

IAEA Board of Governors

Record of the 1249th Meeting
GOV/OR.1249

Nuclear security: Measures to protect against nuclear terrorism
Nuclear Security Plan 2010-2013

Board of Governors

GOV/OR.1249

Issued: November 2009

Restricted Distribution

Original: English

For official use only

Record of the 1249th Meeting

Held at Headquarters, Vienna, on Monday, 7 September 2009, at 3.15 p.m.

Contents

Item of the agenda ¹	Paragraphs
3 Measures to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety (<i>continued</i>)	1–86
4 Nuclear security: Measures to protect against nuclear terrorism	87–191
(a) Nuclear Security Report 2009 and review of the implementation of the Nuclear Security Plan 2006–2009	
(b) Nuclear Security Plan for 2010–2013	

¹ GOV/2009/67.

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.)

Mr FERUTĂ		Chairman (Romania)
Mr SHOOGUFAN	_____	Afghanistan
Mr THERESKA		Albania
Mr KHELIFI		Algeria
Mr CURIA		Argentina
Mr POTTS	}	Australia
Mr CAMERON		
Mr VALLIM GUERREIRO		Brazil
Mr BARRETT		Canada
Mr DONG Baotong		China
Mr CODORNIU PUJALS		Cuba
Ms MOREIRA VELÁSQUEZ		Ecuador
Mr SIRRY		Egypt
Mr RAAPPANA		Finland
Mr MONDOLONI		France
Mr PAPE		Germany
Ms AMOAH		Ghana
Mr ASHRAF		India
Mr AQRAWI		Iraq
Mr COGAN		Ireland
Mr NAKANE		Japan
Mr ARSHAD		Malaysia
Mr CANCHOLA GUTIERREZ	}	Mexico
Mr FUENTES SANCHEZ		
Ms MACMILLAN		New Zealand
Ms RIVERA		Philippines
Mr NECULĂESCU		Romania
Mr BERDENNIKOV	}	Russian Federation
Mr KARASEV		
Mr MINTY		South Africa
Mr MARTÍNEZ-CARO		Spain
Mr MULTONE		Switzerland
Mr FIDAN		Turkey
Mr SMITH		United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mr DAVIES		United States of America
Mr VEDOVATTI RAFFO		Uruguay
Mr ELBARADEI	_____	Director General
Mr TANIGUCHI		Deputy Director General, Department of Nuclear Safety and Security
Mr ANING		Secretary of the Board

Representatives of the following Member States also attended the meeting:

Angola, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Holy See, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Italy, Republic of Korea, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, Slovakia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

Abbreviations used in this record:

AdSec	Advisory Group on Nuclear Security
ALARA	as low as reasonably achievable
Assistance Convention	Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency
BSS	International Basic Safety Standards for Protection against Ionizing Radiation and for the Safety of Radiation Sources
CPPNM	Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material
CSS	Commission on Safety Standards
Early Notification Convention	Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
EU	European Union
GRULAC	Latin American and Caribbean Group
HEU	high-enriched uranium
INSServ	International Nuclear Security Advisory Service
INSSP	Integrated Nuclear Security Support Plan
IRRS	Integrated Regulatory Review Service
IRSRR	Incident Reporting System for Research Reactors
ITDB	Illicit Trafficking Database
Joint Convention	Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management

Abbreviations used in this record (continued):

NGO	non-governmental organization
NPT	Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
NSF	Nuclear Security Fund
OSART	Operational Safety Review Team
RANET	Response Assistance Network
SCART	Safety Culture Assessment Review Team
SSAC	State system of accounting for and control of nuclear material
TCF	Technical Cooperation Fund
UPSAT	Uranium Production Site Appraisal Team
WHO	World Health Organization

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

3. Measures to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety (continued) (GOV/2009/48; 2009/Note 38)

1. Mr CANCHOLA GUTIERREZ (Mexico) thanked the Agency for its commitment to encouraging international cooperation in support of maintaining high levels of nuclear safety and security. During 2008, Member States which had expressed interest in embarking on or expanding nuclear power programmes had been helped by the Agency in establishing an effective safety infrastructure, developing a legal framework, setting up a regulatory body and applying international legal instruments related to safety. Mexico offered its support to the Agency in promoting the exchange of information and experience among the countries of the Latin America region that were interested in initiating nuclear power programmes.
2. Mexico had participated in the work to develop and update safety standards by sending experts to technical meetings, providing comments and applying the standards within the country. The Safety Guide on establishing a safety infrastructure for a national nuclear power programme would be a very valuable instrument in that connection.
3. As regards review services, Mexico was prepared to receive a SCART mission in the near future with the aim of maintaining a high level of safety. Also, Mexico was committed to implementing the recommendations made by the IRRS mission it had hosted in 2007 and would participate in the International Conference on Effective Nuclear Regulatory Systems to be hosted by South Africa in December 2009.
4. Mexico, which was one of the 15 States that had registered their national assistance capabilities with RANET, called on more Member States to register their data soon.
5. Ms RIVERA (Philippines), having stressed the importance her country attached to nuclear safety, noted with satisfaction that international cooperation, particularly through the Agency, had continued to advance efforts towards improving nuclear safety worldwide. Since the growing use of nuclear technologies around the world warranted commensurate strengthening of the nuclear safety regime, the Secretariat was to be commended for its continued work in promoting nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety in Member States.
6. Her country welcomed the assistance extended by the Agency to Member States, including the Philippines, on developing a safety infrastructure for the introduction of a nuclear power programme, which had helped the Philippines move forward with its plan to include nuclear power in its energy mix.
7. The Agency documents *Considerations to Launch a Nuclear Power Programme* and *Milestones in the Development of a National Infrastructure for Nuclear Power* had served the Philippines as useful guides in assessing its existing safety infrastructure and drawing up work plans towards attaining Milestone 1. The Philippines was requesting a siting safety review mission from the Agency to review and validate the existing siting data on the mothballed Bataan nuclear power plant, as well as an expert mission to assess the current status of its education and training programmes in various nuclear energy related fields.
8. Her country continued to support the work of the Asian Nuclear Safety Network and looked forward to contributing to its vision of a sustainable regional network by 2020 for assisting Member

States in improving their nuclear safety infrastructure. The Network's regional approach to capacity building, education and training, sharing of information and experience, and networking was a cost-effective and efficient mechanism for fostering cooperation on nuclear safety.

9. The Philippines welcomed the Agency's efforts in developing an emergency preparedness and response manual on communicating with the public during a nuclear or radiological emergency. In view of the geographical location of the Philippines, developing preparedness and response capabilities with regard to the impact of major natural disasters on nuclear facilities was particularly important. Her delegation looked forward to the publication of the safety report containing guidance on such types of emergencies that was being developed by the Agency.

10. Her country also looked forward to the Agency's continued work in promoting occupational radiation safety in Member States through networking. The newly established Asian Regional ALARA Network was another portal for exchanging information and promoting occupational radiation safety measures.

11. The Philippines appreciated the efforts of the International Steering Committee on Denials of Shipment of Radioactive Material and regional networks in developing an action plan to address the issue of denials of shipment, particularly the improved use of the database on denials that had resulted in specific cases being resolved. Her delegation looked forward to more concerted efforts in implementing that action plan.

12. Mr CAMERON (Australia) said that the IRRS was an important mechanism for helping Member States to assess the effectiveness of their regulatory mechanisms. Australia had benefited from an IRRS mission and believed that the International Conference on Effective Nuclear Regulatory Systems to be held in South Africa later in the year would provide a useful forum for sharing experience and gaining a better view of the effectiveness of safety and security regulatory regimes globally.

13. Australia appreciated the significance attached to Agency safety standards and the role played by the CSS. His delegation welcomed the approval in May 2009 of Parts 4 and 5 of the General Safety Requirements.

14. His country had registered four teams with RANET and was pleased to note that 15 countries had now registered response capabilities with the Agency's Incident and Emergency Centre. Australia encouraged further Member States to register RANET teams to ensure an effective network.

15. Australia welcomed the establishment of the web-based IRSRR, which was expected to serve as a useful tool for sharing lessons learned, and looked forward to it being used at the meeting of IRSRR national coordinators to be held in November 2009.

