



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXVIII)/OR.268
February 1985*

GENERAL Distr.
ENGLISH

TWENTY-EIGHTH REGULAR SESSION: 24-28 SEPTEMBER 1984

RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Friday, 28 September 1984, at 9.25 p.m.

President: Mr. BARREDA DELGADO (Peru)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
11 Protection of nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes against armed attacks	1 - 22
22 Examination of delegates' credentials	23 - 35
23 Election of Members to the Board of Governors	36 - 40
- Oral report by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the following items:	41 - 76
The Agency's accounts for 1983	55
The Agency's programme for 1985-86 and budget for 1985	56 - 59
The financing of safeguards	60
Assessment of Members' contributions to the Regular Budget	61
Scale of assessment of Members' contri- butions for 1985	62
The financing of technical assistance	63
Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat	64 - 73
Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute	74 - 75
Review of the Agency's activities	76
23 Election of Members to the Board of Governors (resumed)	77 - 91
24 Report on voluntary contributions pledged to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund for 1985	92
- Closing of the session	93 - 104

*/ A provisional version of this document was issued on 6 November 1984.

**/ GC(XXVIII)/730.

PROTECTION OF NUCLEAR INSTALLATIONS DEVOTED TO PEACEFUL PURPOSES AGAINST ARMED ATTACKS (GC(XXVIII)/721, 737, 740 and 742)

1. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the present item had been placed on the agenda pursuant to resolution GC(XXVII)/RES/407, adopted by the General Conference the previous year. He recalled that in that resolution the General Conference, inter alia, had requested the Director General to keep the Conference informed of developments in the area of the protection of nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes against armed attacks through the adoption of international rules prohibiting such attacks. A report by the Director General pursuant to that request was contained in document GC(XXVIII)/721.
2. The General Conference also had before it under that item two draft resolutions. The first, which was contained in document GC(XXVIII)/737, had been submitted by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela; an amendment had been proposed to it by Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands and New Zealand, and was to be found in document GC(XXVIII)/740. The second draft resolution had been submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran and was contained in document GC(XXVIII)/742.
3. The President informed the General Conference that the Argentine delegation had made it known to him that consultations had been held with the delegations proposing an amendment to the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/737 with a view to arriving at a text which would receive general acceptance.
4. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) explained that the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/737 was clearly intended to take note of the measures adopted by both the Conference on Disarmament and the General Assembly of the United Nations on a matter which, in the opinion of the countries submitting the draft resolution, was of vital importance to all States and to the Agency, and to induce them at the same time to strive further to arrive at binding international rules in that area. The sponsors had taken into account in the draft resolution the particular competence of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and, since the matter dealt with was a delicate one, the

draft had been modelled on resolution GC(XXVII)/RES/407, which had been adopted by a large majority at the General Conference session of the previous year. That was why the sponsors had refrained from including in the text vague concepts which departed in one way or another from the original proposal. They appreciated the endeavours of certain delegations to avoid modifying the draft and they had responded to those endeavours in the manner that had just been explained.

5. The amendment contained in document GC(XXVIII)/740 made reference to the Agency's safeguards system, which Argentina considered appropriate and which as a whole operated reasonably efficiently and satisfactorily. However, that reference to the safeguards system not only limited the aim of the draft resolution, but also compromised very gravely the application of the prohibition on armed attacks. According to that amendment, installations under safeguards would be specially protected, while others would be considerably less so. That was not logical. One should strive to ensure total protection of the population against the catastrophic dangers to which an armed attack on a nuclear installation could lead. The fact that a facility was or was not under safeguards made no difference at all to the radiation hazards that would result therefrom. The formula proposed by the sponsors was general enough to apply to all installations, and it aimed at complete protection of the population which might be affected. In practice, the consequences of the proposed amendment might be so serious that the sponsors of the draft resolution, following consultations, preferred to withdraw their original proposal, only regretting that the point of it had not been adequately grasped.

6. Mr. BRENNAN (Ireland), speaking on behalf of Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, New Zealand and his own country, took note of the Argentine delegation's statement regarding withdrawal of the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/737. Nevertheless, in view of what had just been said, he wished to explain why the countries mentioned had decided to submit the draft amendment referring to the Agency's safeguards system, contained in document GC(XXVIII)/740, for approval by the General Conference.

