



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXXII)/COM.5/OR.58

24 October 1988

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

Original: FRENCH

THIRTY-SECOND (1988) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna
on Wednesday, 21 September 1988, at 11.20 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. LAVIÑA (Philippines)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the provisional agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
12	The Agency's contribution to sustainable development	1 - 24
14	Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1989	25 - 27
15	The financing of technical assistance	28 - 73

[*] GC(XXXII)/856.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XXXII)/INF/262/Rev.2.

THE AGENCY'S CONTRIBUTION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (GC(XXXII)/COM.5/62)

1. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that document GC(XXXII)/COM.5/62 contained a draft resolution recommended by the Board of Governors (Attachment 1) and a Note by the Secretariat which has been discussed by the Board at its last session (Attachment 2). The subject of the Agency's contribution to sustainable development had been submitted to the Board at its meetings in June and September on the initiative of Sweden, supported by Denmark, Finland and Norway and later by Canada. He invited the representative of Sweden to introduce the draft resolution.

2. Mr. BJARME (Sweden) recalled that the Board had adopted the draft resolution by consensus and its sponsors were accordingly very grateful to the Board; his delegation wished to thank, in particular, the Group of 77 and, especially, the Governors from India and Brazil for their important contribution to the text of the draft, which it hoped would be approved by the Committee of the Whole and then adopted unanimously by the General Conference.

3. Mr. MCGOLDRICK (United States of America) said that his delegation had read with great interest the Note by the Secretariat on the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development which documented very clearly the remarkable way in which the Agency was addressing environmental concerns associated with the use of nuclear energy and the application of nuclear techniques. It noted with particular interest, in paragraph 103 of that Note, that the Agency's environment-related activities accounted for about 17% of the Regular Budget, with a much higher percentage in the nuclear safety and nuclear power areas.

4. The text of the draft resolution originally proposed by the Swedish Government on behalf of the Nordic countries had created some difficulties for his delegation, which it had indicated during discussions of the Board of Governors. The sponsors had taken account of those difficulties and his delegation had therefore been able to join the consensus in the Board. While accepting the draft resolution recommended by the Board, his delegation stressed that its operative paragraph should be interpreted in a manner consistent with the Agency's Statute, which made it an independent member of the United Nations system. Thus, it should be understood that the Agency was not "complying with" resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly or

"following any directive" from that body and that it was exercising its independent decision-making authority in taking action "consistent with" the views expressed by the General Assembly in the relevant resolutions.

5. Mr. IRACABAL LOBO (Chile) commended the Secretariat for its analysis of the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development contained in the Note in Attachment 2 of the document under consideration. His delegation understood the concerns expressed and approved the initiatives of the United Nations in the area of sustainable development, in other words, increasing, harmonious and balanced development of nations, which ensures the preservation of the environment. While considering that the report prepared by the World Commission on Environment and Development described environmental problems which, generally speaking, concerned all countries, it believed that the report placed too much emphasis on the negative aspects of nuclear energy and ignored the manifold contributions made by nuclear energy to protection of the environment.

6. Chile, for its part, was at present carrying on various activities using nuclear techniques to safeguard animal and plant species which were dying out, and also to study atmospheric and marine pollution. It believed, however, that it was no less necessary to make immediate efforts to reduce the adverse effects of nuclear energy, which were described in the World Commission's report and which made the public suspicious of that type of energy. In that respect, his delegation was particularly concerned about the problem of radioactive waste management and believed that each country should find solutions which had no detrimental effect on other countries or on the common heritage of humanity.

7. Moreover, it should be recognized that all measures adopted to solve environmental problems involved high investments, which the majority of developing countries were not in a position to make. The Agency's technical assistance and co-operation activities were therefore of particular importance in that area as well. For those reasons, his delegation supported the proposed draft resolution.

