



GC

International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(46)/COM.5/OR.7
October 2002

GENERAL Distr.
Original: ENGLISH

FORTY-SIXTH (2002) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE SEVENTH MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna
on Friday, 20 September 2002, at 11.25 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. MOLTENI (Argentina)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
13	Measures to strengthen international co-operation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety (<i>resumed</i>)	1 - 13
16	Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and application of the Model Additional Protocol (<i>resumed</i>)	14 - 22
5	Arrangements for the Conference	23 - 35
	(c) Restoration of voting rights (<i>resumed</i>)	23 - 35

[*] GC(46)/19.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(46)/INF/8/Rev.1.

For reasons of economy, this document has been printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their own copies of documents to meetings.
--

Abbreviations used in this record

FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ILO	International Labour Organization
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UPU	Universal Postal Union
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization

MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN NUCLEAR,
RADIATION, TRANSPORT AND WASTE SAFETY (resumed)
(GC(46)/COM.5/L.13)

1. The CHAIRMAN, drawing attention to the draft resolution contained in document GC(46)/COM.5/L.13 and submitted by Australia, said that it had been worked out in the open-ended group chaired by Ambassador Hughes of Australia.
2. Mr. HUGHES (Australia), introducing the draft resolution, said that there had been extensive negotiations on the text, which had merged the thoughts and language of the draft resolutions contained in documents GC(46)/COM.5/L.1 and GC(46)/COM.5/L.4.
3. There were two last-minute changes to which the interested delegations had agreed: in preambular paragraph (k) and operative paragraph 11, “physical security” should be replaced by “physical protection”; and in operative paragraph 15, the word “maritime” should be deleted.
4. The representative of NEW ZEALAND said that the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document GC(46)/COM.5/L.1 were pleased that it had been possible to arrive at the compromise text contained in document GC(46)/COM.5/L.13. They wished to withdraw the draft resolution contained in document GC(46)/COM.5/L.1.
5. The representative of UNITED KINGDOM, speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document GC(46)/COM.5/L.4, welcomed the outcome of the negotiations, which had given rise to a balanced compromise. The draft resolution contained in document GC(46)/COM.5/L.4 was also being withdrawn.
6. The representative of PERU said that he was pleased by the results of the negotiations. Although no agreement had been reached on issues such as emergency response, the exchange of views had been fruitful and instructive.
7. The representative of ARGENTINA said that, although her country had not been a sponsor of either of the original draft resolutions, that had not been due to a lack of interest in the issues to which they referred. Argentina had a very long coastline, and it was also involved in the transport of radioactive material. The discussions in the open-ended group had been very useful, and the 2003 International Conference on the Safety of Transport of Radioactive Material would provide an excellent opportunity for further such discussions.
8. The representative of BRAZIL said that the negotiations leading to the draft resolution contained in document GC(46)COM.5/L.13 had been most valuable.
9. The representative of CANADA said he regretted that, owing to the wording of operative paragraph 14, his delegation had not been able to sponsor the draft resolution contained in document GC(46)COM.5/L.13. Otherwise, however, the draft resolution had his delegation’s full support.

10. The representative of IRELAND said that the issues dealt with in the draft resolution were of great concern to his country and that his delegation was looking forward to the 2003 International Conference on the Safety of Transport of Radioactive Material.

11. The representative of JAPAN welcomed the outcome of the negotiations in the open-ended group and commended Ambassador Hughes on the way in which he had guided those negotiations.

12. The CHAIRMAN, having commended Ambassador Hughes on the manner in which he had chaired the open-ended group, took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(46)/COM.5/L.13 with the changes to preambular paragraph (k) and operative paragraphs 11 and 15 which Ambassador Hughes had just read out.

13. It was so agreed.

STRENGTHENING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPROVING THE EFFICIENCY OF THE SAFEGUARDS SYSTEM AND APPLICATION OF THE MODEL ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL (resumed)
(GC(46)/COM.5/L.7/Rev.1)

14. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft resolution contained in document GC(46)/COM.5/L.7/Rev.1, which had been prepared in the open-ended working group chaired by Mr. Di Sapia of Italy.