7. Firstly, the safeguards system provided a very important and objective criterion – and the word "objective" had to be stressed – for it permitted verification that a nuclear facility was in fact being put to peaceful use. That was a factor that should not be overlooked.

8. Secondly, the safeguards system was a central element in the Agency's mandate and tasks. It was enshrined in the Statute, and the draft resolution before the General Conference ought to take that fact into account. It was therefore appropriate to record that nuclear installations which had been placed under international safeguards should be declared protected from armed attack under international law.

9. With regard to the comments made by the previous speaker, it was in no way intended by the sponsors of the amendment to draw any distinction between peaceful nuclear installations. The proposal did not in any way detract from the status of any particular peaceful nuclear facility. All peaceful nuclear installations would be declared protected.

10. Finally, the sponsors of the draft amendment did not wish to pre-empt in any fashion the deliberations of other fora on the matter of adopting international rules prohibiting armed attacks against all peaceful nuclear installations. They recognized that the competence rested with those other fora; hence their draft amendment had been very brief and couched in the most general terms possible.

11. The PRESIDENT invited the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran to introduce the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/742.

12. Mr. SOLTANIEH (Islamic Republic of Iran), first thanking the Director General for the report that had been submitted to the General Conference pursuant to resolution GC(XXVII)/RES/407, explained that his country had always attached great importance to the protection of nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful uses against armed attacks.

13. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/742 reflected in effect the consensus among all Member States of the Agency that any armed attacks against peaceful nuclear installations should not only be discouraged but also explicitly prohibited. Furthermore, operative paragraph 1 responded to the concern of Member States who would prefer the Agency to deal with its problems within the framework of its Statute.

14. He was convinced that the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by his country would by and large ensure that the dangerous violations of the past did not occur again in the future. He called on other delegations to support the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/742 and requested a roll-call vote on the issue.

15. Mr. BIN-DAAER (United Arab Emirates) proposed two changes in the form of the draft resolution submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran; the words "the gravity of" in paragraph (d) of the preamble should be replaced by "the grave", and the words "would call for" replaced by "would guarantee" in the third line of the first operative paragraph.

16. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said he wished to table a procedural motion and to make an appeal to the General Conference. Item 11, which was of considerable importance and extreme complexity, dealt with important matters of principle for all Member States. The first draft resolution (GC(XXVIII)/737) introduced by Argentina and the proposal for its amendment (GC(XXVIII)/740) submitted on serious grounds by Belgium and other countries had both been withdrawn, since their sponsors had realized that it was difficult, at a late stage in the Conference session, to make headway with consultations and arrive at conclusions in a logical and fully responsible manner.

17. That left the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/742, which had been introduced by the Islamic Republic of Iran and to which a proposal for amendment had been submitted by the representative of the United Arab Emirates. That draft resolution would certainly raise as many difficulties as the first one and the draft amendment contained in document GC(XXVIII)/740. The matter was a very difficult and complex one and, because of that circumstance, the

General Conference would need just as much time to study the draft resolution submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran and the proposal to amend it as for examining the first draft resolution and the proposal to amend it, which had just been withdrawn on that account. He therefore suggested that in accordance with Rule 59 and Rule 62(c) of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference the debate on item 11 of the agenda should be adjourned and all documents relating thereto withdrawn.

18. The PRESIDENT pointed out that when a delegate requested adjournment of the discussion of an item under Rule 59 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference, in addition to the proposer of the motion two delegates could speak in favour of and two against the motion, after which the motion should be immediately put to the vote.

19. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic) said he could not entirely agree with the delegate of Australia on his motion for adjournment of consideration of the draft resolution presented by the Islamic Republic of Iran. He did not think that the matter was a very complicated one requiring a great deal of time for study and discussion.

20. Examination of the draft resolution submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran showed that it was very simple and did not contain any ideas that were not in accordance with the Agency's objectives of maintaining peace and avoiding a possible catastrophe for mankind. The draft resolution was not directed at any delegation, nor at the past. It dealt with the future and was based on a very clear idea - namely, that any aggressor should be punished in accordance with the laws of the Agency. Hence he saw no reason to adjourn the discussion.