16. Australia attached high importance to ensuring the safety and security of radioactive sources and was pleased to note that, as of 30 June 2009, 95 States had made a political commitment to implement the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources. Australia, which had chaired the recent technical meeting on implementation of that Code of Conduct with regard to long term strategies for the management of sealed sources, acknowledged the role of Canada and the United States of America in providing funds to support the attendance of experts from States which could not otherwise have participated. He commended the conclusions contained in the Chairman's report of that meeting to all Member States interested in ensuring the safety and security of disused and orphaned radioactive sources, and requested that the Secretariat make the report available publicly. Of particular note were the obstacles to the reuse and recycling of sources identified by the meeting, the importance of central facilities for the management of disused sources and the discussion of issues surrounding detection of sources in scrap metal consignments.

17. In the context of the long term management of disused sources, there were potential synergies between information-sharing mechanisms under the aforementioned Code of Conduct and those under the Joint Convention. Those synergies merited further exploration.

18. His country attached great importance to the safe, reliable and timely transport of radioactive materials that had an essential role in medical, scientific and industrial applications. It therefore supported the International Steering Committee on Denials of Shipment of Radioactive Material in its endeavours to promote efficient processes for the transport of radioactive materials carried in compliance with relevant regulations. His delegation noted that the world's supply of short-lived medical isotopes was particularly affected by denials or delays, which could significantly exacerbate current shortages of key isotopes. Australia looked forward to working with the Agency and other relevant bodies to examine what special markings or special transport arrangements could be used to facilitate the transport of urgent short-lived medical isotopes.

19. In view of the importance of establishing best practice in uranium mining and processing, Australia welcomed the revival of the Agency's UPSAT review service, which was extremely pertinent in the light of increased calls for assistance associated with the resurgence in the uranium mining industry and the number of new countries entering the field.

20. Mr VALLIM GUERREIRO (Brazil) commended the Agency on its efforts to strengthen international cooperation in the important field of nuclear safety and noted with satisfaction the high level of nuclear safety maintained throughout the world.

21. Brazil believed that effective implementation of Agency safety standards was important for ensuring a high level of safety and that the Agency's review services, such as the IRRS, OSART and SCART, helped Member States to implement those standards. Brazil had requested a first UPSAT mission, a recently revived review service.

22. He drew attention to the nuclear safety activities implemented under the Ibero-American Forum of Radiological and Nuclear Regulatory Agencies, a body which Brazil considered to be an efficient instrument for enhancing nuclear safety in the region. He made particular mention of the regional training course on prevention of accidental exposure in radiotherapy and risk analysis held in March 2009 in Chile, organized by the Agency as a follow-up to projects concluded by the Forum in 2008. The Forum had also established the Ibero-American Nuclear and Radiation Safety Network, an effective tool for the exchange of knowledge, experience and lessons learned in the field of nuclear safety. In that connection, Brazil welcomed the establishment by the Agency of a prototype global nuclear safety and security network.

23. Brazil concurred with the view that safety measures and security measures had to be designed and implemented in an integrated manner so that security measures did not compromise safety and vice versa, particularly with regard to the application of security measures inside facilities that contained radioactive material.

24. His delegation welcomed the publication of standards in the field of the safety of fuel cycle facilities, which filled a gap in the Agency's safety requirements and provided parameters for the licensing process of nuclear facilities, thus enhancing the capabilities of national regulatory bodies. Brazil encouraged the Secretariat to continue its efforts to ensure that the standards for fuel field facilities could become as comprehensive as those for research reactors.

25. Brazil supported the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources and its supplementary Guidance on the Import and Export of Radioactive Sources. Brazil believed that, as long as it did not impede international cooperation and commerce, the Guidance provided exporter and importer States with useful advice that facilitated implementation of the Code of Conduct.

26. Mr BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) emphasized the need for continuous improvement of international efforts to strengthen nuclear and radiation safety. The Agency had an important role to play in that regard in supporting the implementation of international legal instruments, developing and applying safety standards, and improving national safety infrastructures.

27. In view of the number of States considering the option of developing nuclear power or expanding existing programmes, Agency cooperation with those States was particularly urgent. His delegation was pleased to see that activities to that end were given due attention in the report.

28. The third review meeting of Contracting Parties to the Joint Convention had been held successfully in May 2009. The Joint Convention played an important role in the system of international treaties in the field of the peaceful use of atomic energy, and he stressed Russia's commitment to fulfilling its obligations under that instrument.

29. Mr NAKANE (Japan) said that his country had been engaged in the safe transport of radioactive materials jointly with France and the United Kingdom for over 30 years, employing all the safety measures defined by the Agency, and would continue to make every effort to ensure further safety. He hoped that Member States appreciated Japan's excellent safety record and its commitment to maintaining it. Also, together with France and the United Kingdom, Japan had been engaged in constructive dialogue with coastal States. He drew members' attention to the fact that a communication meeting, hosted by shipper States, would be held with coastal States at the margins of the 53rd General Conference. Japan hoped that the forthcoming General Conference would adopt a well-balanced resolution on transport safety.

30. Japan's nuclear authorities and nuclear power operators had been making continuous efforts not only to ensure safety, but also to increase international transparency regarding their activities. For example, following a strong earthquake off the coast of Japan in July 2007, Japan's nuclear safety regulatory body had conducted an examination of the effects of the earthquake on the Kashiwazaki-Kariwa nuclear power plant in collaboration with an Agency survey team. Given the crucial importance of knowledge sharing on seismic safety, Japan was disseminating relevant information through the Agency's international workshops and through the channels provided by the International Seismic Safety Centre.

31. At the third review meeting of Contracting Parties to the Joint Convention, held in May 2009, it had been agreed that Contracting Parties were to implement the international peer review mechanism. Japan believed that international peer reviews were an important measure for compliance with and further development of international safety standards, as well as for the enhancement of transparency. Japan continued to encourage other Member States to become party to the Joint Convention.

32. Japan had accumulated a wealth of experience on nuclear installation safety, including seismic safety, and would continue to make every effort to contribute to the further improvement of the safety of nuclear facilities around the world. Also, Japan attached great importance to the Agency's regional activities to increase cooperation in the field of nuclear safety, such as the Asian Nuclear Safety Network. Japan had participated in the second meeting of the Nuclear Safety Strategy Dialogue of that Network held in Seoul in April 2009.

33. Mr MINTY (South Africa) said that nuclear knowledge management was one of the pressing issues that developed and developing countries alike needed to tackle as a matter of high priority. In that context, South Africa participated in the Agency's fellowship and scientific visit programme, both as a provider and a recipient, and had also established an accelerator facility for use in nuclear education and training, providing relevant hands-on experience. South Africa was now offering a master's course in accelerator and nuclear science, which would facilitate the leveraging of existing expertise and facilities to benefit regional partners.

34. In October 2010, South Africa was to host the Ninth World Conference for Neutron Radiography, the aim of which was to bring together researchers, students and fellows to share information, build networks and strengthen relationships between international partners in neutron radiography related research.

35. In December 2009, South Africa was to host the International Conference on Effective Nuclear Regulatory Systems, which would — inter alia — emphasize the responsibility to be shared by all nuclear regulators, operators and vendors for maintaining effective global nuclear safety and security infrastructure and culture. By drawing attention to the important role regulators could play in promoting nuclear safety and security, that Conference had a vital contribution to make.

36. Radioactive waste management was an important area in the use of nuclear energy. As such, it formed an integral part of South Africa's nuclear energy policy and was addressed in detail in the country's radioactive waste management policy and strategy. In January 2009, South Africa had passed an act providing for the establishment of a national radioactive waste disposal institute.

37. Ms AMOAH (Ghana) said that her country supported the Agency's efforts to enhance the establishment of a sustainable global nuclear safety regime. Ghana was ready to share its regulatory experience with other African countries, including through hosting regional training courses and fellows from the African region at its radiation protection institute.

38. In anticipation of embarking on a nuclear power programme in the long term, Ghana was determined to establish an effective and efficient national safety infrastructure, to be administered by an independent regulatory body, to which end it was in the process of ratifying the relevant international legal instruments. Ghana welcomed the Agency's initiative in preparing the Safety Guide on establishing a safety infrastructure for a national nuclear power programme to ensure the smooth implementation of a high level of safety during the three phases of the introduction of nuclear power programmes. She hoped the Agency would address the concern expressed by Argentina on behalf of the Group of 77 regarding the need for infrastructure issues to be dealt with in an integrated manner so that safety would remain an integral part of broader efforts to develop infrastructure.