8. Ms. BHADURI (India) said that her country attached great importance to environmental problems and considered that sustainable development was in that respect perhaps more essential than might at first be thought, since there were a number of misconceptions to the effect that

nuclear energy was incompatible with the notion of sustainable development. Developing countries needed nuclear energy and her delegation therefore believed that the Agency should study the positive aspects of that type of energy in the context of sustainable development and environmental protection. The draft resolution recommended by the Board of Governors to that effect took account of the amendments proposed by her delegation, which therefore had no hesitation in supporting it.

9. Mr. MALU wa KALENGA (Zaire), while supporting the proposed draft resolution, noted that nuclear energy was by its very nature non-renewable and therefore could hardly contribute to "sustainable" development: the adjective appeared to be badly chosen. Moreover, in view of its contents, it would be better for the draft resolution to be entitled "the Agency's contribution to ecologically rational and sustainable development". Apart from those comments his delegation supported the draft resolution, the objectives of which it approved.

10. Ms. KINSKY (France) said that her delegation had supported the draft resolution of the Board of Governors, believing its subject to be of great importance for the Agency and for all countries which had developed or intended to develop a nuclear power programme and which were convinced that it was the energy of the future. Her delegation wished to reiterate its appreciation of the Secretariat's analysis of the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development and to express its gratitude to the delegations of the Nordic countries which, in presenting the draft resolution under consideration, had given the Agency the opportunity to clarify what was really at stake with regard to the development of nuclear power in the context of the continuous progress of humanity. In his report to the Board at its February meetings, the Director General should describe what had already been done in the Agency's programmes to place the peaceful uses of nuclear energy at the service of a permanent improvement in the quality of life.

11. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) recalled that his delegation had had the opportunity to express its point of view on the Agency's contribution to sustainable development at the meetings of the Board of Governors. It approved the draft resolution recommended by the Board, which took into account the remarks and observations made, particularly by the Group of 77,

and stressed that the Agency should make its contribution to sustainable development within the limit of available resources, in other words, without any additional burden on the budget.

12. Mr. KHAIRUL ZAMAN (Malaysia) expressed satisfaction with the document in which the Secretariat described the present activities of the Agency contributing to sustainable development. His delegation approved the draft resolution recommended by the Board of Governors on the initiative of the Swedish delegation and was particularly pleased because it took into account the comments made during the Board meetings.

13. Mr. KANIEWSKI (Poland) said that for several years, governments and the general public had realized the effects which uncontrolled development could have if carried out without regard for the environment. That awareness had led to an intensification of international co-operation to detect and reduce all forms of pollution. However, the fight against pollution presupposed financial and technical resources on a scale which could be impossible for many countries acting individually and that was where the Agency could perhaps play a part. Even though environmental protection was not its main mission, the Agency could and should make an important contribution to it in all cases where the use of various nuclear techniques could be an effective method.

14. Agreeing with the World Commission on Environment and Development that there could be no sustainable development unless ecological concerns were taken into consideration, his delegation supported the draft resolution proposed, inasmuch as it strengthened the efforts already made by the Agency in that area. Although no form of energy was without danger for the environment, nuclear energy nevertheless remained the least harmful. Lastly, his delegation believed that the draft resolution should be interpreted in a way that was compatible with the Agency's Statute, according to which one of its tasks was the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and that included nuclear power.

15. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) said that his delegation joined the consensus on the draft resolution. Nevertheless it would have preferred the report to have been more positive as far as the contribution of nuclear energy and, particularly, its applications to environmental protection were

concerned; also as regards the Agency's contribution to solving ecological problems.

16. Mr. METZGER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, considered by the Board of Governors at its previous series of meetings, gave the Agency the opportunity to clarify to what extent and in what way nuclear energy could contribute to sustainable development. In that connection, the Secretariat should be commended on the Note which it had prepared showing how the Agency's activities were already contributing to the objectives laid down in the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development as well as those of General Assembly resolution 42/187. His Government approved the proposed draft resolution.