21. The PRESIDENT, noting that no other delegation wished to speak, put the Australian motion to the vote.

22. The motion was adopted by 37 votes to 14, with 23 abstentions.

EXAMINATION OF DELEGATES' CREDENTIALS (GC(XXVIII)/743)

23. The PRESIDENT recalled that the General Committee had met the day before as a credentials committee to examine the credentials of delegates as provided for in Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. The Committee's report was set out in document GC(XXVIII)/743. Paragraphs 2-12 of the report described the manner in which the Committee had approached its task and reported the opinions expressed during the discussion. Since the appearance of that report, the delegates of Brazil and Argentina had submitted credentials which satisfied the requirements of Rule 27. Paragraph 13 of the report contained a draft resolution recommended for adoption by the General Conference.

24. He then asked whether delegates wished to comment on the report and on the draft resolution contained in it.

25. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking on behalf of a group of countries - Algeria, Cuba, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam - expressed reservations with regard to acceptance of the credentials of the Israeli delegate, which they believed should be rejected on the following grounds: the Security Council of the United Nations did not recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel; Israel had annexed the Golan Heights, which belonged to the southern part of Syria, and that annexation had been repudiated and was considered illegal by the United Nations organizations; and Israel was also occupying other Arab territories, including territories belonging to Palestine, the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon.

26. The PRESIDENT assured the delegate of the Syrian Arab Republic that the reservations he had expressed on behalf of a group of countries would be reflected in the record of the meeting.

27. Mr. SHASH (Egypt) reaffirmed his country's well-known position with regard to the credentials of the Israeli delegate; Egypt did not recognize the annexation of Jerusalem by Israel, which it considered a violation of international law and the conventions of the United Nations.

28. Mr. D.A. SINGH (Malaysia) associated himself fully with the statement by the delegate of the Syrian Arab Republic with regard to the credentials of the Israeli delegation.

29. Mr. SOEPRAPTO (Indonesia) said that his delegation did not recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and did not agree to Israel representing the people of the illegally occupied Arab territories. For that reason he, too, wished to express reservations with regard to the credentials of the Israeli delegate.

30. Mr. YU (People's Republic of China) said that he endorsed the reservations that had been expressed regarding the Israeli delegate's credentials.

31. Mr. S.K. SINGH (India) said that his delegation supported the reservations expressed by a number of delegations, on behalf of whom the delegate of the Syrian Arab Republic had spoken, for the reasons that the latter had so clearly expressed. The problems involved related to both the political aspects and the technical aspects of the Agency as a technical organization. India's views on the Palestine problem, the problem of Jerusalem and the problem of the Golan Heights were well known, and it was because of those problems that his delegation wished its reservations to be duly reflected in the record of the meeting.

32. Mr. HOSSAIN (Bangladesh) associated himself with those representatives of Arab countries and other States who had spoken before him expressing reservations with regard to the credentials of the Israeli delegate.

33. Mr. PEŠIĆ (Yugoslavia) joined the delegates from Africa, Asia and other regions who had expressed reservations regarding the Israeli delegate's credentials.

34. The PRESIDENT asked the General Conference whether it now wished to adopt the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee in paragraph 13 of its report (GC(XXVIII)/743) on the examination of delegates' credentials, note being taken of the reservations expressed by delegations, which would be fully reflected in the record.

35. It was so decided.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (GC(XXVIII)/716 and 732)

36. The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that 11 Members had to be elected to the Board from the geographical areas specified in paragraph 2 of document GC(XXVIII)/732 to ensure that the Board would be constituted in accordance with Article VI.A of the Statute.

37. He further recalled that consultations had taken place within the eight geographical groups and that to facilitate the election an informal note on the results of those consultations had been circulated to delegations.

38. At the invitation of the President, a member of the Egyptian delegation and a member of the Irish delegation acted as tellers.

39. A vote was taken by secret ballot to elect 11 Members to the Board of Governors.

40. The PRESIDENT said that the counting of votes would take some time and therefore suggested that the remaining business under item 23 be deferred until the tellers had reported to him.

ORAL REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

41. Mr. UMAR (Nigeria), Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, presented the Committee's report on items 13 to 21 of the agenda.

42. With regard to item 13 (The Agency's accounts for 1983), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in Part I of document GC(XXVIII)/714.

43. With respect to item 14 (The Agency's programme for 1985-86 and budget for 1985), the Committee recommended adoption of draft resolution A as set out in document GC(XXVIII)/715/Mod.1, and draft resolutions B and C contained in Annex III to Part I of document GC(XXVIII)/715.