39. It was important to establish an effective regulatory infrastructure in all States to ensure operational safety at nuclear facilities and in the use of nuclear technology. Ghana, therefore, fully supported the Agency's efforts in the areas of human capacity building, education and training and would support the standardization of postgraduate academic radiation protection programmes to be offered at designated regional education centres. Also, Ghana welcomed cooperation at regional levels for the fostering and sharing of information and experience.

40. Her delegation appreciated the establishment of regional safety networks, which would help to ensure global nuclear safety and security. Ghana noted with satisfaction the formation of various such networks and would support the work of the newly established Forum of Nuclear Regulatory Bodies in Africa. Furthermore, it welcomed the plans to establish a similar network for research reactor safety in Africa.

41. Ghana was grateful to the Agency for drawing attention to the significant increase in interest in uranium exploration in recent years. More and more countries were requesting assistance with respect to the legal, technical and safety implications of uranium mining, including the environmental consequences. The Agency had identified that the challenge for the international community was to ensure safe and efficient operations and avoid the creation of new legacy sites. The Agency's call for the sharing of good practices and stewardship principles within the world's uranium production industry was a step in the right direction. Also, Ghana echoed others in welcoming the revival of the UPSAT review service.

42. Mr MONDOLONI (France) noted with satisfaction the encouraging results contained in the report, in particular concerning the safety of nuclear power plants and research reactors. France would continue working with the Agency to further improve safety worldwide through international cooperation. France took an active part in the Agency's significant extrabudgetary programme on seismic safety for existing nuclear power plants, including through the provision of cost-free experts.

43. In the context of expanding nuclear programmes and the arrival of new entrants to the global nuclear community, France was pleased at the convergence of its views and those of the Agency on ensuring that civilian nuclear development adhered strictly to the highest standards for safety, security, and non-proliferation. It was essential to have in place national regulatory infrastructures tasked with monitoring nuclear safety and radiation protection as a precondition to adopting or developing nuclear technology.

44. In the decades ahead, maintaining not only the competencies of safety regulators but also competencies in industry would be a major challenge. For that reason France was making special efforts to develop relevant initial and ongoing training programmes for new entrants' safety experts and authorities. France invited the Agency to join in developing the training programmes on nuclear facility safety, in which other European safety experts had cooperated.

45. France intended to take part in the review of areas identified for further work in that connection at the 2010 international conference on challenges faced by technical and scientific support organizations in enhancing nuclear safety and security. France had long attached special importance to harmonizing principles and standards for nuclear safety and radiation protection and was therefore pleased to note that the work of the CSS and other safety standards committees had resulted in a single document which brought together the basic principles of safety in all its aspects.

46. France welcomed the initiation of discussion regarding the interface and synergies between the Agency's safety standards and Nuclear Security Series by the CSS and AdSec. It was necessary to ensure compatibility among practices related to nuclear safety, on the one hand, and nuclear security, on the other. Even though there were interfaces — even overlap — between the two areas, it was important to remember that each also had its specific features, particularly as concerned the scope of application, the level of State involvement and managing the confidentiality of information.

47. Medical exposure to ionizing radiation was a global priority in radiation protection, being by far the largest source of artificial exposure of the population to ionizing radiation. For that reason, France wished to help in the sharing of relevant international experience in order to pool information and lessons learned from incidents that had occurred. In that connection, France was organizing — in collaboration with the Agency, WHO and the European Commission — an international conference from 2 to 4 December 2009 in Versailles on radiation protection of patients receiving radiotherapy.

48. While safety regulation was a national responsibility, radiological risks could extend beyond national borders. International cooperation served to promote and strengthen safety at the global level through sharing experience and enhancing risk management capabilities to prevent accidents, intervene in emergencies and mitigate negative impacts.

49. France supported measures aimed at promoting good regulatory practices in nuclear safety. In fulfilling its Statute, the Agency had built up a significant corpus of safety standards providing the basis for elaborating guides for practical application. In that context, France supported collaboration between the European Commission and the Agency within the framework of the Instrument for Nuclear Safety Cooperation (INSC) and looked forward to future extrabudgetary contributions by the Commission to Agency activities.

50. Finally, regarding the safety and security of radioactive sources, France continued to support the international efforts mounted by the Agency to improve the control of such sources. It noted with satisfaction the increase in international support enjoyed by the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources, which it encouraged all States to adopt. France had carried out a number of operations in close cooperation with the Agency to render such sources safe and secure, particularly in Africa.

51. Mr ASHRAF (India) said that safety would always remain at the heart of the development and sustainable use of nuclear science and technology. As continuous enhancement of the relevant knowledge base was an important factor in ensuring that safety remained a priority, the Agency's programme to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation and transport safety was commendable.

52. He noted with satisfaction the several initiatives carried out in the year under review to support Member States embarking on nuclear power programmes. India understood their desire to have clear and practical guidance for establishing a national nuclear safety infrastructure. That would be a challenge, considering the complexity of the technology, the limited infrastructure in the Member States and global concerns. He believed that the new Safety Guide under preparation on that topic would adequately address their needs. He also noted the several capacity building and education and training programmes available through the Secretariat to support those Member States in applying the Agency's safety standards. India would continue to participate in such programmes and share its experience.

53. India fully supported the Agency's safety standards programme, which set the global reference for the high level of safety required for nuclear energy and its applications. India noted that, following the adoption of a long term structure and format for Safety Requirements by the CSS, the revision of Safety Requirements No. GS-R-1 and the BSS was being undertaken by the Secretariat. India welcomed the criteria adopted by the CSS for a long term user-friendly set of Safety Guides. Also, it noted with interest the progress being made towards establishing integrated nuclear safety and security standards in recognition of certain common purposes of safety and security so that measures implemented to achieve one goal did not compromise the other. India's experts would continue to contribute to the drafting and review of the Agency's safety standards.

54. The Agency's initiatives to address safety issues brought forward by extreme natural events were timely and appropriate. Recent occurrences had shown the likelihood of events affecting installations beyond even a stringent design basis. India welcomed the revision and preparation of relevant documents, as appropriate, in light of the lessons learned from those occurrences.

55. Finally, India welcomed the launching of the Fuel Incident Notification and Analysis System (FINAS), which should improve safety through the exchange of feedback.

56. Mr PAPE (Germany) said that safety in nuclear, radiation, transportation and waste activities was a key area of the Agency's activities and one in which his country was ready to assist.

57. With reference to section B of the report, he said it was Germany's view that Member States which were considering embarking upon nuclear projects should make sure that an appropriate safety infrastructure was implemented. In that context, Germany appreciated the work of the Secretariat in assisting Member States, especially in the field of safety standards, radiation protection and the transport of nuclear material.

58. The third review meeting of Contracting Parties to the Joint Convention, held in May 2009, had offered an excellent opportunity to share experience with other Member States with regard to the storage and treatment of nuclear waste at the back end of the fuel cycle. Intensive discussions were

taking place in Germany regarding the final repository for highly radioactive waste. Any decision on that issue would have to be based on the highest safety standards and best practices. In that context, cooperation with the Secretariat and other Member States could offer valuable assistance.

59. With regard to paragraph 147 of the report, his delegation encouraged the Secretariat to continue its assistance in the very complex area of uranium mining and processing. Germany, with the vast know-how its State-owned company, Wismut, had gained in the decommissioning of contaminated areas in Eastern Germany, was ready to support the respective Agency activities.

60. Finally, regarding paragraphs 36–41, he said Germany attached great importance to the field of nuclear liability and therefore urged all countries that have not yet done so to join the relevant international conventions and ensure their credible implementation.

61. Mr MULTONE (Switzerland) said that the report provided a broad and complete picture of the Agency's cooperation activities in the areas of application of nuclear safety principles.

62. For Switzerland's safety authority and nuclear industry the most important and valuable Agency activities were those related to the establishment of safety standards, and its OSART and IRRS review services. Switzerland's safety authority, the first to experience an IRRS mission, would receive a second such mission in 2011.

63. Concerning the Agency's promotion of small and medium sized reactors which were designed — inter alia — for heating and desalination, there had been noticeable interest in mini-reactors in Switzerland. The public seemed to think that their small size solved all the associated problems. From the point of view of the safety authority, things were not so simple; such reactors should not be promoted until the entire life cycle of the facility and its fuel had been subjected to a thorough safety analysis. In that context, the Agency could direct its attention to the monitoring of construction programmes for such reactors.