15. The representative of DENMARK, introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union, said that the text was the result of constructive consultations in the open-ended working group. The text was in line with the language used in a number of documents that had been accepted by the Board of Governors.

16. The representative of CANADA said that his delegation was pleased that the text reflected his country's particular interests.

17. The representative of ISRAEL said that no consensus had been reached on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

18. The representative of CHILE, having announced that his country had signed the protocol additional to its safeguards agreement with the Agency the day before, said that his delegation was very pleased with the text now before the Committee.

19. The representative of the LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA said that, despite its many reservations, his delegation would not block a consensus on the draft resolution contained in document GC(46)/COM.5/L.7/Rev.1. However, it would like future such draft resolutions to include: a call to the nuclear-weapon States to halt their nuclear weapon production programmes and draw up a timetable for a nuclear weapon disposal process in whose verification the representatives of developing countries would participate; a call to the nuclear-weapon States to submit all their surplus stocks of nuclear weapons-grade material to

Agency verification; and a call to all countries to conclude comprehensive safeguards agreements and protocols additional thereto with the Agency.

20. The representative of PAKISTAN said it was unfortunate that the working group had been unable to arrive at a consensus on the draft resolution under consideration, which his delegation was unable to endorse.

21. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee wished him to inform the General Conference that it had been unable to reach a consensus on the draft resolution contained in document GC(46)/COM.5/L.7/Rev.1.

22. It was so agreed.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONFERENCE

(c) RESTORATION OF VOTING RIGHTS (resumed)
(GC(46)/INF/6 and Add.1; GC(46)/20)

23. The CHAIRMAN recalled that earlier in the week a proposal had been made by the representative from Argentina that the maximum period for payment plans for Member States in arrears in the payment of their assessed contributions be extended from five to ten years.

24. The representative of DENMARK, speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that there was no need to change arrangements so recently endorsed by the Board, which were based on the guidelines contained in document GOV(1998)/54/Rev.2.

25. The representative of PERU said he understood that a number of Member States would be able to pay off their arrears if the maximum payment period was extended to ten years.

26. The representative of DENMARK, supported by the representative of JAPAN, said that, since it was the Board which had approved the payment plan scheme in the first place, discussions about possibly modifying the scheme should first take place in the Board.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that in his view the General Conference was entitled to change the maximum payment period.

28. The representative of MEXICO said that, as stated by the representative of Peru on Tuesday, some Vienna-based organizations belonging to the United Nations system had arrears payment schemes with a maximum payment period of ten years.

29. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF BUDGET AND FINANCE, responding to a question asked by the representative of MEXICO, said that the 30 Member States which had lost their voting rights together accounted for over US \$8 million of arrears in assessed contributions. The Secretariat considered that some of those Member States would be able to pay off their arrears if the maximum payment period were ten years; that would ease the Agency's cash flow problems.

30. The Agency, with a payment plan scheme with a maximum payment period of five years, was in a minority within the United Nations family. In most schemes, the maximum payment period was ten years, and there was even a scheme with a maximum payment period of 20 years. It should be borne in mind, however, that interest was charged on arrears in the case of some schemes.

31. The representative of BRAZIL said that moving to a ten-year payment period would encourage Member States in arrears to negotiate a payment plan, which would make for greater budgetary predictability and raise the level of Member State participation in Agency activities.

32. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF BUDGET AND FINANCE, responding to a question asked by the representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, said that seven organizations belonging to the United Nations family had payment plan schemes with a maximum payment period of ten years: FAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and WIPO. ICAO had a scheme with a maximum payment period of 10-15 years and ILO one with a maximum payment period of 20 years.

33. The representative of PERU said that in his view the fact that the Board had approved the current arrangements did not mean that the General Conference could not change those arrangements.

34. The CHAIRMAN, noting that the Committee had been unable to reach a consensus, said he would recommend to the General Conference that it request the Board of Governors to discuss the matter during its session in June 2003.

35. It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.