44. Under the same item, the Committee had discussed the draft resolution entitled "The Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage" set forth in document GC(XXVIII)/736, and recommended to the Conference that it adopt the draft resolution.

45. Also under that item, the Committee had discussed the draft resolution entitled "Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the International Atomic Energy Agency's technical co-operation" which was set forth in document GC(XXVIII)/733, and recommended to the Conference that it adopt the draft resolution.

46. With regard to item 15 (The financing of safeguards), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/725.

47. Under item 16 (Assessment of Members' contributions to the Regular Budget), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/726.

48. As to item 17 (Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1985), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/727.

49. Regarding item 18 (The financing of technical assistance), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in GC(XXVIII)/734.

50. With reference to item 19 (Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat), the Committee recommended to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/735.

51. Under item 20 (Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/728. At the same time, some of the Committee members had expressed the wish for a review of Article VI as a whole.

52. Finally, under item 21 (Review of the Agency's activities), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/738.

53. The PRESIDENT suggested that the draft resolutions relating to the items of the agenda that had been referred to the Committee of the Whole could now be considered by the Conference with a view to their adoption.

54. It was so agreed.

The Agency's accounts for 1983

55. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/714 was adopted.

The Agency's programme for 1985-86 and budget for 1985

56. Draft resolution A contained in document GC(XXVIII)/715/Mod.1 and draft resolutions B and C contained in Annex III to Part I of document GC(XXVIII)/715 were adopted.

57. Mr. DARTOIS (Belgium) noted that the budget for 1985 had just been adopted. That budget, as opposed to the budgets for previous years, provided for zero real growth, which the Belgian Government regarded as essential for international organizations. Nevertheless, his country could not join the consensus on the section of the budget dealing with safeguards and, in the event of a vote on it, would have had to abstain. That reservation was an indication of his delegation's disapproval of that section of the budget, which was continuing to grow in an unjustifiable manner. Belgium, whose attachment to non-proliferation was unquestionable, believed that the application of safeguards should be reviewed.

Draft resolution on the Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage (GC(XXVIII)/736)

58. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/736 was adopted.

Draft resolution on the Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the International Atomic Energy Agency's technical co-operation (GC(XXVIII)/733)

59. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/733 was adopted.

The financing of safeguards

60. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/725 was adopted.

Assessment of Members' contributions to the Regular Budget

61. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/726 was adopted.

Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1985

62. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/727 was adopted.

The financing of technical assistance

63. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/734 was adopted.

Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat

64. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/735 was adopted.

65. Mr. S.K. SINGH (India), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 as well as for his own country, pointed out that, with regard to the draft resolution on the staffing of the Agency's Secretariat which had just been adopted under item 19, Secretariat staff included the staff of the Department of Safeguards. In a statement made at a meeting of the Board of Governors on 20 September 1984, the Deputy Director General for Safeguards, recalling that certain Member States had deplored the fact that the fraction of proposed new inspectors from developing countries was not higher, had stated that he was proposing 29 persons for approval, ten of them from developing countries. It had been surprising to learn that, according to the Deputy Director General's own words, six of the ten came from developing countries belonging to the Group of 77, while the other four were from developing countries which did not belong to it. That meant that for the Agency's Secretariat there were two categories of developing countries - those which were members of the Group of 77 and those which were not.

66. The Governor from the Philippines and several other Governors, himself included, had queried that classification. They had been told that the Agency was applying what was called the UNDP system, by which countries benefiting from technical assistance programmes or ones to which indicative planning figures (IPFs) were assigned were classed as developing. The Secretariat had stated subsequently that it considered all members of the Group of 77 and certain other States, such as Turkey, Bulgaria and Portugal, to be developing countries.

67. On looking into the matter it had been found that, for its part, UNDP had been applying a relatively flexible system which had varied over time. In some years it had assigned IPFs even to countries like Poland. Turkey, Bulgaria, Portugal and Poland were all countries with very friendly relations with the Group of 77. It was not acceptable, however, for the Secretariat to decide unilaterally, and without being duly authorized by the Board of Governors or the General Conference, which countries should be regarded as developing.