64. Mr LEE Jang-Keun (Republic of Korea)* shared the view that the development of the highest level of nuclear safety infrastructure was essential for nuclear power and other nuclear and radiation related programmes. In that light, the Republic of Korea welcomed the Agency's ongoing and significant efforts to support the establishment of national nuclear safety infrastructures, in particular in Member States planning to embark on nuclear power programmes. The Integrated Nuclear Infrastructure Review (INIR) under development and the Agency's peer review services would be effective and comprehensive in evaluating the appropriateness of nuclear safety infrastructure in Member States, and thus would form a solid foundation for strengthening national nuclear safety capabilities.

65. The Republic of Korea had faced numerous complex challenges in the course of building its nuclear safety infrastructure since its first nuclear power plant had gone into commercial operation in 1978. Accordingly, it understood the difficulties confronting new entrant countries in each phase of the process, from site selection through to decommissioning. With its accumulated knowledge and experience in the area, the Republic of Korea was willing to support the development of nuclear safety and regulatory infrastructure of new entrants. Above all, the International Nuclear Safety School (INSS), which had been opened in January 2008 within the Korean Institute of Nuclear Safety as the Agency's regional training centre in Asia, would make an exemplary contribution in supporting nuclear safety capacity building in Member States. With Agency support, the INSS had set up a framework for international education and training, hosted several training courses and organized new programmes tailored to the levels and interests of trainees. In addition, the INSS had established a master's degree programme in nuclear safety for foreign regulatory staff; the opening ceremony for the programme had taken place on 4 September 2009.

66. The Republic of Korea was actively participating in the Asian Nuclear Safety Network (ANSN), not only to raise the level of nuclear safety in Asia, but also to establish and enhance nuclear safety infrastructure and capacity in Asia. His country, which had hosted the second ANSN Strategy Dialogue in cooperation with the Agency in April 2009 in Seoul, believed that a variety of networks — like the Asian Regional ALARA Network — would contribute to supporting the notion that nuclear safety infrastructure was an integral part of nuclear power programmes. Therefore, the Agency's efforts to establish a prototype of the global nuclear safety and security network (GNSSN), comprising all existing networks, was praiseworthy; it would be an effective tool in guiding Member States to exchange relevant knowledge, experience and lessons learned.

67. The Republic of Korea's willingness to share experience and expertise with Member States extended not only to nuclear power plants, but also to other areas of radiation safety. It supported the Agency's efforts aimed at full implementation of the action plan on radiation safety. In particular, the Republic of Korea strongly believed that the Information System on Occupational Exposure in the Medical, Industrial and Research Areas (ISEMIR) had upgraded the level of radiation safety of Member States and contributed to regulatory harmonization. In the area of medical safety, the Republic of Korea expressed its support for the Agency's work on the justification of medical exposures and the provision of guidelines and methodology for a system aimed at addressing long term recording of cumulative radiation exposure.

68. His delegation supported the Agency's vital and continuing role in the area of decommissioning, in particular in disseminating lessons learned and best practices to Member States through the International Decommissioning Network (IDN). Though the Republic of Korea was in the final stage of decommissioning uranium conversion facilities and research reactors, the future decommissioning of commercial nuclear power plants remained a challenge. It therefore appreciated the Agency's networking activities and efforts in the area of decommissioning. The Republic of Korea would continue to improve its infrastructure and regulatory framework in light of the feedback regarding international best practices and lessons learned through the IDN.

69. He reiterated his country's readiness and determination to render its full support to develop the nuclear safety infrastructure within the framework of the global nuclear safety regime and international cooperation in the nuclear safety area.

70. Mr TANIGUCHI (Deputy Director General for Nuclear Safety and Security) thanked members for their encouraging remarks and valuable comments on the agenda item. The Secretariat appreciated members' continued strong support for the Agency activities aimed at the continuous improvement of nuclear safety worldwide, including the synergistic, 'big-picture' approach to safe, secure and peaceful uses of nuclear power and radiation technologies.

71. In response to the comment made by the Group of 77 and China, as well as GRULAC, on inclusion of a reference to the informal, open-ended process on the future of the Agency in paragraph 1 of the report, he said the Secretariat had considered that any relevant Agency activities, whether formal or informal, could be included. However, in light of the widely shared concerns in that regard, the reference in question would be deleted.

72. The Secretariat appreciated the fact that several members had highlighted the importance of capacity building mechanisms that integrated, as appropriate, knowledge networking, education and training, and such peer reviews and advisory services as the IRRS.

73. The Secretariat was following with keen interest the development by the European Commission of a nuclear safety framework based upon the Agency's Safety Fundamentals and the peer reviews. That was an important step towards a harmonized approach to enhancing nuclear safety worldwide.

74. Many comments had been made regarding the challenges of launching new nuclear power plants and expanding existing programmes, as well as the importance of the safety and security of radioactive sources, particularly disused sources and orphan sources, both scheduled as topics for discussion at the next three Senior Regulators' Meetings. The Secretariat was mindful and would continue to pay particular attention to the non-binding nature of the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources as well as to the relevant legally binding conventions, and how those important international instruments were implemented worldwide in support of the global nuclear safety regime. What really mattered, however, was de facto substantive improvement of safety, rather than discussion of the de jure aspects of such instruments.

75. The CHAIRMAN, summing up the discussion, said that the Board had commended the Secretariat for its continued efforts to strengthen its activities relating to nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety. A suggestion had been made for a modification in the report.

76. Several members had noted the Agency's efforts to increase membership of the various safety conventions and codes of conduct, and they had expressed support for those instruments and emphasized their importance in promoting nuclear safety in Member States. They had called on those States which have not yet done so to adhere to those instruments.

77. Several other members had stressed that those codes of conduct were not legally binding.

78. Several members had invited the Agency to further identify possible synergies and areas of international cooperation in nuclear safety.

79. Wide ranging views had been expressed with regard to safety related issues, such as the IRRS; the importance of the Agency's safety standards and guidelines; the safety of nuclear installations; occupational radiation safety; transport safety and denials of shipments; the safety of radioactive sources; radioactive waste management; radiation safety; incident and emergency preparedness and response.

80. The important role of the Agency in providing assistance for countries which were beginning to build the necessary infrastructure for a safe and secure nuclear programme had been emphasized. Several members had emphasized that safety remained an integral part of the broader efforts to develop infrastructure.

81. Several members had underlined the importance of enhancing the Agency's assistance to developing Member States, including through education and training programmes, with a view to upgrading their national radiation protection and regulatory infrastructures.

82. Several members had outlined their national and regional efforts to promote nuclear safety.

83. Several members had noted with satisfaction that operational safety performance remained high and that nuclear power plants and research reactors maintained good safety records. However, the need for vigilance and continuous improvement in safety levels had been stressed.

84. The Board had noted the Secretariat's responses on some of the points raised during the discussion.

85. With regard to document GOV/2009/48, entitled "Measures to strengthen international cooperation in nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety", and taking into account the views and concerns expressed by Member States, he took it that the Board wished to take note of the report.

86. It was so decided.

4. Nuclear security: Measures to protect against nuclear terrorism

(a) Nuclear Security Report 2009 and review of the implementation of the Nuclear Security Plan 2006–2009

(GOV/2009/53; Progress Report on Implementation of the IAEA Nuclear Security Plan 2006–2009, available on GovAtom only).

(b) Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013

(GOV/2009/54)

87. The CHAIRMAN said that the Nuclear Security Report 2009, contained in document GOV/2009/53, had been produced in response to resolution GC(52)/RES/10 in which the General Conference requested that the Director General submit an annual report on activities undertaken by the Agency in the area of nuclear security, highlighting significant accomplishments of the prior year and indicating programmatic goals and priorities for the coming year. Additional information on a review of the implementation of the Nuclear Security Plan 2006–2009 was available on GovAtom.

88. The Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013, contained in document GOV/2009/54, had also been produced in response to resolution GC(52)/RES/10. A draft of that plan had been previously circulated to Member States and had been the subject of informal discussions. The document before the Board had been finalized in light of those discussions.

89. Both the Nuclear Security Report and the Nuclear Security Plan had been the subject of an informal briefing to Member States on 27 August.

