

IAEA Board of Governors
Advisory Committee on Safeguards and Verification within the Framework
of the IAEA Statute
Record of the 2nd Meeting
GOV/COM.25/OR.2

(Click the link below to go directly to the NAM statement)

[Schedule of Future Meetings \(Malaysia\)](#)

Board of Governors

GOV/COM.25/OR.2

Issued: December 2005

Restricted Distribution

Original: English

For official use only

Advisory Committee on Safeguards and Verification within the Framework of the IAEA Statute

Record of the 2nd Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Friday, 11 November 2005, at 3.15 p.m.

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹	Paragraphs
2 Presentation by the Secretariat (<i>continued</i>)	1–4
3 Schedule of future meetings	5–28

¹ GOV/COM.25/2.

Attendance

(The list below gives the name of the senior member of each delegation who attended the meeting, as well as that of any other member whose statement is summarized in this record.)

Ms. FEROUKHI		Chairperson (Algeria)
Mr. FASSIH	_____	Algeria
Ms. KELLY		Argentina
Ms. STOKES		Australia
Mr. MACKAY		Belarus
Mr. VIEIRA DE SOUZA		Brazil
Ms. GERVAIS-VIDRICAIRE	}	Canada
Mr. PROUDFOOT		
Mr. LI Junjie		China
Ms. QUINTERO CORREA		Colombia
Mr. CODORNIU PUJALS		Cuba
Mr. GARCÉS-BURBANO		Ecuador
Mr. RAMZY		Egypt
Mr. ALBERT		France
Mr. HONSOWITZ		Germany
Ms. BALANOU		Greece
Mr. PATEL		India
Mr. HISWARA		Indonesia
Mr. AMANO (Chairman of the Board of Governors)		Japan
Mr. MOON Byung-Ryong		Korea, Republic of
Mr. TAJOURI		Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
Ms. KOLSHUS		Norway
Ms. OLIVEIRA BICHO		Portugal
Mr. SERGEEV		Russian Federation
Ms. YEW		Singapore
Ms. ŽIAKOVÁ		Slovakia
Mr. LEVSTEK		Slovenia
Mr. WRIGHT		South Africa
Mr. PERERA		Sri Lanka
Ms. GUSTAFSSON		Sweden
Mr. KHADDOUR		Syrian Arab Republic
Mr. ANDREWS		United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mr. GLASS		United States of America
Ms. GARCÍA de PÉREZ		Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of
Mr. ELBARADEI	_____	Director General
Mr. WALLER		Deputy Director General, Department of Management
Mr. ANING		Secretary of the Committee

Representatives of the following Member States attended the meeting:

Austria, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Romania, Spain, Tunisia, Zimbabwe.

Abbreviations used in this record:

NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
NPT Review Conference	Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
SAGSI	Standing Advisory Group on Safeguards Implementation

* Speakers under Rule 50 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure are indicated by an asterisk.

2. Presentation by the Secretariat (continued)

1. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN* congratulated the Chairperson on her designation.
2. It was clear from its mandate that the Committee should pursue its task within the bounds of certain procedures and modalities. The discussions that had taken place over the preceding months had identified certain elements of the Committee's mandate that should act as guidelines. Thus, it had been agreed that the Committee should be open-ended and that any recommendations made should enjoy a consensus.
3. A number of points that had been made during the preceding meeting indicated the complexity of the issues at hand. Therefore, sufficient time was needed to analyse all aspects of each proposal. Certain highly important issues needed careful consideration by the Committee and due priority should be given to them. Comprehensive safeguards were still not universally applied and the Committee should encourage States to conclude safeguards agreements with the Agency. For several decades, the Agency had focused its attention on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, but fewer efforts had been made to agree on measures that could contribute to nuclear disarmament. At the 2000 NPT Review Conference, it had been agreed that nuclear-weapon States with excess fissile material that was usable in nuclear weapons but no longer needed for military purposes should place it under voluntary safeguards. Iran believed that certain nuclear-weapon States had still not fulfilled that commitment and the Committee should consider that issue and seek a solution.
4. As the Committee had been established within the framework of the Agency's Statute, none of its recommendations should undermine in any way the inalienable right of Member States to use and develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The Committee should not change the legal safeguards instruments existing between the Agency and Member States in any way that would affect the rights and obligations of States party to those instruments. Furthermore, a balance should be maintained between the three pillars of the Agency's activities.

3. Schedule of future meetings

5. The CHAIRPERSON said that proposals had been made to hold some meetings before the June meetings of the Board. Others had insisted on the need for more time for consultations on the frequency of meetings. Some concerns had been expressed regarding the financial implications of the Committee's work.
6. The DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL FOR MANAGEMENT said that holding meetings of the Committee did have financial implications. The services required were the same as for a Board meeting, i.e. conference clerks, security, translation and interpretation and supplies. Altogether, Board meetings cost approximately €80 000 per day. The highest costs were for translation and interpretation: €57 000 and €11 000 respectively.
7. As the Committee was subsidiary to the Board, it would be preferable to fund it through the Regular Budget. However if extra-budgetary resources proved to be necessary, one possibility would

be to attract such resources for items currently funded through the Regular Budget, thus making available Regular Budget funds to be used for the Committee's activities.

