

JOINT CONVENTION ON THE SAFETY OF SPENT FUEL MANAGEMENT AND ON THE SAFETY OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT

Organizational Meeting of Contracting Parties 7–9 April 2003

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING FOR THE FIRST REVIEW MEETING

1. The Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management entered into force on 18 June 2001. The Preparatory Meeting in December 2001 decided that the first Review Meeting would start on 3 November 2003, with a suggested duration of two weeks. The Organizational Meeting pursuant to Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules (INFCIRC/602) was held at the headquarters of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna, from 7 to 9 April 2003. Twenty-nine of the 30 Contracting Parties attended, as follows: Argentina; Austria; Belarus; Belgium; Bulgaria; Canada; Croatia; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Ireland; Republic of Korea; Latvia; Luxembourg; Morocco; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Romania; Slovakia; Slovenia, Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; Ukraine; and United Kingdom. The United States of America also attended as described in Paragraph 5.
2. Mr. George Jack, Canada, was elected President of the Organizational Meeting. Ms. Kirsti-Liisa Sjöblom, Finland, was elected Vice-President.
3. The Meeting adopted the proposed Agenda, as shown in Annex I.
4. The President announced that, pursuant to Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, Mr. Tomihiro Taniguchi, Deputy Director General, Head of the Department of Nuclear Safety and Security, would act as Secretary to the Meeting, to direct the work of the Secretariat.
5. The President advised the Meeting that he had received a letter from the United States of America, which stated, *inter alia*, that, although the USA had not yet deposited the instruments of ratification with the Agency as depository for the Convention, all substantive decisions with regard to ratification by the USA of the Joint Convention had been completed and requested an invitation to participate fully in the Organizational Meeting. While the Meeting welcomed the imminent ratification by the USA, some delegations expressed concerns over making exceptions to rules of procedure, the possible precedent set by that, and the perception of fairness to other countries which are also close to ratification. Without prejudice for any other meetings of Contracting Parties, the Meeting agreed by consensus to the request from the United States of America in this particular instance. The USA delegation then joined the Meeting as full participants.

6. The Secretary examined the credentials of participating delegations as communicated by Contracting Parties. Under Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, the Meeting approved all the communications listing delegates as presented by the Contracting Parties participating in the Organizational Meeting on the understanding that some delegations would provide the Secretariat with formal credentials as soon as possible.

7. The Meeting, noting that no requests had been submitted by intergovernmental organizations to participate as Observer in the Organizational Meeting pursuant to Article 33(2) of the Convention, decided not to invite any.

8. The Meeting decided to use the list of nuclear power plant reactors of Contracting Parties, as contained in Annex II, as a basis for establishing Country Groups for the first Review Meeting. The Meeting then decided to establish five (5) Country Groups for the first Review Meeting. Pursuant to Section III.3 of the Guidelines regarding the Review Process (INFCIRC/603), the Meeting allocated Contracting Parties to Country Groups based on the ranking established in the list of nuclear power plant reactors, using a tennis seeding method. Contracting Parties without nuclear power plants were added to Country Groups, continuing from the point at which allocation of Contracting Parties with nuclear power plants ended, in alphabetical order, starting with Latvia (the initial letter of whose name was randomly selected). The procedure resulted in the composition of Country Groups listed in Annex III, which was agreed by the Meeting.

9. The Meeting elected Mr. Laurence Williams, United Kingdom, as President of the first Review Meeting and Ms. Diana Clein, Argentina, and Mr. Damir Subasic, Croatia, as Vice-Presidents of the Review Meeting.

10. The Country Groups, established as described in para. 8 above, then met separately and, pursuant to Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, made recommendations for other Officers of the first Review Meeting.

11. Upon recommendation from the Country Groups, and pursuant to Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, the Meeting elected Country Group Co-ordinators as follows:

- | | |
|---------|------------------------------------|
| Group 1 | Mr. John Greeves, USA |
| Group 2 | Mr. Paul Kayser, Luxembourg |
| Group 3 | Mr. Peter Lietava, Czech Republic |
| Group 4 | Mr. Werner Mester, Germany |
| Group 5 | Ms. Kirsti-Liisa Sjöblom, Finland. |

One delegation noted that it had reservations related to the results of this election which would be expressed in the context of selection of the other Officers.