17. Ms. LACANLALE (Philippines) said that her country had for a long time been concerned about the consequences which technical development could have on the environment, but those concerns had hardly had any echo until the present time. Therefore, her delegation welcomed with satisfaction the draft resolution on the Agency's contribution to sustainable development. It approved the activities undertaken by the Agency to help achieve ecologically rational development and, particularly, the use of nuclear techniques in environmental monitoring which it hoped would become an integral part of the Agency's programmes in the future.

18. Mr. ROIG (Cuba) said the Agency and its Member States had always attached priority to the environmental aspects of nuclear energy and that accounted for what Cuba considered to be the well-planned development of nuclear energy. In terms of effects on the environment, the nuclear industry had a record of which traditional energy industries using coal, oil or gas could be envious, since conventional power plants released millions of tonnes of ash and toxic gases and practice showed that the utilization of fossil fuels was many times more dangerous than that of nuclear fuel. His delegation believed that, while continuing to take account of the analyses and recommendations of the World Commission on Environment and Development, it should be borne in mind that the Commission had not done justice to the steps taken in the area of radiation protection and nuclear safety. That was why it approved the analysis contained in the Note by the Secretariat, which placed nuclear energy in its proper context among the various energy options

available to countries. His delegation also approved the draft resolution recommended on that subject by the Board of Governors.

19. Mr. TILEMANN (Australia) said that his delegation was able to support draft resolution GC(XXXII)/COM.5/62. The report of the World Commission on Environment and Development covered a set of difficult, extremely important questions which dealt primarily with the effects of energy production on the environment and his delegation was pleased that it had been possible to have discussions on that subject. Efforts aimed at further co-ordinating international action to deal with environmental problems resulting from industrial growth and, particularly, increased energy needs were both timely and essential. Australia, which was one of the main uranium exporting countries, recognized the contribution made by nuclear energy to the economic well-being of a large number of the Agency's Member States and believed that the contribution of nuclear energy to the application of control measures and appropriate standards in the nuclear power industry should be understood and widely recognized.

20. Australia supported the general trend of the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development but noted that it had not always taken into account the role played by the Agency in the framework of international activities related to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. In that respect, his delegation was pleased to note that in his statement to the General Conference on 19 September, the Director General had provided clear information to rectify the report's shortcomings.

21. Ms. AWADALLAH (Egypt) said that her delegation had always supported environmental protection efforts and that Egypt was attempting at national level to attain the objectives set in that area. It therefore welcomed with satisfaction the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development which contained guidelines for those responsible at national and international levels. It also believed that the Agency had discharged the activities entrusted to it in the area of nuclear safety and radiation protection and that those activities were contributing to sustainable development. Her delegation took it that the Secretariat would take into account all the comments which had been made in all the Agency's bodies, particularly in the Board of Governors. In conclusion, it supported the draft resolution under consideration.

22. Mr. MELIBARY (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation, believing that the Agency's contribution to sustainable development was one of the most important aspects of its activities and that it should carry them out within the limits of the available budgetary resources, associated itself with those countries which had supported the draft resolution under consideration.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that in the absence of any objections he would take it that the Committee of the Whole wished to recommend to the General Conference that it should adopt the draft resolution contained in Attachment 1 of document GC(XXXII)/COM.5/62.

24. It was so decided.

SCALE OF ASSESSMENT OF MEMBERS' CONTRIBUTIONS FOR 1989 (GC(XXXII)/843)

25. The CHAIRMAN noted that, for consideration of the present item, the Committee had before it document GC(XXXII)/843. As in previous years that document contained a draft resolution on page 2, but he wished to draw the Committee's attention to paragraph 2 of the cover page.

26. As there were no speakers, he took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/843.

27. It was so decided.

THE FINANCING OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (GC(XXXII)/841, GC(XXXII)/COM.5/64)

28. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it, for the next item, a report by the Board of Governors (GC(XXXII)/841) and a draft resolution submitted by Egypt (GC(XXXII)/COM.5/64). He invited the representative of Egypt to introduce the draft resolution.

