore, the reference to "maximising their effectiveness and efficiency" was not relevant to the paragraph.

74. As the reference in paragraph 14 to the development of additional guidance on the areas listed had serious implications for the application of safeguards, the Russian Federation was willing to engage in further discussions on the subject but considered that such references were for the moment premature.

75. The representative of MOROCCO was in favour of amending the wording of paragraph 7 to that used in the resolution in 2015, namely "Calls upon" rather than "Affirms", and of deleting "but rather contribute" after "do not hamper". Those slight changes in wording would result in substantial changes in meaning and would reinstate the intention that had lain originally behind the paragraph.

76. She supported the proposals to amend "to provide" in paragraph 8 to "to consider providing", as in the 2015 resolution, and to insert "all" before "nuclear and other radioactive material during use" in paragraph 2.

77. The representative of CHINA, supported by the representatives of COSTA RICA and CHILE, spoke in favour of the amendment to paragraph 7 proposed by the representative of Morocco and of the insertion of "all" into paragraph 2, as suggested by the representative of Brazil.

78. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA stressed that the wording of paragraph 7 supported the inalienable right of Member States to pursue peaceful uses of nuclear technology and had been modified from that used in previous resolutions to be more affirmative in tone, on the assumption that nuclear security was supported universally. In response to other Member States' concerns, he would agree to amend "Affirms" at the beginning of the paragraph to "Calls upon", but considered that "but rather contribute" should remain unchanged.

79. He supported the current wording of paragraph 8, for it addressed to some extent concerns that the nuclear security programme was neither sustainable nor capable of meeting Member States' needs and expectations, without sufficient NSF and Regular Budget support.

80. The representative of INDONESIA supported the amendment to paragraph 2 proposed by the representative of Brazil, and to paragraph 8, for the reasons given when supporting the corresponding preambular paragraphs.

81. Indonesia considered that the amendment to the wording of paragraph 7 proposed by the representative of Morocco importantly reassured Member States that they would be able to exercise the right to peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Indonesia could not support the text as currently worded.

82. The representative of JAPAN was in favour of the amendment to paragraph 2 proposed by the representative of Brazil and of the amendment to paragraph 7 proposed by the representative of the United States of America, stressing, in regard to the latter paragraph, that the concept of inalienable right was important, as was that of nuclear security which could further international cooperation and was beneficial to Member States.

83. The representative of CUBA agreed that the wording of paragraph 4 should reflect the consensus on paragraph (f). She agreed to the proposed amendment to paragraph 7 to reflect

the wording to that used in 2015 and thus ensure that measures taken to strengthen nuclear security would not call into question States' inalienable rights to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

84. Cuba supported the proposed amendment to the wording of paragraph 8, reinstating that used in 2015. It also supported the proposal by the representative of the Russian Federation to insert "Parties" into paragraph 9 in order to refer to the States Parties to the Convention.

85. The representative of FRANCE said that she did not support the proposed amendment to paragraph 2, for it added no value to the paragraph because "all" had already been included in paragraph (e).

86. The representative of CANADA called for the wording of paragraph 2 to remain unchanged, for although she saw the value of correlating preambular with operative paragraphs, the former sometimes contained broader goals and views that exceeded the Agency's mandate, which would be the case if "all" were inserted.

87. Canada had appreciated the attempts to word paragraph 7 more positively, by affirming that nuclear security could contribute to peaceful uses of nuclear energy, but could agree to amended wording that preserved elements of positive wording.

88. Canada strongly supported the wording of paragraph 8 because nuclear security was beneficial to all States and it was therefore important to ensure that the Agency had sufficient resources. It called for the wording of paragraph 13 to be preserved as a framework for identifying efficiencies and synergies. It considered that the wording of paragraph 14 addressed specific cybersecurity issues, and would engage in discussions to address Member States' concerns about safeguards-related connotations in the wording.

89. The representative of INDIA called for the wording of paragraph 8 to remain unchanged because sufficient and predictable resources must be provided to enable the Agency to carry out its nuclear security activities. India also called for the wording of paragraph 2 to remain unchanged.

90. The representative of the REPUBLIC OF KOREA supported the amendment proposed to the wording of paragraph 4 to ensure consistency with the proposed amendment to the wording of paragraph (f).

91. Her country called for the wording of paragraph 8 and paragraph (s) to remain unchanged, stressing that the Agency's nuclear security allocations were far from sustainable, relied heavily on extraordinary budget resources and were constrained by a high staff turnover.

92. The representative of the NETHERLANDS was prepared to insert "all" into paragraph 2, but noted that, as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution, the Netherlands supported the current wording in its entirety. It was prepared to change "States" in paragraph 9 to "Parties to the Convention", but pointed out that the reference to parties to the Amendment to the CPPNM would thus be lost. The current wording had been intended to allow the Agency to urge Member States that had not yet ratified the Amendment to do so.

93. The Netherlands did not support the amendment to the wording to paragraph 9 proposed by the representative of Switzerland, considering that it was premature to call for the review conference for which the CPPNM and the Amendment thereto provided.

94. The Netherlands acknowledged the proposals to amend the wording of paragraph 7 to reinstate that of the 2015 resolution. It called, nonetheless, for the wording to be considered with a view to preserving the current positive wording, as suggested by the representatives of Canada and the United States of America, in order to ensure sufficient financial, political and technical support for

the Agency's work. It considered that every Member State should be able to provide political support by participating in the General Conference at ministerial level, for example.

95. The representative of the SUDAN supported the insertion of "all" into paragraph 2, as proposed by the representative of Brazil.

96. The Sudan was in favour of the reinstatement in paragraph 7 of the wording used in 2015 and called for the first phrase in paragraph 8 to be amended to "Calls upon Member States in a position to do so to provide the necessary technical and financial support".

97. The representative of ECUADOR supported the insertion of "all" into paragraph 2, as proposed by the representative of Brazil. She supported the reinstatement in paragraph 7 of the wording used in the 2015 resolution, there being no need to change the import of the previous year's text. She also supported the reinstatement in paragraph 8 of the wording used in the 2015 resolution.

98. The representative of BELGIUM spoke in favour of paragraph 8 as currently worded, stressing that the wording "political, technical and financial" was sufficiently broad to cover the views of all Member States.

The meeting rose at 3.45 p.m.