90. Mr TANIGUCHI (Deputy Director General for Nuclear Safety and Security) said that the Nuclear Security Report 2009 contained details of the Agency's major achievements in the area of nuclear security, including achievements related to the IAEA Nuclear Security Series, the ITDB programme, INSSPs, nuclear security missions, education and training. Supporting the report was an additional document available on GovAtom on the review of the implementation of the Nuclear Security Plan 2006–2009, which described the results obtained and lessons learned from implementing the plan.

91. Regarding the Director General's report on the Nuclear Security Plan for 2010–2013, he said that in implementing the two previous nuclear security plans the Agency had learned a number of important lessons, some applicable to States, others applicable at the regional and international levels and to the Agency. Those lessons had been incorporated into the third Nuclear Security Plan for 2010–2013, which had been developed following extensive consultations with Member States. Having thanked Member States for their helpful comments in that regard, he said that the plan was designed to respond to the priorities identified in consultation with Member States and to address the sustainability of nuclear security improvements.

92. Activities carried out under the Nuclear Security Plans had contributed significantly to national efforts to improve nuclear security. However, there was still a long way to go before the goals for global nuclear security would be reached.

93. The threat of a nuclear security event was a reminder that there was no room for complacency. The materials and facilities that were subject for security considerations were much broader than initially thought. That was a new paradigm for nuclear security. All substances, fissile or other radioactive, had to be managed to ensure their accountability, safety, security and peaceful uses. Wherever those materials were, they should be subject to management systems that ensured security.

94. In conclusion, he said it was clear that the responsibility for nuclear security rested with the State, and it was also clear that global nuclear security benefited from international coordination and cooperation. While there had been very significant developments in addressing nuclear security improvements, much more needed to be done in that area.

95. Mr CURIA (Argentina), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, noted with satisfaction that the report contained in document GOV/2009/53 recognized that the responsibility for nuclear security rested entirely with each State, and that the Agency provided assistance upon request.

96. The Group welcomed the Agency's efforts in elaborating nuclear security guidance, in consultation with Member States, to be published in the IAEA Nuclear Security Series of publications. The Group noted with interest that the aim of that guidance was to help States to implement their national nuclear security systems.

97. The Group underscored that developing and sustaining effective global nuclear security would require a variety of steps to be taken in a number of areas.

98. The Group noted with satisfaction that, in the framework of the Nuclear Security Plan 2006–2009, the Agency continued to provide nuclear security assistance to States while taking into account the other activities undertaken by the Agency's programmes and the synergies among all those activities, as well as SSACs.

99. The Group took note of the continuing reports about incidents of illegal possession, movement and attempted sales of nuclear and other radioactive material. The Group recalled that the criteria established for reporting incidents to the ITDB were very broad and thus the numbers alone did not reflect the significance of those incidents. In that context, the Group requested the Secretariat to provide a qualitative analysis of the actual significance of those incidents and an assessment of their associated risks and actual relevance to possible acts of nuclear terrorism.

100. The Group appreciated the efforts of the Agency to respond to the expressed needs of countries by establishing INSSPs to consolidate the nuclear security needs of individual States into integrated plans for nuclear security improvements and assistance. Those plans enabled the Agency, the State concerned and potential donors to coordinate activities, optimize the use of resources and avoid duplication.

101. The Group underscored that effective nuclear security required both human resources and technical systems. That made it necessary for the Agency to provide assistance to States upon request for improving technical systems at facilities or locations where nuclear and other radioactive material was used, stored or transported, establishing effective border controls or implementing nuclear security at major public events.

102. In the area of emergency preparedness and response, the Group noted that the ConvEx3 emergency exercise in Mexico in July 2008 had identified the need to strengthen the Agency's emergency preparedness and response capabilities. The Group highlighted that the aforementioned activities in the context of the Nuclear Security Plan 2006–2009 had been implemented mostly through extrabudgetary voluntary contributions from Member States and others to the NSF. The Group also highlighted that reliance on the NSF had proved successful.

103. Turning to the Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013 contained in document GOV/2009/54, he said that the Group had always supported the Agency's nuclear security activities, the overall goal of which was to assist Member States in improving their nuclear security.

104. The Group noted that the plan reflected that the responsibility for nuclear security rested entirely with each State and that the Agency's assistance was provided upon request. The Group further noted

with satisfaction the assertion contained in the document that adherence to the Agency guidelines and recommendations related to enhancing security was voluntary and should respect the primacy of the State in security issues, premises which should underlie the role of the Agency in enhancing nuclear security. The scope of its activities must be determined by the Member States and as reflected in the Board decisions and General Conference resolutions.

105. The Group recognized that safeguards agreements between the Agency and States, inter alia, through effective SSACs made central contributions to preventing illicit trafficking in nuclear material.

106. The Group appreciated the Agency's efforts in the area of risk reduction and that the Agency provided, upon request, assistance to: strengthen the physical protection of facilities; obtain effective accounting for and registry of nuclear material through the development of SSACs; establish analogous mechanisms for the accounting for and registry of other radioactive material; establish effective border controls; and, bring vulnerable radioactive material into safe and secure storage or disposal conditions when such material was out of governmental control.

107. The Group appreciated that, in implementing the plan, full account would be taken of activities undertaken in the Agency's nuclear safety and safeguards programmes and the relevant synergies between safety, security and safeguards. The Group also appreciated that, when safety and safeguards activities also served nuclear security purposes, additional funding would be provided from the NSF to accelerate their implementation and that activities would respect existing competencies throughout the Agency with a view to avoiding duplication and promoting sustainability.

108. The Group reiterated its views regarding the conditions placed by donors on the use of their voluntary contributions to the NSF, which had an impact on programme delivery. The Group encouraged the Agency to continue to work with donors to resolve that issue and ensure maximum flexibility in the use of funds, thus minimizing the need to resort to the Regular Budget.

109. The Group of 77 and China noted that the activities included in the Nuclear Security Plan for 2010–2013 would continue to be funded largely from extrabudgetary contributions made on a voluntary basis to the NSF. The Group reiterated that nuclear security was not a core statutory function of the Agency and that the sole responsibility for implementing nuclear security measures rested with Member States. Therefore, the Group believed that it was fully justifiable for the activities undertaken in the area of nuclear security to continue to be financed through voluntary and extrabudgetary resources.

110. The Group of 77 and China noted that the cost of implementing the new plan was estimated to be some €23 million, which represented a remarkable increase in resources compared with the current plan. The Group stressed the importance of having an adequate balance between promotional activities, including the technical cooperation programme, and other activities of the Agency in terms of the resources they received. In that context, the Group encouraged Member States to contribute to the TCF, which was of fundamental importance for developing Member States, in order to provide it with sufficient, assured and predictable resources.

111. The Group noted that the Agency had assisted in the repatriation of HEU research reactor fuel, at the request of interested States. However, the Group found it necessary for such activities, which did not result in actual risk reduction and only catered to the perceived risk reduction of some Member States since the material was moved from the control of one State to another, to rely fully on funding from the NSF and not from the TCF or the Regular Budget.

112. In that context, the Group noted that risk reduction activities were expected to consume the largest portion of the resources required for implementing the Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013 and requested further clarifications regarding the breakdown of the related activities.

113. Furthermore, the Group requested that the Secretariat provide a detailed explanation, including empirical evidence, regarding the assumption that the risk that nuclear or other radioactive material could be used in malicious acts remained high.

114. The Group underscored the importance of identifying the legal basis upon which the Agency would cooperate and coordinate with other international initiatives in the area of nuclear security. The Agency's resources should not be consumed by catering to initiatives that had been established by only a few countries or NGOs. Priority must be given to those areas that were supported by all Member States.

115. Noting the references to the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources and its supplementary Guidance contained in document GOV/2009/54, he reiterated the Group's opinion that that Code of Conduct should not hamper the wide use of radioactive sources, especially in developing countries, and should not be used to deny the peaceful uses of atomic energy or the export of those sources for use in developing Member States. Furthermore, the Group reiterated that Codes of Conduct and guidance documents were not legally binding, as reflected — inter alia — in resolution GC(48)/RES/10. The document should therefore contain an explicit reference to reflect the non-legally binding nature of that Code.