29. Mr. GALAL (Egypt) thanked the Chairman of the Board of Governors for the efforts which he had made to reach a consensus on the question of the financing of technical assistance for 1990-92. Those efforts had been successful since the Board had agreed on indicative planning figures (IPFs) amounting to \$45.5 million for 1990, \$49 million for 1991 and \$52.5 million for 1992. Although those figures did not fully meet the technical assistance

needs of developing countries, particularly in view of the zero growth in the Regular Budget, his delegation invited the Committee to adopt the draft resolution GC(XXXII)/COM.5/64.

30. Mr. ROIG (Cuba) recalled that the problem of financing technical assistance had been under study since 1981, both in the General Conference and in the Board of Governors. There were two clear and well-known positions on that subject. The first advocated that technical assistance be financed from the Regular Budget like the other programmes in order to guarantee predictable and assured resources for the implementation of projects. Supporters of the second position favoured the existing mechanism of IPFs and the financing of the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund (TACF) by voluntary cash contributions from Member States. His country supported the second position, particularly since so far there had been significant increases in the level of resources allocated to the TACF. That was not the case for the Regular Budget, which was subject to serious financial restrictions likely to jeopardize the implementation of certain programmes which had already been approved and which were very important for many Member States, particularly developing countries.

31. His delegation believed that the existing mechanism of funding TACF was effective and constituted an acceptable formula for the majority of recipient countries. It should guarantee real and systematic growth in the resources allocated to the technical assistance and co-operation programme so as to be able to respond with increasing effectiveness to the needs of developing countries and other countries. In order to achieve that goal, all countries should participate in the financing of TACF, pledges of contributions should be honoured particularly by the major donors and those pledges should be based on the IPFs established by the Secretariat and approved by the Board of Governors and the General Conference. In other words it was by implementing the maximum of technically feasible projects that the existing mechanism for funding technical assistance could be justified. If that were not accomplished, it would be much more difficult in future to obtain the necessary support for the IPF mechanism, since many Member States regarded the technical assistance and co-operation programme as one of the Agency's most important under its statutory obligations. Therefore, the necessary financial

resources should be obtained to ensure the full implementation of that programme.

32. In conclusion, his delegation wished to express clearly its concern at the difficulties encountered during consideration of the IPFs for the following programming cycle (1990-92), since some countries had not demonstrated the necessary political will in support of a modest annual increase in the resources of the TACF, an attitude which could be interpreted as an attempt to weaken the technical assistance programme and to restrict still further the real possibilities open to many developing countries to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes for the well-being of their inhabitants. His delegation hoped that those difficulties would not recur in the future.

33. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) said that technical assistance was one of the Agency's essential activities and that a large number of developing countries had profited a great deal from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy during the past few years, particularly since, as a result of the IPFs, the resources devoted to technical assistance had increased. His delegation believed that at present, the best way of promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy was to use the IPF system and to maintain the principle of voluntary contributions. For its part, Iraq had honoured all its financial commitments to the TACF.

34. Mr. HEIDSMA (Netherlands) said his delegation had noted with satisfaction that an agreement had been reached in the Board on the IPFs for the period 1990-92. His country firmly believed that the same degree of priority should be given to technical assistance activities as to the other major activities of the Agency; that was why it had always paid its full share of the target and would do so again in 1989.

35. However, it should be pointed out that his Government considered that the targets fixed for the period 1990-92 were high in comparison with the present growth of the Regular Budget, which was virtually zero and would probably remain at that level in future. His country might therefore have difficulties from a budgetary point of view since its contribution to the TACF was regarded as a contribution to the Regular Budget and it was not easy to explain to the Netherlands financial authorities that the principle of zero growth for the Regular Budget did not apply to that particular contribution.

