

General Conference

GC(67)/COM.5/OR.3

Issued: December 2023

General Distribution

Original: English

Sixty-seventh regular session

Committee of the Whole

Record of the Third Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Tuesday, 26 September 2023, at 3.15 p.m.

Chair: Mr CSERVENY (Hungary)

Later: Ms CALLESEN (Denmark)

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹		Paragraphs
17	Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards (<i>continued</i>)	1–40
13	Nuclear and radiation safety	41–194

¹ GC(67)/24

Abbreviations used in this record

CNS	Convention on Nuclear Safety
CSA	comprehensive safeguards agreement
EPR	emergency preparedness and response
EU	European Union
GSR	General Safety Requirements
HEU	high enriched uranium
Joint Convention	Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management
NPP	nuclear power plant
NPT	Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Joint Convention	Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management
USA	United States of America

17. Strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of Agency safeguards (continued)

(GC67/16; GC(67)/COM.5/L.8)

1. The CHAIR suggested that the Committee continue working page by page to complete the first reading of the draft resolution contained in document GC(67)/COM.5/L.8.
2. It was so agreed.
3. The representative of CHINA, providing an update on consultations regarding a preambular paragraph on naval nuclear propulsion, said that, while his delegation recognized Australia's constructive efforts to adjust its proposal, the imbalanced wording did not fully reflect the situation. He suggested building on Australia's suggested paragraph as follows: "Noting the Director General's reports and updates to the Board of Governors and relevant discussions in the Board of Governors on naval nuclear propulsion, in particular on the transfer of HEU and the challenge to the NPT regime and the IAEA safeguards regime, as well as different views and concerns expressed by Member States in this regard." China remained open to further discussions with Australia and other Member States.
4. The CHAIR, welcoming the update, invited the Committee to comment on page 6 of the draft resolution.
5. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation proposed rewording the end of the paragraph 28 to read: "including in, but not limited to, the annual Safeguards Implementation Report", to reflect the need to update the Supplementary Document to the Report on The Conceptualization and Development of Safeguards Implementation at the State Level (GOV/2014/41) on the implementation of the State-level concept.
6. The representatives of FRANCE, GERMANY, ROMANIA, the UNITED KINGDOM and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, expressing their appreciation for the Russian Federation's flexibility, said that they would consult with their capitals on the proposal.
7. The representative of SWEDEN, expressing his delegation's preference for retention of the current wording concerning the State-level concept, said that any consultations in that regard must relate only to minor adjustments.
8. The representative of PAKISTAN, conveying his delegation's support for the proposal, said that the constructive and minimal addition rendered the need to update the document more explicitly.
9. The representative of BRAZIL said that her delegation would consider the Russian Federation's constructive and elegant solution.
10. The CHAIR, noting that consensus on paragraph 28 was drawing near, encouraged delegations to continue their consultations on the proposed amendment and to enlist the involvement of the Secretariat.
11. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN expressed support for the Russian Federation's proposal. Turning to paragraph 30, he said that the last part of the text should be reworded to read: "State-level approaches will be progressively developed and implemented for States as agreed by the State".

12. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, stating his delegation's opposition to Iran's amendment, said that, while no facility existed to agree to a State-level approach, the Secretariat and the concerned State consulted on safeguards implementation.

13. The representatives of the GERMANY and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that the original text should be maintained.

14. The representative of FRANCE, affirming her delegation's preference for the original text, said that paragraph 25 assured consultation on safeguards implementation.

15. The representatives of AUSTRALIA and CANADA said that, although they preferred not to change the wording regarding the State-level concept, they would consider the Russian Federation's proposal on paragraph 28. Iran's amendment to paragraph 30, however, was not acceptable.

16. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that amendments seemed to be rejected on the basis of the proposing State rather than substance. Paragraph 25 did not allay his concerns, as it was unclear how State-level approaches could be developed and implemented for States without their consent.

17. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF CONCEPTS AND PLANNING said that, as stated in paragraph 25, the State-level concept did not, and would not, entail the introduction of additional rights or obligations for States or the Agency and did change the interpretation of existing rights and obligations. A State's CSA therefore constituted sufficient consent for implementation of a State-level approach within that State. Moreover, the State-specific factors — explained in document GOV/2014/41 — took into consideration the legal basis for safeguards implementation and the nature of the concerned safeguards agreements. Accordingly, he considered it unnecessary to amend paragraph 30.