116. Finally, the “other open sources” referred to in paragraph 34 of the plan should be clearly defined.

117. Ms HELLSTRÖM (Sweden)*, speaking on behalf of the European Union, the candidate countries Turkey, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia², the Countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, the EFTA countries Iceland and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, and Azerbaijan, welcomed the Director General's annual report on measures to protect against nuclear terrorism. As usual, the report served as a useful tool in evaluating the Agency's activities on nuclear security and in particular under the Nuclear Security Plan for 2006–2009.

118. The EU reaffirmed its view that the responsibility for nuclear security rested entirely with each individual State.

119. The EU recognized that nuclear security was an essential programme and commended the Agency for its tireless efforts to strengthen international cooperation and improve nuclear security worldwide. In that context, the EU welcomed Agency efforts to strengthen and continue to play a constructive role in its interaction with other international organizations and initiatives, such as the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism and the World Institute for Nuclear Security.

120. The EU had continued its extrabudgetary support to the Agency's nuclear security activities through four EU joint actions in the context of the common foreign and security policy, totalling €23 million over the preceding five years. In addition, individual EU Member States had made significant contributions. Through the joint actions, support had been given in the areas of legislative and regulatory assistance, strengthening the security and control of nuclear and other radioactive

² Croatia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia continue to be part of the Stabilisation and Association Process.

materials and strengthening of national capabilities for detection and response to illicit trafficking. The support had been targeted to countries in Central Asia and the Caucasus, South East Europe and the Balkan region, Mediterranean countries in the Middle East, Africa and South East Asia.

121. Turning to the Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013, she said that despite significant contributions to national efforts to improve nuclear security under the previous Nuclear Security Plans, further challenges remained ahead. The EU therefore welcomed the proposed plan as it could significantly contribute to reaching the objective of effective security wherever nuclear or other radioactive material was in use, storage or transport.

122. The International Symposium on Nuclear Security held in Vienna in 2009 had been an important forum for sharing experiences and giving directions for the future. It had been recognized that there was a need to continue the work towards global, sustainable nuclear security. All States had responsibilities to establish appropriate systems and take necessary measures to prevent, detect and respond to malicious acts in that regard.

123. The EU looked forward to the early completion of the IAEA Nuclear Security Series, in particular the fundamentals and recommendations related to the security of nuclear and other radioactive material and facilities. Together with the implementing guidelines, they should constitute a comprehensive set of guidance that would serve as a benchmark, support implementation of national nuclear security systems and foster nuclear security worldwide.

124. The international legal instruments were of great importance to strengthening the global nuclear security framework. The EU called on all States to become parties to the CPPNM and its amendment. Since effective national implementation was dependent on the availability of useful guidance, the EU looked forward to the early and successful outcome of the INFCIRC/225 revision in the framework of the Nuclear Security Series.

125. The Agency's nuclear security peer reviews and advisory services were essential tools to assist Member States in evaluating their nuclear security systems. The EU was pleased that those services would be better tailored to the needs of individual requesting States and offered in a flexible modular manner. Also, those expert services should complement self assessment methodologies.

126. The EU welcomed the steps taken in the framework of the programme and budget for 2010–2011 aimed at funding nuclear security activities from the Regular Budget. However, implementation of the proposed Nuclear Security Plan for 2010–2013 continued to a large extent to be dependent on extrabudgetary resources through the NSF. The EU was considering providing continued financial support to the NSF and called upon all Member States to contribute on a voluntary basis to that fund.

127. Mr ARSHAD (Malaysia) noted that the report contained in document GOV/2009/53 recognized that the responsibility for nuclear security rested entirely with each Member State and that the Agency provided assistance upon request. His delegation highly appreciated the support provided to Malaysia in that regard and thanked the Secretariat for its commendable efforts in the preparation of the Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013. Malaysia was also grateful to donor States for their continuing extrabudgetary support in the implementation of that plan.

128. Malaysia remained fully committed to the objectives of the NPT and called for urgent steps to be taken towards general and complete nuclear disarmament. The verifiable and irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons was the only guarantee of global nuclear security.

129. Malaysia fully condemned all acts of terrorism, including nuclear terrorism, regardless of the motivation of their perpetrators. In that regard, Malaysia had signed the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism in September 2005.

130. Malaysia assigned a high priority to combating any kind of terrorism by addressing its root causes and was a member of an extensive counter-terrorism network in the South East Asia region. Malaysia was implementing a national environmental and radiological sources portal monitoring system to detect the movement of radiological or nuclear material in order to deter illicit trafficking. Moreover, Malaysia had hosted several Agency activities on nuclear security in recent years.

131. His country however cautioned against the disproportionate focus on perceived threats to nuclear security that could result in unjustifiable denials of the shipment of vital radioisotopes, particularly those required for crucial medical and healthcare applications. It also cautioned against linking the increase in interest in nuclear energy to an increase in the perceived threat to nuclear security.

132. Mr BARRETT (Canada) said that the collective implementation of a robust nuclear security regime would not only protect the public from physical harm, but also provide the necessary framework and confidence to fully realize the beneficial uses of peaceful nuclear energy.

133. Despite significant progress achieved through the Agency's Nuclear Security Plans and other important international efforts, the spectre of nuclear terrorism had not yet abated. While important achievements had been made, future needs and priorities would still have to be addressed through multilateral efforts to strengthen nuclear security. To date, Canada had contributed approximately \$12 million to the NSF as part of its continuing commitment to the G8-led Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction. Activities supported by the NSF were essential in strengthening nuclear security worldwide.

134. Canada thanked the Office of Nuclear Security for its work in implementing nuclear security activities over the preceding year. Regarding the Nuclear Security Report 2009, Canada greatly appreciated the ongoing work to develop the Nuclear Security Series, particularly the nuclear security fundamentals and essential elements, as well as the recommendations documents. The highest priority for Canada remained revision 5 of INFCIRC/225, which contained a very valuable set of recommendations used by many Agency Member States in the development of their physical protection programmes. Canada remained a committed and active participant in the further revision of that document and was also participating in developing the suite of reference level nuclear and radioactive materials documents.

135. Successful implementation of the Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013 would help reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism. Canada's latest contribution of \$4 million to the NSF, as announced in March 2009 by its Minister of Foreign Affairs at the Agency hosted International Symposium on Nuclear Security, would support the activities described in the new plan.

136. The plan was a critical guiding document in the area of nuclear security. For it to be useful and remain relevant throughout the coming four years it must be a 'living document' — sufficiently flexible to accommodate major international shifts and to retain its currency and cogency through continuous improvement. Such ongoing review and improvement would be particularly important in terms of assessing progress in attaining the plan's objectives.

137. It was important to ensure that the performance indicators described in the new plan were appropriate, realistic and aligned with the objectives of each of the four elements of the nuclear security programme and their related activities. For example, his country recommended that each activity had a clear result as well as performance indicators with which to measure the attainment of the result. That was essential in order to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the Agency's nuclear security activities. There was room for further improvement consistent with results based management.

138. Finally, Canada endorsed the calls for contributions to the NSF, until such time as nuclear security activities could be more fully financed from the Regular Budget.

139. Mr CURIA (Argentina) said that the Secretariat's approach to nuclear security merited careful examination. Security needed to be addressed in conjunction with safety. He pointed out that there was no global security regime that existed independently of the Agency's statutory safety function. Also, nuclear security must be prevented from having a detrimental effect on peaceful nuclear activities, especially applications of vital importance to health and economic development. The Agency must ensure the fullest possible access to such applications.

140. The guidance and recommendations mentioned in paragraphs 10 and 11 of document GOV/2009/53 should be incorporated into a single body of recommendations prepared jointly by security and safety specialists in order to prevent possible conflicts, confusion, duplication and additional costs in activities involving nuclear and radioactive material. Furthermore, it was important to reach timely agreement on the scope and content of those documents in view of the complexity of the material.

141. Argentina was pleased with the work of AdSec and the CSS and their decision to establish a joint task force to discuss safety and security synergies and interfaces and the feasibility of producing combined safety and security recommendations. Also, it welcomed the increasing recognition of the need to integrate both safety and security into design and implementation.

142. His country was concerned about the reports of illegal possession and movement of nuclear and other radioactive material that showed a persistent picture of nuclear trafficking. It was important that the Secretariat provide the Board with more information to support that assertion, differentiating clearly between nuclear and other radioactive material.

143. Finally, in terms of nuclear security recommendations, the Secretariat should ensure transparency in its activities, using a similar procedure to that followed for nuclear safety. Beyond that, given the specific characteristics of nuclear security, all guides and documents should be submitted to the Board of Governors for consideration and approval.