His country would endeavour to pay its share of the target for the period 1990-92 but could not as yet confirm that it would be able to do so.

36. Mr. SILANGWA (Zambia) expressed satisfaction with the IPFs recommended for 1989, 1990 and 1991. His Government attached great importance to the Agency's technical assistance activities and that was why it continued to believe that those activities should be financed on a more predictable basis. Although the target fixed for TACF had increased, the amounts actually received had not allayed his delegation's fears about the unpredictable nature of the existing funding mechanism. The Board of Governors and the General Conference should therefore continue to look for solutions to make that mechanism more predictable. His delegation therefore supported the draft resolution GC(XXXII)/COM.5/64, of which it was a co-sponsor.

37. Mr. PABON (Venezuela) said his delegation was very much interested in the question of technical assistance and, more particularly, in the funding of that assistance. That question was, of course, the one which was most important for the developing countries to which the Agency was providing technical assistance in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. For its part, Venezuela was more especially interested in projects relating to applications in medicine, agriculture and industry. The Venezuelan delegation took the present occasion to express its support of the Agency's work and of any proposal designed to develop those activities without involving an increase in the contributions of Member States. Despite the importance which it attached to other areas of Agency activities, the Venezuelan delegation was opposed to the use for other purposes of funds intended for technical co-operation.

38. At the meetings of the Board in February 1988, the Venezuelan delegation had emphasized the importance of the question of apportionment of resources among the various regions and among the countries of a single region. The criteria for apportionment should be examined on the basis of fair and appropriate principles permitting balanced programming. In that context, the Venezuelan delegation attached particular importance to the evaluation process.

39. In conclusion, Venezuela considered that the resolution in document GC(XXV)/RES/388 continued to be valid and that technical assistance should be

funded through the Regular Budget. Consultations should also be continued with a view to arriving at a consensus on the subject of the IPFs for the years on which no agreement had yet been reached. For that reason, the Venezuelan delegation supported the resolution submitted by Egypt.

40. Mr. MALU wa KALENGA (Zaire) pointed out that everybody was in agreement in recognizing that the basic resolution in the matter was that in document GC(XXV)/RES/388, which specified what the Board of Governors had to do. It would therefore be necessary that the General Conference should deal each year not with a simple report of the discussions held in the Board, but with a report corresponding exactly to the three operative paragraphs of that resolution. From that point of view, it would appear that the Secretariat was not doing exactly what was expected of it, i.e. each year giving an assurance that during the past year technical assistance had actually been funded on the basis of resources comparable to those of the Regular Budget, predictable and assured, and indicating explicitly what had been the level of voluntary contributions in relation to the fixed target. Furthermore, it was obvious that the problem did not have to do only with non-fulfilment of the target; it was also due to the fact that the payment of voluntary contributions in national currency imposed major constraints which could be detrimental to the proper functioning of the programme.

41. The second operative paragraph of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388 emphasized the fact that technical assistance should progress at the same rate as other activities of the Agency, including those relating to safeguards. Each year, the Secretariat should indicate whether the target set for technical assistance (IPF) was keeping pace with the Agency's programme. There was no document that gave information of that kind. He wished to obtain from the Secretariat details on the two points he had just raised, and to learn, in particular, whether the IPFs for 1990, 1991 and 1992 were in line with the requirements set forth in resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388.

42. In conclusion, his delegation was willing to support the draft resolution presented by Egypt, on the understanding that the record of the present meeting would be forwarded to the Board so that in future it could take explicit account of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388.

43. The CHAIRMAN assured the delegate from Zaire that the record of the meeting would be communicated to the Board.

44. Mr. NITZSCHE (German Democratic Republic), said that although he welcomed the consensus in the Board on the subject of IPFs for the period 1990-92, he felt concern in noting that a large number of Member States of the Agency had not yet announced the amount of their contributions to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund for the current year and that several others had announced contributions lower than their share of the target. It was to be hoped that the situation would improve in that respect and in that of assessed programme costs, the non-payment of which was difficult to justify since payment was made in national currency. For its part, the German Democratic Republic had paid its contribution to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund for 1988 earlier than in the preceding years, in order to allow both for the financial situation of the Agency and for the efforts of the Secretariat to meet the needs of developing countries in using nuclear technology for the benefit of development.