18. The representative of SWEDEN, concurring with the Director's explanation, said that Iran's proposals were not being singled out. There was no need for any country with a State-level approach to agree to how the Secretariat implemented safeguards in that country.

19. The CHAIR, expressing appreciation of the clarification on the matter, invited the Committee to continue its consideration of page 6.

20. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, moving on to paragraph 33, proposed inserting "without any new obligations beyond the safeguards agreement" at the end. He said that the Secretariat's use of new technologies should not entail any new obligations for a State beyond its safeguards agreement, and the two parties should cooperate to avoid misunderstandings in that regard.

21. The representative of FRANCE, emphasizing that amendments were considered on the basis of merit, and not of their presenter, said that the substance of any proposal must be acceptable to all Member States and be aligned with the Agency's work, methods and mandate. Paragraph 33 was about the technical tools used by the Agency for safeguards implementation — not about safeguards agreements. Given that Iran's proposal blurred the purpose of the paragraph, she preferred to keep the wording agreed upon in 2022.

22. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that his country was working in good faith to find consensus. Iran's proposal was tautologous, since a State's safeguards agreement constituted the obligations to be implemented. Suggesting that the chapeau might give Iran some assurance, he requested retention of the original wording.

23. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, expressing her delegation's preference for the original text, said that the paragraph was about encouraging the Agency to build

voluntary partnerships with Member States and to develop tools and technologies, not about obligations on States.

24. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that the Secretariat's use of new technologies had safeguards implications, as resolved safeguards issues were being re-examined because of alleged discrepancies between measurements taken with old technology and those taken with new technology. His delegation was happy to consult further on its proposal, which was intended to highlight such unacceptable situations.

25. The CHAIR suggested that delegations continue consulting on the paragraph to achieve consensus and invited the Committee to consider page 7.

26. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, turning to paragraph 39, proposed ending the text with "strictly within the scope of each individual State's safeguards agreement and related subsidiary arrangements".

27. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, supported by the representatives of FRANCE and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that the proposal was redundant because the chapeau already gave such assurances, and that the original wording should be maintained.

28. The representative of SWEDEN said that the paragraph concerned the early provision of design information under the safeguards strengthening measures discussed extensively by the Board in the 1990s. As essential guidance on such reporting had been derived from those discussions, his delegation wished to retain the original text to avoid contradicting the Board's decision.

29. The representative of ROMANIA, supported by the representative of ITALY, said that there had been a strong preference in the working group for the original wording. Moreover, the proposal was irrelevant to the substance of the paragraph.

30. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that the original text should be kept to avoid restricting Member States' ability to engage in early consultations with the Agency.

31. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN wondered how his proposed amendment would restrict Member States' ability to work with the Secretariat.

32. The representative of SWEDEN, noting that the original text was in line with the Board's decision that design information should be provided as early as possible, said that Iran's proposal would legally restrict the early consultations explicitly encouraged in paragraph 39.

33. The DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF CONCEPTS AND PLANNING said that he understood the paragraph to relate to safeguards by design, and engagement with the Department of Safeguards for effective implementation in new facilities, rather than to a modified Code 3.1 issue.

34. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that it remained unclear how his proposal would restrict a State's cooperation with the Secretariat on safeguards, given that the CSA together with the related subsidiary arrangements constituted the legal channel for that purpose.

35. Drawing the Committee's attention to safeguards confidentiality within the Secretariat, he proposed inserting a paragraph 41 bis, or even replacing paragraph 41, with wording to the effect that the General Conference recognized the need to strengthen the Agency's confidentiality regime to ensure effective protection against disclosure of classified safeguards information within its organizational structure in the light of paragraph F of Article 7 of the Statute; and that the General Conference requested the Secretariat, in consultation with Member States and with due regard to the current stringent confidentiality regime of some international organizations, to provide a comprehensive report to the General Conference at its next regular session, aimed at identifying gaps and exploring ways and means

of strengthening the Agency's confidentiality regime, taking into account general principles and associated measures for the handling of confidential information, conditions of staff employment relating to the protection of confidential information, and procedures for alleged breaches of confidential information.

36. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that the proposal merited consideration, especially as it cited points included in the Agency's safeguards confidentiality regime as contained in document GOV/2959.

37. The representative of ROMANIA said that paragraph 41 already covered those points and should not be replaced with Iran's cumbersome and redundant wording. A much shorter paragraph 41 bis could potentially be considered, although its added value remained unclear.

38. The CHAIR, recalling the Secretariat's earlier explanation of the Agency's confidentiality regime and information security policy, said that Member States with doubts should continue to communicate with the Secretariat to clarify confidentiality requirements under their safeguards agreements. Delegations should consult further with the Secretariat to produce a legally and practically watertight text.

39. The representative of EGYPT, turning to paragraph (p), proposed replacing "within the context of" with the more legally accurate phrase "in accordance with".

40. With the first reading of the draft resolution complete, the CHAIR said that delegations should continue their consultations to find agreement on the various proposals.

Ms Callesen (Denmark), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

13. Nuclear and radiation safety

(GC(67)/13, GC(67)/INF/2; GC(67)/COM.5/L.12)

41. The CHAIR said that the Committee had before it a report by the Director General on nuclear and radiation safety, contained in document GC(67)/13, and a draft resolution on nuclear and radiation safety, contained in document GC(67)/COM.5/L.12.

42. The representative of AUSTRALIA, introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(67)/COM.5/L.12, said that delegations had shown collegiality and constructiveness throughout the lengthy discussions at the seven meetings of the open-ended working group and in her other contacts with them. Nonetheless, the draft resolution included some paragraphs that might require further discussion. Some proposals had been received recently that had not been comprehensively communicated or discussed.

43. In addition to the 31 countries listed in the document, Canada, Norway and Thailand had sponsored the draft resolution.

44. The CHAIR proposed that the representative of Australia take the Committee through the open paragraphs.

45. It was so agreed.

46. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that paragraph (g) was new wording originating from a proposal by Iran that some delegations had deemed more suited to other resolutions. The tabled text therefore reflected amendments from other Member States.

47. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed rewording the first part of the paragraph to read: “Recognizing the importance of technical assistance, capacity building and exchange of information, with due regard to confidentiality, in the field of nuclear safety”. That would make the paragraph more balanced and indicate a mutual, rather than unilateral, provision of information. Moreover, “exchange” was used more frequently in that context in the text.

48. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, strongly objecting to any reference in the paragraph to exchanging or sharing information, reintroduced his delegation’s original proposal, which read: “Recognizing the high importance of technical assistance, capacity building, as well as transfer of technology in the field of nuclear safety, and reiterating that all States should be able to have access to materials, equipment and technology needed in this regard without any discrimination”.

49. The representative of CANADA, backed by the representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, said that, despite her delegation considering the new paragraph unnecessary, it could accept the Russian Federation’s amendment. She added that Canada would continue to put forward proposals to build consensus on the new wording and suggested a small editorial change.

50. The representative of FRANCE, expressing a preference for the current wording, said that she could consider the Russian Federation’s amendment but not Iran’s original proposal.

51. The representative of AUSTRALIA, speaking in her national capacity, said that her delegation could accept the Russian Federation’s amendment but shared the concerns about Iran’s original proposal.

52. The representative of PAKISTAN said that his delegation endorsed the Russian Federation’s amendment. He suggested referring to “all Member States” to convey the idea of non-discrimination in Iran’s proposal.

53. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that, although he would consider the suggestion from the representative of Pakistan, paragraph (g) remained unacceptable because the reference to technology transfer had been omitted.

54. There being no further comments, the CHAIR invited the Committee to consider the next open paragraph.

55. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that the European Union’s proposed new paragraph (k), noting the five principles identified by the Director General to help ensure nuclear safety and security at Zaporizhzhya NPP, enjoyed the support of many Member States. One delegation, however, had requested its deletion.

56. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that the reference to the situation-specific ‘five principles’ was unacceptable in a general resolution on nuclear and radiation safety. Furthermore, Member States had not been consulted on them.

57. The representative of AUSTRIA, thanking Australia for ensuring a balanced, inclusive and transparent drafting process, said that, despite the ‘five principles’ being established for a specific NPP — which was not named in the draft resolution — it was essential to mention them given their importance for nuclear safety. Although his delegation would have preferred “Welcoming”, it had understood that the neutrality of “Noting” was more acceptable to other States.

