

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

Exchange of views (*continued*)

1. **The Chairman** said that document NPT/CONF.2000/MC.III/CRP.15/Rev.1, which the Committee had before it, had broadly and constructively taken into account the comments and suggestions made by delegations at the meeting held the previous day. The criterion used in preparing the revised document had been to achieve broad acceptance of the final report. New paragraphs had been added and the numbering had therefore been altered. So far, section II B, paragraph 12, and the last sentence of paragraph 11 in section III did not have the support of all delegations.

2. **Mr. Yang Dazhu** (China) said that at the meeting held on the previous day his delegation had said that it needed more time to study the revised draft report. To some extent, the revised text reflected the opinions put forward by delegations and, if appropriate amendments were made, it might become a compromise text that would be submitted to the Conference for adoption. His country had participated in the work of the Committee in a constructive and cooperative spirit and hoped that it would be possible, without too much difficulty, to conclude the work on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, particularly in relation to the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

3. The structure and content of the revised draft were positive, in spite of the fact that certain parts needed to be improved. In the first place, there was no mention in the text of nuclear power even though a large proportion of the electric power generated throughout the world was of nuclear origin; it was therefore essential, in considering the peaceful use of nuclear energy, to mention that contribution which was of benefit to mankind. In the second place, the subjects of nuclear safety, radioactive waste, the transport of radioactive material, the conversion of military materials to peaceful uses and the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes took up a major part of the revised draft, while only a small part was devoted to technical cooperation, particularly the subject of funds for technical cooperation. Many delegations had emphasized the voluntary nature of the Technical Cooperation Fund which had reduced its importance. Accordingly, that part of the report should be strengthened. In the third place, many developing

island countries had repeatedly expressed their concerns with respect to the transport of radioactive materials. His country considered that those concerns were legitimate and should be reflected in the report.

4. Specifically, in section III, paragraph 2, of the initial draft (NPT/CONF.2000/MC.III/CRP.15) the words "power generation" should be added after "inter alia". During the debate that suggestion had been supported by many delegations, even though it was understandable that some countries, because of their particular situations, had opted not to develop nuclear energy. The elements mentioned in document NPT/CONF.2000/MC.III/CRP.7 should be reflected in the final report, in particular paragraphs 1, 3 and 6. In section III, paragraph 6, second sentence, relating to technical cooperation, the word "voluntary" should be deleted so that the sentence would read: "It urges member States of the IAEA to make every effort to pay in full and on time their contributions to the Technical Cooperation Fund ...". Certain delegations had suggested the addition of the phrase "and reminds them of their obligation to pay their assessed programme costs". His country saw no problem in that. The first version of the report correctly reflected the relevant resolution adopted by IAEA at the 1999 General Conference; accordingly, it was to be hoped that the wording that had been adopted by consensus some months earlier at the Conference would be maintained and that the delegations concerned would reconsider their suggestions. His country supported the proposal made by the Islamic Republic of Iran for the inclusion in the report of the relevant elements given in document NPT/CONF.2000/MC.III/WP.10, in particular paragraphs 2 and 4.

5. Turning to editorial suggestions, he said, with reference to section I, paragraph 6, that his delegation supported the proposal by the United Kingdom with respect to the medium-term strategy. In section II A, paragraph 2, the word "all" should be deleted in the second sentence. His delegation supported the position of France and the United Kingdom concerning section II A, paragraph 4, second sentence, and pointed out that, in paragraph 7 of that section, the word "transparency" should be deleted. In the middle of paragraph 13 of the same section, the expression "to build consensus" should be deleted so that the sentence would read: "The Conference recognizes the activities of IAEA in the search for new approaches on radioactive waste management solutions that are both

safe and publicly acceptable". His delegation proposed that, in the last sentence in paragraph 15 of that section, the expression "notes that it is important" should be used instead of the word "urges". He also proposed the deletion of the phrase "nationally or in cooperation with others to ensure that they have efficient liability mechanisms in place". The revised sentence should read: "The Conference notes that it is important for all States to have in place an efficient liability mechanism". Finally, in section II B, paragraph 8, specific reference should be made to "international standards and international law".

6. **Mr. Gerstler** (Germany) said that the text prepared by the Chairman was balanced and represented a consensus formulation of the various proposals made by delegations. However, the proposal by China to amend the wording with respect to matters such as technical cooperation was not acceptable. The same applied to the issues of liability and the transportation of radioactive materials which were technical cooperation matters and should be dealt with in Vienna or Paris. The Chairman's text could not achieve a consensus if it were substantially amended, particularly with respect to the matters he had mentioned.

7. **Mr. Pohan** (Indonesia) said that section II B, paragraph 11, was of the greatest importance for countries of the Non-Aligned Movement and that it could be strengthened still further. Section I, paragraph 1, of the revised draft should be replaced by the text in paragraph 1 of document NPT/CONF.2000/MC.III/CRP.7, which read: "The Conference reaffirms the legal obligations of the States Parties, set forth in Article IV of the Treaty, to facilitate the fullest possibility exchange of equipment, materials, scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to cooperate with other States to further development of applications of nuclear energy".

8. **Mr. Kerpens** (Suriname), while acknowledging the efforts made by the Chairman to prepare a text that would make it possible to reach a consensus, said that the text did not fully take account of his delegation's concerns. In section II B, paragraph 9, of the revised text the concerns of certain delegations had been reflected, particularly with respect to national and international regulations. However, the important proposals put forward by New Zealand, which had been supported by many delegations, had not been taken into account since the paragraph continued to

insist on rights but made no mention of obligations. In paragraph 10 of the same section the proposal by Haiti that the expression "welcomes" be replaced by "notes" had not been reflected. He welcomed the fact that the Chairman had not given in to pressure in favour of the deletion of paragraph 12 of the revised text; however, he pointed out that the important amendment proposed by Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago, among others, concerning the environmental impact assessment had been omitted. That was important as a means of enabling small countries to take certain measures in the event of an accident. The proposals made by New Zealand concerning the liability regime should be included in the text so as to avoid any misunderstandings or ambiguities. It was important to emphasize that the overwhelming majority of States supported certain opinions and that only four States were opposed to them. Those States should put forward amendments to the text in a constructive spirit instead of merely insisting on the deletion of certain passages.

9. **Mr. de Yturriaga** (Spain) agreed with the statement by the representative of Germany. He disagreed with the proposal by China concerning the deletion, in section III, paragraph 6, of the word "voluntary", since the drafting of that paragraph reflected reality and was consistent with the IAEA Statute according to which the technical cooperation contributions were voluntary.

10. **Mr. Eslanizad** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that he fully supported the proposals made by China to strengthen section III of the draft. Specifically, China's proposal to add "power generation" after "inter alia" in the second line of paragraph 2 of that section had received the support of many delegations but had not been taken into consideration; nevertheless the use of nuclear power to generate electricity was a resource for many Third World countries. For the same reason, it was difficult to accept section I, paragraphs 8 and 10, in which the peaceful use of nuclear energy was subordinated to sustainable development, which might be interpreted in the restrictive sense that, in order to achieve such development, the use of such energy would have to be curbed. That was inadmissible, because for some countries sustainable development depended precisely on nuclear power. On the other hand, in the penultimate line of section III, paragraph 6, after the words "Assessed Programme Costs", the following text should be inserted: "It also vigorously rejects any attempt by any Member State to use the