45. Very generally speaking, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic considered that the system of IPFs was meeting the requirements of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388 of the General Conference and constituted a practical and reliable mechanism. It was also of the opinion that the funding of the Agency's Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund should continue to be based on voluntary contributions in national currency.

46. Mr. HABIBI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation was convinced that the Agency's technical assistance and co-operation activities should be funded through the Regular Budget or through any other predictable and assured source, just as the other large-scale programmes of the Agency, and he hoped that a consensus would be reached very soon on that proposal.

47. Furthermore, although the total annual volume of voluntary contributions for technical assistance had actually increased, the annex to document GC(XXXII)/841 showed that as of 1 June 1988, the promised sum represented only 77.83% of the target of US \$38 million set for the current year. Apparently the budgetary difficulties of certain countries did not permit them to guarantee payment of their contributions to the increased effort. For that reason the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran

emphasized the need for a more reliable formula for the funding of technical assistance.

48. Mr. ZELENTSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted with satisfaction that the development of technical co-operation was obvious, as regards both the volume of services and the number of projects and recipient countries. He was also glad to note that the Agency was still looking for new approaches and methods in that area and that the level of staff training activities in the recipient countries had risen significantly, a development creating a very favourable basis for the absorption by the countries of technical assistance in the form of equipment and facilities.

49. The Soviet delegation had already announced the level of its contribution in the plenary, on the understanding that the sum in question would be used for the purchase of material in the Soviet Union or for the organization in that country of training courses making use of Soviet experts, and also for meetings of experts on problems of co-operation. On that subject, the Soviet Union was in favour of a flexible and realistic policy taking into account the interests of various countries and thus capable of solving the problems that might arise. The Soviet Union also approved the Secretariat's proposal for extending the terms of reference of the Committee on Technical Assistance and Co-operation, as well as the total amounts of the IPFs adopted for the period 1990-92. Generally speaking, it appreciated the universal character of that system of calculating contributions, by which both the amount of resources and the scale of the targets could be reliably predicted. Furthermore, that system was not in contradiction with the principle of voluntary contributions to the TACF in national currency, the main point being that it was understood that each country should make an effort to pay its contributions in full within time limits set.

50. Mr. KENYERES (Hungary) reiterated the opinion often expressed by his country that the system of financing based on the IPFs and on voluntary contributions was the best compromise, as experience had shown that it served the interests of all Member States, whether they were recipients or donors. Furthermore, the Hungarian delegation was convinced that the financing of technical assistance would pose far fewer problems if all Member States announced and paid their voluntary contributions in conformity with their share of the target.

51. Mr. McGOLDRICK (United States of America) said that the present system of funding technical assistance was operating exceptionally well since, thanks to IPFs, support for projects had more than tripled since 1980, a result which far exceeded the growth in the size of the Regular Budget over the same period.

52. In June 1988, the Board of Governors had decided to increase by US \$3.5 million per annum in 1990, 1991 and 1992, the IPFs intended to serve as a basis for fixing targets for voluntary contributions to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund. That decision, which should enable the Agency to plan its activities in that area in the knowledge that the necessary resources were available, was proof that the IPF system was working and that it could constitute a predictable and assured basis for financing technical assistance. Nevertheless, the serious financial difficulties with which numerous Governments were confronted suggested the need for realistic expectations about any future growth in that area.