144. Turning to the Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013 contained in document GOV/2009/54, he said that while his country had no objection to the Agency continuing with its cooperative nuclear security activities, the complexity of the issue called for a careful examination of the scope and scale of the programme.

145. To have a clear implementation framework for the plan, the specific characteristics of each region or country must be considered when establishing priorities and developing the Agency's activities. Generalization of the threat without regard for the situation in each State would compromise the effectiveness of nuclear security.

146. The amount of the Agency's technical assistance activities in that area and their apparent lack of connection with safety seemed unreasonable. Safety and security must be addressed in tandem to ensure effective State control of radioactive material.

147. When developing guides and recommendations on nuclear security, the responsibility and sovereignty of States must be kept fully in mind as fundamental principles. That would reduce the risk of activities connected with cooperation and the scope of the recommendations being viewed as international obligations. Also, the revisions to document INFCIRC/225 should be confined to nuclear material.

148. Regarding the provision of additional funding from the NSF to accelerate the implementation of safety and safeguards activities also serving nuclear security purposes, it was important that the

Secretariat maintain an appropriate balance among the Agency's activities and their specific objectives.

149. Since the primary responsibility for nuclear security rested with States, it was not clear why nuclear security support centres needed to be created. Nor was there clarity about the scope of the information platform referred to in paragraphs 28 and 34, particularly as regards the issue of confidentiality of information. He expressed concern that recommended measures were to acquire a binding nature when included as an obligation in international agreements concluded by States, as referred to in paragraph 20, and requested further clarification. Also, his delegation requested that the Secretariat clarify the reference to closer relationships with industry and its representative bodies in paragraph 30.

150. The language of the recommended actions in both documents seemed more in line with that of a resolution and he wondered if that was appropriate.

151. Finally, he said that the Agency's presentation on the legal basis related to nuclear terrorism at a seminar on the prevention of nuclear terrorism held in Buenos Aires in June 2009 had been confusing as it had mixed legally binding instruments with recommendations. More precision was required to establish a binding legal framework on nuclear terrorism.

152. Ms MACMILLAN (New Zealand) welcomed the Agency's major achievements in nuclear security over the past year, including publication of the Implementing Guide on Security in the Transport of Radioactive Material. She expressed satisfaction at its work on human resources development, which was essential for making and sustaining improvements in nuclear security, and its provision of assistance to Member States to improve technical systems, establish effective border controls and implement nuclear security at public events. The Agency's work on recovery, conditioning and repatriation of disused dangerous radioactive sources had made an important contribution to risk reduction.

153. New Zealand recognized the value of the ITDB programme and encouraged all States to participate in it. Her country shared the Agency's concern at the persistent picture of nuclear trafficking emerging from the database and other sources. Measures to detect such trafficking and other potential nuclear security events must remain a high priority. She noted the Agency's conclusion that, in order to successfully fulfil its obligations under the Early Notification and Assistance Conventions in the event of a large nuclear accident with dispersal of radioactivity, additional human resource development and up-to-date equipment and technology would be needed by the Agency's Incident and Emergency Centre.

154. She expressed appreciation for the progress report provided to Member States on implementation of the Nuclear Security Plan 2006–2009, which made it clear that meeting goals for global nuclear security would require further sustained efforts by individual Member States, regional groups and the Agency. She welcomed the new Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013, developed through a valuable interactive process between the Secretariat and Member States, as a tool to guide those efforts.

155. Finally, she pledged an increased contribution of NZ \$40 000 by her country to the NSF for 2009 and called on Member States to contribute to that Fund.

156. Mr FUENTES SANCHEZ (Mexico) reaffirmed his country's support for the Agency's efforts, in coordination with Member States, to improve nuclear security, particularly its support for capacity building at national level. Mexico recognized the importance of protection against nuclear terrorism, especially with regard to the security of nuclear materials and facilities. It therefore welcomed the Agency's work to assist Member States in developing and improving their nuclear security capacity,

establishing national nuclear security systems for nuclear materials and facilities, and detecting and responding to nuclear security events.

157. His Government was engaged in bilateral cooperation to improve the security of sources of ionizing radiation, particularly in medical centres, and had worked on several projects with the United States of America to that end during 2008.

158. Mexico's National Nuclear Safety and Safeguards Commission was the country's contact point for participation in the ITDB programme, enabling access to information on misplaced and orphaned sources. He expressed appreciation for the Agency's support for Member States to build capacity for effective border control to prevent the illegal import and export of nuclear and other radioactive materials.

159. Mexico had received an INSServ mission in December 2008, which had aimed to evaluate the State's capacity to detect and respond to illicit trafficking of nuclear and other radioactive materials, its level of planning and preparedness to respond to nuclear security events involving radioactive or nuclear materials, and its development of the necessary human resources. The mission had visited points of entry and exit for international goods and passengers. In that context, his Government had asked for Agency support in installing detection equipment for use at the 16th Pan American Games, to be held in Guadalajara, Mexico in 2011.

160. Having welcomed the four new titles published in the IAEA Nuclear Security Series in the reporting period, he said Mexico would continue to collaborate with the Agency in preparing more documents in that Series.

161. The technical support envisaged under the Nuclear Security Plan for 2010–2013 for reviewing Member States' legislation in order to establish the legal framework needed to fulfil obligations deriving from the relevant international instruments was important to Mexico. Also welcome was the proposed introduction of a Master of Science degree in nuclear security, which would benefit both students and the experts employed to teach them. Referring to paragraph 43 of the plan, he stressed the need for the Agency to ensure effective coordination between bilateral and multinational programmes in the area of nuclear security, given the increase in the number of such programmes, their potential overlap and the fact that some countries, such as Mexico, had insufficient human and economic resources to participate in many programmes.

162. Every State should establish a nuclear security support centre, as outlined in paragraph 44 of the plan. To that end, Agency support should be provided to identify appropriate facilities at national level and to look into the possibility of creating international or regional laboratories to assist in reducing costs to individual Member States.

163. He emphasized that activities under the Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013 should not detract from priorities in other areas of the Agency's work, such as technical cooperation, which was vital for sustainable development. His delegation was pleased, therefore, that the plan would continue to be funded with extrabudgetary contributions from the voluntary NSF.

164. Mr SIRRY (Egypt) underlined the importance of efforts and Agency assistance to ensure nuclear security, prevent nuclear weapons and sensitive nuclear material from falling into the hands of terrorist groups, and secure nuclear installations against sabotage.

165. His delegation welcomed the view expressed in Agency documents that responsibility for nuclear security rested primarily with individual States, rather than with any international bodies, and that Agency support was extended only in response to requests by Member States.

166. Stressing that the Agency's efforts in the areas of safeguards and nuclear safety pursuant to its Statute led directly to increased levels of nuclear security, he expressed the view that the real danger lay in the possibility that terrorist groups might acquire nuclear weapons. Effective nuclear security could never be achieved until the world was rid of nuclear weapons. The nuclear-weapon States should take serious steps in that direction as the effectiveness of any international cooperation would remain limited so long as such weapons existed.

167. Universal application of the comprehensive safeguards system was necessary for nuclear security because tightening controls on nuclear material and the obligation to submit periodic reports accounting for sensitive nuclear material formed the first line of defence in the fight against nuclear terrorism and illicit trafficking. Reaffirming his country's support for Agency efforts in the field of nuclear security, he emphasized that maintaining security was a sovereign matter and the need for the Agency's activities to be bound by its Statute.

168. Ms RIVERA (Philippines) said that her country shared the Agency's objective of attaining global nuclear security and had benefited from the implementation of the Nuclear Security Plan 2006–2009. The plan provided the Agency with an integrated and systematic mechanism for extending assistance to Member States in the development and implementation of their own national nuclear security plans.

169. Officials from relevant Philippine agencies had participated in various training courses and meetings on nuclear security organized by the Agency, which had greatly assisted their work in preparing a draft national nuclear security plan in 2007. Recommendations obtained through close collaboration with the Agency had further enabled the Philippines to enhance its efforts to strengthen its national nuclear security framework. Interaction with the Agency had resulted in the development of an INSSP, tailored to the country's needs, to aid in implementing its national nuclear security plan, particularly in the areas of optimum use of resources and coordination of activities. The finalized plans would shortly be submitted to senior national authorities.