58. The representative of FRANCE, fully agreeing with the representative of Austria, said that it was important to mention the ‘five principles’ in the draft resolution, especially as they had been part of the Agency’s deliberations for several weeks. It was a neutral and purely factual reference.

59. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, recalling the Committee’s lengthy discussions in 2022 on the seven pillars for ensuring nuclear safety and security during an armed conflict, said that many delegations had insisted on including the ‘seven pillars’ in the safety resolution in view of their supposed global applicability, despite a total lack of consultation with Member States. As a compromise, his delegation had accepted the reference, with some minor modifications. Those delegations now proposed to include the ‘five principles’ on the same grounds and with the same lack of due process. His delegation firmly opposed paragraph (k).

60. The representative of SWITZERLAND, backed by the representative of SWEDEN, said that, while he agreed with the need to keep the resolution general, the situation at Zaporizhzhya NPP was currently the biggest nuclear safety issue. It was therefore important at least to note the ‘five principles’ in the resolution to support the Agency.

61. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that many Member States had expressed support for the neutral and factual wording of the principles when they had been introduced to the Board in June 2023.

62. Turning to paragraph (o), the representative of AUSTRALIA said that Austria had proposed that the words “and give due priority to” be inserted after “enhance”. A number of delegations had reserved their position on the proposal and some had expressed support for it.

63. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that the proposed addition to paragraph (o) was superfluous and should be deleted.

64. The representative of AUSTRIA, supported by the representatives of FINLAND and LUXEMBOURG, said that, especially at a time when several countries were stepping up their nuclear programmes, it was necessary to reiterate what had already been reflected in such Agency publications as *Leadership and Management for Safety* (IAEA Safety Standards Series No. GSR Part 2). He was flexible concerning the wording; it was simply necessary to underline the importance of giving priority to safety, which was a universally applicable technical concept that could not be discussed from the point of view of economics or politics.

65. The CHAIR, noting that further consultations were needed on the proposal, suggested that the Committee move on to discuss the next paragraph.

66. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that paragraph (p) was new text proposed by the European Union. Following long discussions, she believed a consensus was close.

67. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that, while the idea behind the paragraph was very important, it needed to be broader in scope. He therefore preferred placing the paragraph in square brackets so that he could consult with other delegations.

68. Turning to paragraph (r), the representative of AUSTRALIA said that the text contained factual updates relating to the outcome of the joint Eighth and Ninth Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the CNS. Wording that had originally been proposed by the European Union as a separate paragraph had been added to the end of the paragraph as it was closely related to the subject matter of the text.

69. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that her delegation could not agree to the inclusion of the text proposed by the European Union. Moreover, it did not see the need to refer

excessively to individual documents and events, including the contents of the Summary Report of the Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the CNS.

70. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that, while his delegation attached the utmost importance to the CNS, the Committee should focus its attention on the safety issues that were currently facing the Agency. For that reason, he wished to reserve his position on the paragraph and consult further with his technical colleagues and other interested delegations.

71. The representative of BULGARIA said that her delegation supported the inclusion of a factual paragraph on the joint Eighth and Ninth Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the CNS. The CNS was the only legally binding convention on nuclear safety, and the review meetings constituted a major event in that regard. It was therefore important to take note of the review meetings, especially as the most recent meeting had been a joint one.

72. The representative of FRANCE pointed out that the CNS, which had been an important event in the area of nuclear safety, was directly related to the Agency's work and to the current draft resolution. With the word "noting", paragraph (r) was entirely neutral and refrained from providing a qualitative assessment of the review meetings. In addition, it mirrored paragraph 18, which mentioned the Committee's concern regarding the challenges reported by one Contracting Party in its implementation of the CNS commitments.

73. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that, as it was important to certain Member States, his delegation could be flexible and accept a reference to the joint Eighth and Ninth Review Meeting. The reference to the "highest level of participation by Contracting Parties", however, was neither factual nor neutral and should be deleted.