53. Mr. ASLAM (Pakistan) said that the Agency's technical assistance programme was as important as safeguards and that the two activities should have an equal place in the Agency's programme and budget. However, a comparison of the allocations under the Regular Budget for those two programmes since 1970, showed that the safeguards budget had increased 3-4 times that of the technical co-operation budget, which was a regrettable situation.

54. The Pakistan delegation welcomed the consensus reached in the Board on the adoption of IPFs for the years 1990-92. However, it was a matter of concern to note that an increasing number of Member States were unable to pledge their contributions or were pledging a contribution lower than their share of the target, so that the latter could not be met. Pakistan, renewing a long-standing proposal, therefore urged that technical assistance should be funded through regular and assured sources. Having said that, the Pakistan delegation was ready to associate itself with the consensus on the draft resolution presented by Egypt.

55. Mr. MELIBARY (Saudi Arabia) said he had no objections to the draft resolution presented by Egypt and he wished to pay a tribute to the Agency for its efforts on behalf of technical assistance. Nevertheless, his delegation

would have preferred that the Agency should be able to expand those efforts so as to enable a larger number of Member States to benefit by development, regardless of whether they were rich or poor. That was one of the reasons why Saudi Arabia was advocating the funding of technical assistance through the Regular Budget of the Agency, an approach which would oblige all Members to pay their share.

56. Mr. ZANGGER (Switzerland) said his country was fully aware of the importance of technical assistance and paid its contribution to TACF regularly and punctually. However, it thought that the IPFs for 1990-92 were relatively high. It was all the more difficult to explain to the Swiss financial authorities the disparity between zero growth of the Regular Budget and the increase in IPFs as the payments to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund and to the Agency's Regular Budget appeared under the same budget heading. That having been said, the Swiss delegation was able to adopt the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/COM.5/64.

57. Mr. OLUMOKO (Nigeria) wished to recall that resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388 of the General Conference advocated funding technical assistance from resources that were more predictable, adequate and assured. The full application of that resolution seemed all the more urgent to the Nigerian delegation in that a great majority of States Members of the Agency depended on that source of funding for the implementation of their programme of technical co-operation in various areas associated with the Agency's activities. Although the present system based on IPFs was functioning, that still did not mean it was fully satisfactory. Nigeria would respect the consensus which had been reached by the Board on IPFs for the period 1990-92, but it urged Member States to pay their contributions to TACF promptly and in full so that the target which had been set could be achieved. The Nigerian delegation approved the draft resolution GC(XXXII)/COM.5/64.

58. Mr. BERG (Norway) said that his country had often expressed its preference for the present method of financing technical assistance, which had in fact made possible an increase in the volume of contributions which could not have been expected in the framework of the Regular Budget. Furthermore, the Norwegian delegation welcomed the consensus reached in the Board on the subject of the IPFs for the period 1990-92.

59. Mr. AGRELL (United Kingdom) said that his country still attached importance to the activities of the Agency in the area of technical assistance and co-operation and also that it had pledged its full contribution to TACF for 1989. The United Kingdom delegation welcomed the consensus reached in the June Board on the subject of the IPFs for 1990, 1991 and 1992. Of course, higher figures had been proposed during the discussions, but those which had been adopted still represented a substantial increase. That was proof that the present system was in conformity with the spirit of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388, which called for financing by predictable and assured resources. The United Kingdom delegation was able to accept the draft resolution proposed by Egypt.

60. Mr. BAAH-DUODO (Ghana) said his delegation could go along with the draft resolution submitted by Egypt. It regarded technical assistance as one of the main pillars of the Agency's activities and was glad to note that increased resources were earmarked for the period 1990-92. It also commended the Agency on the new methods which had been introduced in the area of technical assistance. However, it, too, called for the establishment of a funding system which would be more predictable and which would guarantee a regular increase in the volume of funds available for implementation of the technical assistance programme. That was even more necessary at a moment in which the developing world had to face new and daunting challenges in the social and economic sphere.