170. She welcomed the assistance envisaged under the new Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013 for newcomer States planning to use nuclear power in their energy mix, which the Philippines was seriously considering. Given the increase in activities related to nuclear power in Asia, similar attention should be given to the safe and secure use of nuclear technology.

171. Noting the quantifiable performance indicators contained in the new plan, she suggested the development of a platform to evaluate how the ensuing numerical results contributed to the achievement of individual objectives and the overall plan objective. That would determine the impact and effectiveness of activities and enable the Agency to identify areas to be strengthened, superfluous activities and gaps to be addressed. She looked forward to receiving information on the Agency's role under the various international legal instruments on nuclear security and a report on efforts to facilitate adherence to those instruments.

172. To ensure sustainability and consistency in national nuclear security activities, more follow-up actions, such as surveys and technical missions, should be undertaken. Maintaining adequate human resources with the required training and competence had become a challenge for the Philippines, and the country looked forward to continuing its participation in nuclear security training programmes.

173. Noting the recognized need to use existing infrastructures and networks at the national, bilateral, regional and international levels so as to avoid duplication of effort, she said that the Philippines would welcome greater coordination between the Agency and existing mechanisms so as to facilitate programme implementation and maximize the use of available resources.

174. Mr SHOOGUFAN (Afghanistan), highlighting the importance of nuclear security, expressed support for the efforts of the Agency and its Member States to widen the scope of activities in the various fields of the peaceful use of nuclear technology. Nevertheless, the international community must remain seized of the need to prevent the misuse, diversion and theft of nuclear materials. Increased levels of use required increased levels of responsibility.

175. Safeguards agreements between the Agency and its Member States, the development of SSACs, secure storage and waste management, and effective border controls were central to the common goal of preventing illicit trafficking of nuclear materials. His delegation concurred with the view that, when safety and safeguards activities also served nuclear security purposes, additional funding should be provided from the NSF. That would accelerate implementation, promote sustainability and help avoid costly duplication. Keeping in mind the fundamental importance of the technical cooperation programme for developing Member States, contributions to the TCF should not be neglected in favour of the NSF, which did not serve a core statutory function of the Agency.

176. The international community should be encouraged to foster cooperation in combating nuclear terrorism. If nothing was done to contain and prevent the proliferation of nuclear materials by rogue elements, criminal groups would gain access to such materials. Activities should be aimed at improving physical protection systems, strengthening the security of civilian nuclear facilities, stopping illicit trafficking in nuclear materials and encouraging information sharing.

177. Also, the international community should accelerate its efforts to develop an effective working partnership capacity to counter nuclear proliferation systematically. A number of voluntary and obligatory measures already being taken by countries could be reviewed to assess their effectiveness and, where necessary, strengthened or adapted with a view to their swift implementation. Nuclear-weapon States, in particular, should be encouraged to pledge additional resources, use their own capabilities to protect nuclear materials within their territory, and prevent the proliferation of nuclear capabilities and materials to non-State actors.

178. The world's people should be able to benefit from nuclear technology while being protected from its dangers. Cooperation at every level and a system of standardized best practices for managing nuclear materials were essential. A cohesive approach, clear decision-making mechanisms, capacity building, and internationally coordinated information exchange were crucial in effectively combating the threat of nuclear terrorism. However, responsibility for nuclear security rested with each State. The Agency's assistance in that regard seemed indispensable in many cases.

179. Mr CAMERON (Australia) highlighted his country's strong support for the Agency's nuclear security programme, as evidenced by its further contribution of AU \$450 000 to the NSF in May 2009. In addition, Australia continued to work closely with the Agency to support its nuclear security activities, participating actively in developing guidance materials and undertaking training courses and security related missions. In particular, his country had hosted two regional training courses in 2009.

180. Australia, which attached importance to the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources and its supplementary Guidance on the Import and Export of Radioactive Sources, was continuing work with its regional neighbours to identify high risk sources and enhance the necessary legislative and security infrastructure and security culture. It looked forward to increased interaction with Agency initiatives in that regard.

181. Taking note of progress in developing the IAEA Nuclear Security Series, he underlined the importance of INFCIRC/225/Rev.4, Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and Nuclear Facilities, as a key element in assuring the security of nuclear materials and facilities. He expressed satisfaction at the high priority assigned to preparing a further revision of the document for incorporation into the Nuclear Security Series. Australia looked forward both to continued involvement in its drafting and to

its final publication as a document containing recommendations. He encouraged the Secretariat in its efforts to complete the drafting of a top-level fundamentals document detailing the essential elements of nuclear security, thereby providing a cohesive framework to facilitate development of the underlying recommendations. Preparing a top-level document would also provide an opportunity to ensure an effective interface between the essential elements of nuclear security and the Agency's safety fundamentals.

182. Australia welcomed the Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013, which provided a sound basis for the Agency to play a helpful role in assisting Member States in their efforts to establish and maintain effective nuclear security and which covered a wide range of activities consistent with the relevant international legal instruments. In view of the importance of good performance indicators for assessing the effectiveness of implementing the plan, he also welcomed the Secretariat's commitment to adopt a continuous improvement approach to refining those indicators.

183. He expressed satisfaction that the plan recognized that international and bilateral initiatives had a significant role to play in enhancing nuclear security worldwide. Australia looked forward to continuing to interact closely with other Member States, both through Agency activities and through other mechanisms, in strengthening nuclear security.

184. Mr KARASEV (Russian Federation) reaffirmed his country's commitment to the Agency's efforts to combat the threat of nuclear and radiological terrorism by helping States to enhance nuclear security in the use, storage and transport of nuclear and radioactive materials and associated nuclear facilities. In that regard, he drew attention to the project, mentioned in paragraph 17 of document GOV/2009/53, to upgrade the Interdepartmental Special Training Centre in Obninsk, Russian Federation, which would provide regular international training courses in the field of nuclear security.

185. Welcoming the progress made in the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, launched by the Presidents of Russia and the United States of America in July 2006, he expressed appreciation to the Agency, which had participated in the Initiative as an observer, for its technical and expert support.

186. He expressed concern, however, at the lack of progress in bringing the amendment to the CPPNM into force owing to the slow rate of adherence among Member States. The amendment's entry into force would contribute to establishing a strong global regime to prevent nuclear terrorism.

187. With regard to the Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013, he expressed doubt at the approach taken, whereby resources from the NSF could be used for safety and safeguards activities. Until now, 90% of funding for the Agency's activities to combat nuclear terrorism had come from the NSF, and such activities should remain its core purpose.

188. Mr DONG Baotong (China) expressed satisfaction that, during the final year of implementation of the Nuclear Security Plan 2006–2009, the Agency had done much to promote the application of relevant international legal instruments and help Member States to establish and improve nuclear security regulatory systems, infrastructure and capacity through a range of activities. He commended the Agency on the results achieved and hoped the Secretariat would continue to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of nuclear security activities.

189. He expressed satisfaction that the new Nuclear Security Plan 2010–2013 had been improved in structure and substance, taking account of experience and lessons learned. While participation in and support for nuclear security at major public events remained a priority, more attention would be devoted to the role of INSSPs in providing more flexible and tailored nuclear security services to Member States in the light of actual conditions and changing needs.

190. With regard to the important area of human resources development and educational programmes, the new plan for 2010–2013 envisaged the establishment of an integrated nuclear security training system, covering short-term training and undergraduate and graduate education. Having pledged his China's continuing support for the Agency's activities in the area of nuclear security, he expressed the hope that, in implementing the new plan, the Secretariat would give due consideration to internal and external coordination, in accordance with its responsibilities under its Statute and relevant international legal instruments.

191. His Government, always careful to fulfil its international obligations and commitments, had also participated actively in revising the CPPNM, the ITDB programme and the Agency's action plan for nuclear security. Furthermore, it had improved its national regulations on the management, import and export of radioactive sources, in accordance with the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources and the Supplementary Guidance on the Import and Export of Radioactive Sources. China had signed cooperative agreements with the Agency on nuclear security and established a joint nuclear safeguards and security training centre to provide training for people from China and other countries in the region. Since 2006, China had organized some 15 training courses, benefiting more than 600 people. In October 2008, the National People's Congress had ratified the amendment to the CPPNM and all preparations to ensure compliance with the Convention had been completed. To facilitate the amendment's early entry into force, he called on other Member States to sign and ratify it as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.