74. Although very important to the CNS Contracting Parties, the phrase "and the actions agreed to address the major common issues arising from country group discussions, as well as good practices, areas of good performance, challenges and suggestions identified by the Contracting Parties" was not relevant to the draft resolution. Moreover, the phrase "and noting with concern the challenges reported by one Contracting Party in its implementation of the CNS commitments and responsibilities in armed conflict" should be discussed in the context of the CNS, not in the context of the current draft resolution.

75. The representative of SWEDEN, expressing support for the comments made by the representatives of Bulgaria and France, noted that there were good prospects for finding consensus wording for the paragraph. His delegation would be happy to consult with the delegation of Iran and others to find a solution.

76. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph (v), said that the text had been jointly proposed by Switzerland and Austria. There had been broad agreement on the importance of the paragraph, although small edits had recently been made to the text.

77. The representative of EGYPT, supported by the representatives of AUSTRALIA, SWITZERLAND and the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, said that the word "a" should be inserted before "potential impact".

78. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that, while the idea behind the paragraph was an important one, his delegation was not comfortable with the current phrasing. He requested that the paragraph be placed in square brackets so that he could consult his national authorities.

79. The CHAIR took it that the Committee agreed to the editorial change. She proposed that the Committee revert to the paragraph at a later stage.

80. It was so agreed.

81. With regard to paragraph (s), the representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, supported by the representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, proposed deleting the phrase “including the actions taken to promote adherence and active participation in the Joint Convention, the overarching issues and good practices and areas of good performance identified by the President and the country groups, and challenges and suggestions identified for Contracting Parties”. Although it was important to highlight the overall outcome of the Seventh Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Joint Convention, her delegation did not consider it beneficial to refer to the actions taken, good practices and areas of good performance, which were subcategories identified by the President and the country groups that did not constitute consensus wording.

82. The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM, believing that the wording had already been agreed upon in the open-ended working group, said that her delegation wished to discuss informally the reasons for reopening the paragraph.

83. The representative of AUSTRALIA, speaking in a national capacity, said that the phrase in question had been used in the previous year’s resolution. Her delegation therefore wished it to be retained.

84. The representative of SWITZERLAND said that, since the wording had been agreed upon the previous year and the Eighth Review Meeting had not yet taken place, his delegation preferred to keep the paragraph as it was.

85. The representative of FRANCE said that, while her delegation did not find it problematic to include text that encouraged States to adhere to the Joint Convention, it would take a closer look at the paragraph with a view to making alternative proposals.

86. The representative of BULGARIA suggested that the paragraph could be placed in square brackets until her delegation had had an opportunity to consider the Russian proposal.

87. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that paragraph (s) had originally been paragraph 93 in the previous year’s resolution; as it was preambular in nature, it had been moved to the corresponding section of the current draft resolution. In terms of the text itself, only technical updates had been made.

88. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA supported retaining the previous year’s wording.

89. The CHAIR suggested that the Committee move on to the next paragraph.

90. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph (y), said that a proposal by Canada to insert the words “and the transport of radioactive material by autonomous/unmanned conveyances” at the end of the paragraph had not been agreed upon.

91. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation did not support the Canadian proposal. The transport of radioactive material by autonomous/unmanned conveyances was a new area of work that required further study and a cautious approach. He suggested that the proposal could be considered the following year once more research on the subject had been done.

92. The representative of CANADA said that the use of such technologies was already a reality. As States considered new and innovative ways of doing things, the Agency needed to look at the application of relevant safety standards. As there had been opposition to the amendment, she was willing to withdraw it for the sake of consensus. She welcomed the suggestion that the issue could be considered the following year.

93. The CHAIR took it that the Committee agreed to the deletion of “and the transport of radioactive material by autonomous/unmanned conveyances”.

94. It was so agreed.

95. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that paragraph (z) was a compromise text formulated on the basis of a number of overlapping proposals. The last part of the paragraph, although awkwardly worded, was a direct quote from the Safety Fundamentals.

96. The CHAIR took it that the Committee wished to accept paragraph (z).

97. It was so agreed.

98. Turning to paragraph (ff), the representative of AUSTRALIA said that the delegation of China had proposed adding the words “and their consequences” after “accidents and emergencies”.

99. The CHAIR took it that the proposed addition was acceptable to the Committee.

100. It was so agreed.

101. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that the text of paragraph (gg) had been taken from paragraph (ff) in the previous year’s resolution.

102. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that paragraph (gg) should have a broader scope and not be solely limited to armed conflict and armed attacks.

103. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that, in her delegation’s view, the paragraph should be deleted. Each State determined independently the operating conditions of its EPR system and decided on what basis it would review them. There was no need to focus on one specific issue that did not apply to all Member States.

104. The representative of FRANCE said that his delegation could not agree to deleting the paragraph. The fact that the issue did not apply to all Member States could be taken into account. The text was not meant to be general in nature, however, but was based on feedback. In response to the representative of Iran, he said that it was premature to consider broadening the scope of the paragraph as the Agency might not yet have all the feedback that it required to assess the need to review the emergency measures.

105. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph (ii), said that the USA had proposed adding the phrase “a well-developed protection strategy comprised of a justified and optimised set of protective actions, including communication arrangements” in order to align the text with GSR Parts 3 and 7.

106. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that his delegation wished the original wording of the paragraph to be retained.

107. The representative of CANADA said that the proposal by the USA was appropriate. His delegation supported the inclusion of wording that had already been the subject of consensus within the Commission on Safety Standards and the Safety Standards Committees.

108. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph (kk), said that Spain had proposed adding the word “some” before “nuclear”.

109. The CHAIR took it that the amendment was acceptable to the Committee.

110. It was so agreed.

111. Regarding paragraph (pp), the representative of AUSTRALIA said that the words “in the light of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant accident” had been replaced with “such as the EU stress tests and topical peer reviews”.

112. The CHAIR took it that the amendment was acceptable to the Committee.

113. It was so agreed.

114. With regard to paragraph (tt), the representative of AUSTRALIA said that “over the short and long terms” had been added to the end of the paragraph.

115. The representative of EGYPT, supported by the representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, said that the proposed wording was superfluous and should be omitted.

116. The representative of CANADA said that his delegation was willing to delete the phrase for the sake of consensus.

117. The CHAIR took it that the deletion of “over the short and long terms” was acceptable to the Committee.

118. It was so agreed.

119. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that paragraph (aaa) was new text proposed by the European Union, on which there had been diverging views.

120. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, noting that the text of the paragraph had been taken from the Summary Report of the joint Eighth and Ninth Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the CNS, said that there was no need to include a specific reference to cross-border cooperation as all issues relating to cooperation between States in the event of a nuclear accident were covered by the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency

121. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN supported deletion of the paragraph.

122. The representative of FRANCE said that he did not agree with the assessment by the representative of the Russian Federation as the CNS was a core element of the draft resolution. Moreover, the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency was a mechanism — it did not explain how, for example, in practice, countries working on a cross-border basis had to cooperate in order to deliver coherent messages to the public concerning the seriousness of an accident and its consequences.

123. The CHAIR, noting that there were no more comments, suggested that the Committee revert to the paragraph at a later stage.

124. Turning to paragraph 4, the representative of AUSTRALIA said that the text had been newly introduced into the draft resolution.

125. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that a paragraph relating to a specific subject in a specific country had no place in the draft resolution and should be deleted, especially as a separate document was being prepared on the subject.

126. The representative of SWEDEN said that his delegation strongly disagreed with that position. In the interests of time, he suggested that the Committee could place the paragraph in square brackets and move on with the discussion.

127. With regard to paragraph 8, the representative of AUSTRALIA said that many delegations attached importance to the text. She welcomed the flexibility shown by the European Union in reverting to previously agreed phrasing in view of the concerns expressed by a number of delegations. As chair of the open-ended working group, she had made two minor editorial changes and had inserted the words “to continue” after “the Agency”, to recognize the continuing nature of the Agency’s work.

128. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN expressed appreciation for the amendment made by the chair of the open-ended working group and said that his delegation could join the consensus on the paragraph.

129. The CHAIR took it that the paragraph was acceptable to the Committee.

130. It was so agreed.

131. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that paragraph 24 was a new addition proposed by Spain. Two amendments had been made to the text that delegations had not yet had a chance to consider.

132. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN requested that the paragraph be placed in square brackets so that he could consult his national authorities.

133. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that Austria had proposed the addition of paragraph 40, the wording of which was almost identical to that of paragraph (k). It did not enjoy consensus.

134. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that the paragraph should be deleted.