61. Mr. ABDELBARI (Algeria) said that the financing of technical assistance was a question of vital importance for the developing Member States of the Agency. In that connection, the present system, although satisfactory as a whole, was still inadequate to the extent that many projects were in abeyance because of a lack of resources. The IPFs for the next three years showed an appreciable decrease in resources allocated for technical assistance. It was for that reason that the Algerian delegation considered that technical assistance should be funded through the Agency's Regular Budget. His delegation would be able to accept the draft resolution submitted by Egypt.

62. Ms. de la GARZA SANDOVAL (Mexico) said that her Government attached paramount importance to the Agency's programme of technical

co-operation, considering that the programme and the fund from which it was financed were the most adequate instruments available to the Agency for supporting progress and modernization in the developing countries, which was one of its statutory functions.

63. As well known, the IPFs which the Board recommended for approval by the General Conference were the result of intensive negotiations and consultations. They therefore represented a compromise and, for that reason, could not be fully satisfactory to all the interested parties. The Mexican delegation had fought during the negotiations for a greater increase in the amount of the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund. Having said that, she would endorse the draft resolution submitted by Egypt.

64. At a time when zero growth had been imposed on the Agency's Regular Budget, the Mexican delegation was unable to agree that funding of the technical co-operation programme should come under the Regular Budget. The principle of zero growth should not be applied to TACF and it seemed more appropriate to maintain the present system of financing.

65. Mr. IRACABAL LOBO (Chile) said that, unfortunately it had to be recognized that, despite the efforts which the Agency had been making for so long in all its bodies, the positions adopted by the delegations with respect to application of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388 remained unchanged. It appeared increasingly difficult to arrive at a rapprochement between those who were in favour of technical assistance being funded from the Regular Budget and those who thought financing should continue to be based on voluntary contributions.

66. While fully respecting those who defended the other point of view, he reiterated that, to attain the most important statutory objective, namely, that of hastening and increasing the contribution of nuclear energy to peace and prosperity throughout the world, it was essential that the developing countries should be able to count on financing of technical assistance which was both predictable and assured, something that would be possible with funding through the Regular Budget.

67. The recent introduction of a biennial programme justified even further the position which the Chilean delegation had adopted for several years;

methods in line with what it advocated would ensure longer-term implementation of the planned programmes than was now possible. He therefore urged other representatives to do everything in their power to try, despite their differences, to arrive at the definition of a number of points of agreement, which would be a first step towards agreement on a question of such importance. In conclusion, the Chilean delegation supported the draft resolution submitted by Egypt.

68. Mr. METZGER (Federal Republic of Germany) said his delegation was convinced that the financing of technical assistance by TACF was the method best suited to achieving the objectives of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/388, especially when it considered the constraints in the Regular Budget and the arrears in the contributions of some Member States. His Government was satisfied with the agreement on IPFs for the years 1990-92, and for 1989, as in the past, the Federal Republic of Germany had promised to pay its full share of the target set for contributions to TACF, actual payment being subject to approval of Parliament.

69. Mr. ZANNAD (Tunisia) wished to emphasize the importance of technical assistance for the developing countries, the needs of which were numerous and represented a heavy financial burden. Tunisia favoured the financing of that sector being effected as a matter of priority through the Regular Budget, which constituted an assured and guaranteed source and the total amount of which should be increased substantially. Nevertheless, voluntary contributions could constitute an appreciable supplement to such funding. In that connection, Tunisia appealed to the industrialized countries to contribute more generously to TACF, and it thanked countries for their past contributions. The Tunisian delegation supported the resolution submitted by Egypt.

70. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) said his delegation considered that technical assistance and co-operation should continue to be financed by voluntary contribution on the basis of IPFs. For its part, Italy would endeavour to increase its voluntary contribution to TACF. For the moment the Italian delegation was not able to join the consensus on IPFs which the Board had agreed to in June. He also recalled that his country was providing extrabudgetary funds in an amount ten times higher than its voluntary contribution.