8. The representative of MALAYSIA*, speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, said that the Chairperson should continue her consultations and come back to the Committee with a proposal, based on information from the Secretariat and proposals by Member States. That proposal could then be circulated by the Secretariat to all Member States for consideration and feedback and the Chairperson could then come up with a final decision.

9. The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA said that it had been several months since the decision had been taken to create the Committee and it was encouraging to see so many delegations present. The presentations by the Secretariat had been very helpful. If several months passed before the next meeting, it would be easy to forget what had been said at the current meeting. Ideally, the United States would like the next meeting to be held the following month, but it expected that there would be resistance to holding another meeting so soon. At the very least, consideration should be given to holding the next meeting, or the first substantive meeting, on 17-18 January 2006. Subsequent meetings could be held in February, April and May 2006, the specific dates being fixed pursuant to the Chairperson's consultations. It would certainly be desirable to hold some additional meetings before the June Board. It was important that delegations work seriously and diligently on the issues and move towards substantive, rather than procedural, discussions.

10. The representative of CANADA said that the two proposals that had been made regarding the frequency of meetings were not contradictory. His country had proposed that three or four meetings should be held before the June Board. If they began in mid-January, that would give the Chairperson ample time to hold consultations.

11. The representative of EGYPT said that it was reasonable to decide when to hold the next meeting. However the Committee should confine itself to deciding to hold it some time in the second half of January, depending on room availability. There should be consultations regarding further meetings and a decision on those should only be taken at the next meeting.

12. The representative of BRAZIL associated himself with the statement made by the representative of Egypt. Delegations needed time to consult further and then decide on the best time to hold further meetings. It was essential that the Chairperson consult delegates over the optimal frequency of meetings.

13. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN* asked if there was any overlap between the January meeting and other important meetings in Vienna. It was important that experts could attend all meetings.

14. The CHAIRPERSON said that there seemed to be an emerging consensus that the Committee should reach agreement on the issue of the next meeting. There had been no objections to the proposal that the Committee meet in mid-January 2006. In the meantime, consultations would be held with the Secretariat to ensure that a room was available, and to avoid any overlap with other meetings in Vienna.

15. The representative of the LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA asked how long the meeting in January 2006 would last. He also suggested that the third meeting should take place quite soon after the second one so as to ensure that experts coming from capitals could participate in both meetings.

16. The CHAIRPERSON said that she thought the Committee was in a position to agree to hold its next meeting in January 2006. She would hold consultations with a view to arriving at a compromise on the frequency of the Committee's meetings. The duration of the next meeting would depend on the

topics to be dealt with. Therefore, in her consultations, she would also focus on which topics were of highest priority.

17. Summing up the discussion, she said that suggestions had been made for specific items and themes to be included in the work programme of the Committee, such as: strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards and verification system and assessing relevant General Conference and Board of Governors resolutions in that regard; enhancing information access and sharing; strengthening the verification and analytical capabilities of the Agency; assisting States to improve safeguards implementation; promoting the universal application of comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols; and improving the distribution of resources to ensure more efficient inspections. Members had indicated that they might propose further items at a later stage.

18. Suggestions had also been made for the work programme to include specific briefings by the Secretariat and Member States on such issues as the legal and technical foundations of safeguards, safeguards reporting to the Board, the implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 1540 and the possible role of the Agency in that regard, and experiences with clandestine procurement networks.

19. Many members had expressed the view that the work of the Committee should not duplicate the work of the Secretariat or SAGSI.

20. Several members had stressed the importance of maintaining a balance between the Agency's verification and promotional activities. Some members had expressed the view that the work of the Committee should not place any additional financial burden on Member States, or divert funds already allocated for other Agency activities.

21. It had been emphasized that the Committee should operate on the basis of consensus.

22. Taking into account those proposed items and themes, she intended to conduct informal consultations with a view to reaching agreement on the priority issues to be taken up by the Committee.

23. The representative of the ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN* said that it was important that delegates had time to consult with their capitals over any proposals, both at that meeting and in the future.

24. The CHAIRPERSON said that she would obviously allow delegates the necessary time to consult with capitals.

25. The representative of ARGENTINA said that capitals might want to comment on issues that had been discussed at the current series of meetings.

26. The CHAIRPERSON asked whether her summing-up was acceptable.

27. The Chairperson's summing-up was accepted.

28. The CHAIRPERSON said that it was envisaged that she would present a report on the outcome of the Committee's meetings to the Board of Governors at its November meetings.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.