135. The representative of FRANCE said that his delegation could not agree to the deletion of the paragraph.

136. The representative of ITALY said that the paragraph should be retained as it was of utmost importance to his delegation.

137. The CHAIR, having taken note of the views expressed, suggested that the Committee move on to the next paragraph.

138. With regard to paragraph 41, the representative of AUSTRALIA said that the words “including developing a long term plan for the development of safety standards” had been added to the end of the paragraph.

139. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN requested that the paragraph be placed in square brackets as the new wording was still not acceptable to his delegation.

140. The representative of CANADA said that he preferred to keep the new wording as the development of long term plans for safety standards was essential to keeping the Agency on the right track.

141. The CHAIR, noting the need for further discussions on the paragraph, suggested that the Committee move on to the next paragraph.

142. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph 44, said that the wording had been taken from paragraph 40 in the previous year’s resolution.

143. The CHAIR suggested that the Committee move on to the next paragraph so as to allow time for delegations to consider paragraph 44.

144. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that paragraph 45 was new text that incorporated a range of inputs from delegations.

145. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that he was concerned that the scope of the paragraph had been limited to armed conflict situations. He would need to consult with his national authorities to see whether that would be acceptable.

146. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph 47, said that the wording had also been taken from paragraph 40 in the previous year's resolution.

147. The CHAIR took it that the paragraph was acceptable to the Committee.

148. It was so agreed.

149. With regard to paragraph 58, the representative of AUSTRALIA said that "and to assess the major common issues as well as good practices accordingly" had been added to the end of the text. The Russian Federation had suggested that the word "assess" could be replaced with "take into account".

150. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that it made sense to reflect the wording used in the Summary Report for the joint Eighth and Ninth Review Meeting of the States Parties to the CNS, which stated that the "President recommended that Contracting Parties take these issues into account when preparing their National Reports for the 10th Review Meeting". In the same vein, her delegation also suggested that "calls upon" be replaced with "recommends".

151. The representative of BULGARIA suggested amending the end of the paragraph to read: "reflect the major common issues in their national reports to the next review meeting as well as good practices accordingly", which mirrored the wording used in the guidelines to the CNS.

152. The CHAIR took it that the Committee agreed to replace "calls upon" with "recommends".

153. It was so agreed.

154. The CHAIR asked the representative of the Russian Federation whether she could accept the Bulgarian proposal.

155. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that, while she preferred her own proposal, she could consider amending the paragraph along the lines suggested by the representative of Bulgaria, so that it would read: "consider reflecting the major common issues in their national reports to the next review meeting as well as good practices accordingly".

156. The representative of EGYPT said that his delegation needed more time to consider the Bulgarian proposal. Although similar phrasing could be found in documents related to the CNS, the use of such strong wording in the draft resolution could be problematic, especially when the Agency was merely calling upon or recommending States to address the Challenges and Suggestions from their review process. In his delegation's view, it was best for States themselves to determine the appropriate action in that regard.

157. The CHAIR asked the representative of Egypt whether he could accept the replacement of "assess" with "take into account".

158. The representative of EGYPT said that he was concerned that "take into account" implied a new form of action to which delegations should be subscribing; that was something which he was not ready to do.

159. Turning to paragraph 66, the representative of AUSTRALIA said that the European Union had proposed the inclusion of the words "in particular related to the increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather conditions".

160. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN requested that the paragraph be placed in square brackets so that he could give it further consideration.

161. Regarding paragraph 67, the representative of AUSTRALIA said that the text contained amendments proposed by Saudi Arabia.

162. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN requested that the paragraph be placed in square brackets as his delegation needed more time to study it.

163. The representative of EGYPT proposed changing “deepen” to “further”, as deepen wrongly implied that Member States had a superficial understanding of the impact of climate change.

164. The CHAIR took it that the amendment was acceptable to the Committee.

165. It was so agreed.

166. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph 83, said that the Russian Federation had proposed the addition of the words “and volunteers subject to exposure”, which complemented the agreed wording proposed by Türkiye in paragraph (qq) and aligned the paragraph with GSR Part 3.

167. The CHAIR took it that the paragraph was acceptable to the Committee.

168. It was so agreed.

169. The representative of AUSTRALIA, expressing gratitude to Argentina for its work to finalize a range of proposals dealing with consumer goods, said that paragraph 88 contained updated references to the Secretariat’s work on consumer goods containing radionuclides.

170. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN expressed thanks to Argentina for its constructive proposal and to other delegations for their useful inputs to the text. As he was still awaiting feedback from his national authorities, he requested that the paragraph be placed in square brackets. The same applied to paragraph 89.

171. The representative of FRANCE said that her delegation was grateful to Argentina for its constructive proposal and hoped that consensus on the paragraph could be reached.

172. The CHAIR suggested that the Committee revert to paragraphs 88 and 89 once the representative of Iran had heard back from his national authorities.

173. The representative of AUSTRALIA said that paragraph 90 was new text proposed by Australia that complemented the proposals made by Argentina in paragraphs 88 and 89.

174. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that he was still awaiting instructions from his national authorities.

175. The representative of FRANCE said that her delegation supported the proposed paragraph.

176. Turning to paragraph 94, the representative of AUSTRALIA said that the words “Encourages efforts to avoid and address problems related to denials of and delays in the shipment of radioactive material, particularly shipment by air and” had been deleted.

177. The CHAIR took it that the paragraph was acceptable to the Committee.

178. It was so agreed.

179. With regard to paragraph 95, the representative of AUSTRALIA said that the text had been newly introduced into the draft resolution.

180. The representative of the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said that, while she understood the importance of resolving the issue of denial of shipments, she found it inappropriate to note the need to convene an open-ended committee of technical and legal experts, as the development of the draft Code of Conduct on the Facilitation of Safe and Secure Transport of Radioactive Materials was still at an early stage and further work was required to reflect the outcome of the work of the Denial of Shipment

Working Group. She therefore proposed deleting “to convene an open-ended committee of technical and legal experts from Member States”.

181. The representative of ARGENTINA said that, while he preferred to keep the text as it was, he was willing to look for a solution that would address the concerns expressed by the representative of the Russian Federation.

182. The representative of AUSTRALIA, turning to paragraph 97, said that Canada had proposed the insertion of the words “maritime transport” before “shipments”.

183. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that, in his delegation’s view, the proposal by Canada was redundant as it was already clear from the reference to “relevant coastal States” that the paragraph was about maritime transport. In the interests of flexibility, however, he could join the consensus on the new wording.

184. The CHAIR took it that the paragraph was acceptable to the Committee.

185. It was so agreed.

186. Regarding paragraph 100, the representative of AUSTRALIA said that there had been a proposal to insert “as applicable” after “Member States” and “as appropriate” after “in place”. There had been no agreement on the proposed amendments.

187. The representative of FINLAND said that his delegation firmly believed that both “as applicable” and “as appropriate” should be deleted. The management of radioactive waste and spent fuel was not only a financial and political issue but also a societal one; safe fuel and waste management were among people’s most significant concerns relating to nuclear energy. Moreover, there was no reason for the international nuclear community to lower the level of ambition in the current paragraph compared to the previous year because Member States had made great strides in planning long term waste management solutions.

188. The representative of AUSTRIA, supported by the representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, also favoured deletion of “as applicable” and “as appropriate”, as he felt that the wording of the paragraph should not be diluted.

189. The representative of EGYPT said that he understood the view expressed by the representative of Finland. It was not his intention to derogate from previously agreed wording. He believed, however, that there might be some room for certain qualifiers in the text that could allay the concerns expressed by a number of delegations in order to move forward more easily.

190. The representative of SWEDEN agreed that the Committee should not lower its standards relating to the management of radioactive waste and spent fuel; accordingly, his delegation supported the comment made by the representative of Finland.

191. The representative of FRANCE, expressing support for the position of the representative of Finland, said that she could not agree to the inclusion of the words “as applicable” and “as appropriate”, as the management of radioactive waste and spent fuel was a matter of great importance to her country.

192. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN said that it was not his intention to lower expectations relating to the management of radioactive waste and spent fuel. Rather, he was trying to make the wording of the paragraph more precise by drawing attention to the sovereign right of Member States to make commitments towards a particular cause.

193. The representative of SWITZERLAND supported using the previous year’s wording.

194. The CHAIR suggested that the Committee resume discussion of the paragraph at its next meeting.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.