68. The item under consideration was not a matter of development aid or technical assistance, but of the staffing of the Secretariat and the recruitment of personnel for safeguards. There was therefore good reason to be a little bewildered and concerned. The assistance provided by UNDP to Member States was not necessarily based on their being classed as developing countries. UNDP, which was very careful in that connection, had never claimed that the beneficiaries of its technical assistance were necessarily or exclusively developing countries. He therefore felt compelled to point out the error made in the statement which the Deputy Director General for Safeguards had read out to the Board of Governors on 20 September 1984.

69. The Group of 77 was composed of countries appearing in lists A and C of the annex to General Assembly resolution 1995 (XIX), by which UNCTAD had been established. Those lists had been altered from time to time by decisions of the Trade and Development Board which the General Assembly of the United Nations invariably endorsed. The important point about those lists was the seal of approval that the General Assembly had placed upon them. Two countries which appeared in lists A and C, China and Israel, were not members of the Group of 77. Conversely, Cyprus, Malta and Romania, which were members of the Group of 77, did not appear in those lists. Portugal, Bulgaria and Turkey were not members of the Group of 77, nor were they included in lists A and C.

70. Lest the Agency's Division of Personnel should become even more confused by what was going on in the United Nations system, it was to be noted that the United Nations Statistical Office followed a system of classification which was different from both that of UNDP and that of the United Nations General Assembly. According to the Statistical Office classification, all countries were considered developing with the exception of (i) developed market economy countries (United States of America, Canada, EEC countries, EFTA countries, Spain, Yugoslavia, Israel, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa); (ii) the socialist countries of Eastern Europe (Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Soviet Union);

and (iii) the socialist countries of Asia (China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mongolia and Viet Nam). Thus, certain countries – such as Yugoslavia, Romania and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea – which were members of the Group of 77 and were recognized as such in the resolutions of the General Assembly could not be regarded as developing under the system of the United Nations Statistical Office.

71. There seemed to be an infinite variety of systems applied by the international organizations. The World Bank, for its definition of developing countries, considered merely the per capita GNP of States and regarded countries such as China, Mongolia, Turkey, Portugal, Greece and Israel, which were not members of the Group of 77, as developing countries. Conversely, the World Bank did not include any country of Eastern Europe, not even Bulgaria, in that category. Similarly, although China and Mongolia were developing countries from the Bank's point of view, the same did not apply to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

72. There was clearly need for the Agency to show caution in that matter. He wished to recall once more that the Department of Safeguards was not dealing with technical assistance or any other kind of economic aid; the matter under consideration was the delicate one of staffing. The only definition of developing countries that one could agree to see followed by the Agency was the system that had been decided on by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 1995 (XIX), as amended from time to time.

73. As the matter was a rather technical one and a considerable amount of research had been done on it so as to clarify the situation for all concerned, he requested that his statement be reproduced in extenso in the record of the meeting.

Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute

74. The PRESIDENT informed the General Conference that a vote had been requested on the draft resolution in document GC(XXVIII)/744, and invited the General Conference to vote on it by show of hands.

75. There were 66 votes in favour and 3 against, with 11 abstentions. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/744 was adopted.

Review of the Agency's activities

76. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVIII)/738 was adopted.

The meeting was suspended at 11.20 p.m. and resumed at midnight

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (GC(XXVIII)/716 and 732) (resumed)

77. The PRESIDENT informed the General Conference of the results of the voting.

78. The result of election of three Members from the area of Latin America was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	10
<u>Valid votes:</u>	257
<u>Required majority:</u>	43
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Argentina	86
Ecuador	86
Peru	85

79. Having obtained the required majority, Argentina, Ecuador and Peru were elected to the Board.

80. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Western Europe was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	15
<u>Valid votes:</u>	163
<u>Required majority:</u>	41
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Greece	83
Norway	80

81. Having obtained the required majority, Greece and Norway were elected to the Board.

82. The result of the election of one Member from the area of Eastern Europe was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	7
<u>Valid votes:</u>	82
<u>Required majority:</u>	42
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
German Democratic Republic	82

83. Having obtained the required majority, the German Democratic Republic was elected to the Board.

84. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Africa was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	13
<u>Valid votes:</u>	165
<u>Required majority:</u>	42
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Ivory Coast	82
Morocco	83

85. Having obtained the required majority, the Ivory Coast and Morocco were elected to the Board.

86. The result of the election of one Member from the area of the Middle East and South Asia was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	3
<u>Valid votes:</u>	86
<u>Required majority:</u>	44
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Islamic Republic of Iran	29
Jordan	57

87. Having obtained the required majority, Jordan was elected to the Board.

88. The result of the election of one Member from the area of South-East Asia and the Pacific was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	5
<u>Valid votes:</u>	84
<u>Required majority:</u>	43
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Indonesia	83
Malaysia	1

89. Having obtained the required majority, Indonesia was elected to the Board.

90. The result of the election of one Member from the areas of Africa or the Middle East and South Asia or South-East Asia and the Pacific was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	7
<u>Valid votes:</u>	82
<u>Required majority:</u>	42
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Indonesia	1
Malaysia	81

91. Having obtained the required majority, Malaysia was elected to the Board.

REPORT ON VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS PLEDGED TO THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND
CO-OPERATION FUND FOR 1985 (GC(XXVIII)/729/Rev.4)

92. The PRESIDENT said that document GC(XXVIII)/729/Rev.4 contained information on the voluntary contributions for 1985 pledged by 10 p.m. on 27 September 1984. By that time the total amount of contributions pledged by the Agency's Member States had been US \$12 661 726. Since then, Cyprus, Albania and Guatemala had announced pledges of \$2600, \$2600 and \$5000 respectively. Thus, the aggregate amount so far pledged was US \$12 671 926.

CLOSING OF THE SESSION

93. Mr. RODRIGUEZ VARGAS (Colombia), speaking on behalf of the countries of Latin America, expressed his appreciation to the President for the skill with which he had guided the Conference during its twenty-eighth session, thereby testifying to the interest and competence with which Latin America handled matters relating to the Agency's mandate. Also, he thanked the Director General and the Secretariat for their support and the Government of Austria for its hospitality.

94. Mr. SULLIVAN (Canada), speaking on behalf of the area of North America, paid tribute to the President for the way in which he had guided the Conference's work in spite of the difficulties encountered. He also thanked the Director General and the Secretariat.

95. Mr. OSZTROVSZKY (Hungary) commended the President, on behalf of the countries of Eastern Europe, for the patience with which he had guided the work of the General Conference. Thanks to him, major problems and difficulties had been overcome, as a result of which the Agency would be better able, in years to come, to carry out its work for peace. Also, he thanked the host country and the Secretariat.

96. Mr. S.K. SINGH (India), speaking on behalf of the countries of the Middle East and South Asia, commended the Director General and the Secretariat on their efficient work. He thanked the President for his patience and sincerity, which were a credit to Latin America.

97. Mr. SOEPRAPTO (Indonesia) complimented the President, on behalf of the area of South East Asia and the Pacific, for his skill in conducting the deliberations of the General Conference. He expressed appreciation to the Director General and the Secretariat for the smooth way in which the session had proceeded.

98. Mr. BADDOU (Morocco), on behalf of the African group, praised the President for the way in which he had brought the discussions to a happy conclusion. He thanked the Director General and the Secretariat for their unflagging efforts and the Austrian Government for its warm hospitality.

99. Mr. MIYAZAWA (Japan), speaking on behalf of the countries of the Far East, associated himself with the previous speakers in complimenting the President on the way in which he had discharged his functions, and thanked the Director General, the Secretariat, the host country and the city of Vienna.

100. Mr. NOÈ (Italy), speaking on behalf of the countries of Western Europe, said that credit for the success of the twenty-eighth session of the General Conference was due to the President. Also, he thanked the Director General and the Agency's staff.

101. The PRESIDENT said that the discussions during the twenty-eighth session had been evidence of the interest of countries in the Agency's activities and the progress achieved throughout the world in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Delegations had demonstrated their will to work for the common good and, given the present critical situation in international organizations, had shown themselves to be aware of the importance of effective multilateral co-operation.

102. He thanked the Director General and the Secretariat for their administrative support of the meetings and expressed his appreciation to the city of Vienna for its welcome.

103. In conclusion, he emphasized the importance of contributing in every way possible to the continuation of dialogue and the search for consensus aimed at enabling the Agency to discharge its noble functions in the interest of mankind. He invited all present to observe one minute of silence for prayer or meditation.

All present rose and stood in silence for one minute.

104. The PRESIDENT declared the twenty-eighth session of the General Conference closed.

The meeting rose at 12.35 a.m.