12. Further recommendations from the Country Groups concerned the selection of Chairpersons, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteurs. Some delegations expressed the view that in these recommendations insufficient weight had been given to the need for the Officers to be balanced between Contracting Parties with nuclear power plants and those without. This was seen as being important for the future development of the Convention, since the Meeting hoped that there would be many further ratifications from countries not having nuclear power programmes. It was however pointed out that for Contracting Parties likely to have small delegations to the Review Meeting it could be unduly onerous to undertake additional responsibilities, especially if these involved representation outside their own Country Group. Delegations emphasized that efficient conduct of the peer review process was the overriding concern. Taking all of these views into account, and after reference back to certain Country Groups, the Meeting selected the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur for each Country Group as follows:

- Group 1 Ms. Patricia Bubar, USA; Mr. Andrejs Salmins, Latvia; Mr. Jozef Blazék, Slovakia
- Group 2 Mr. Carlos Torres, Spain; Mr. Lucian Biro, Romania; Mr. Jean Scherrer, France
- Group 3 Mr. Magnus Westerlind, Sweden; Mr. Martin Hum, UK; Mr. Patrick O'Sullivan, Netherlands
- Group 4 Mr. Igor Sudakov, Belarus; Ms. Anita Sørlie, Norway; Mr. Ivan Vovk, Ukraine
- Group 5 Mr. Jae In Shin, Korea, Rep. of; Mr. Günter Hillebrandt, Austria; Mr. Richard Ferch, Canada

13. To ensure that, in accordance with Rule 11(d) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, no Chairperson or Rapporteur is assigned to the Country Group of which his/her country is a member, the Meeting drew numbers to advance Chairpersons and Rapporteurs to different groups. The number drawn for Chairpersons was 3 so the designated Chairpersons were advanced by 3 Groups. The number drawn for Rapporteurs was 2 so the designated Rapporteurs were advanced by 2 Groups. The Meeting, noting that some Vice-Chairpersons were from Contracting Parties likely to have small delegations to the Review Meeting, decided not to advance Vice-Chairpersons. As a result, the final allocation of Officers to Country Groups was as follows:

	Chairperson	Vice-Chairperson	Rapporteur	Co-ordinator
Group 1	Magnus Westerlind Sweden	Andrejs Salmins Latvia	Ivan Vovk Ukraine	John Greeves USA
Group 2	Igor Sudakov Belarus	Lucian Biro Romania	Richard Ferch Canada	Paul Kayser Luxemburg
Group 3	Jae In Shin Korea, Republic of	Martin Hum UK	Jozef Blazék Slovakia	Peter Lietava Czech Republic
Group 4	Patricia Bubar USA	Anita Sørli Norway	Jean Scherrer France	Werner Mester Germany
Group 5	Carlos Torres Spain	Günter Hillebrandt Austria	Patrick O'Sullivan Netherlands	Kirsti-Liisa Sjöblom Finland

14. There was a call from some delegations for further reflection by Contracting Parties before the Review Meeting as to whether any changes to the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules (INFCIRC/602) or the Guidelines regarding the Review Process (INFCIRC/603) were needed to accommodate the considerations that emerged during the discussions on the selection process for Officers. Any suggestions should be fed into the open-ended Group responsible for preparing improvements to the Review Meeting.

15. Pursuant to Article 33(2) of the Convention the Meeting decided, by consensus to respond to the written request from the Nuclear Energy Agency of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/NEA) by inviting it to participate as Observer in the plenary sessions of the first Review Meeting. It was noted that, as required by Article 33(2) of the Convention, the OECD/NEA had indicated in writing its acceptance of the confidentiality provisions of Article 36.

16. Pursuant to Rule 11(e) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules and Section II.2 of the Guidelines regarding the Review Process, the Meeting decided not to organize topic sessions at the first Review Meeting. However, noting that there was a lack of rules or guidelines as to the organization and conduct of topic sessions, the Meeting requested the Secretariat to prepare suggestions for consideration by the Review Meeting as to how topic sessions could be conducted if desired in future Review Meetings. Notwithstanding this request, one delegation expressed the view that the organization of topic sessions would mitigate against the fundamental tenet that safety should be considered for radioactive waste management as a whole rather than focussing on specific aspects.

17. Pursuant to Rule 39(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, the Meeting decided that plenary sessions at the first Review Meeting shall be conducted in English, French, Russian and Spanish. Pursuant to Rule 39(6) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, the Meeting decided that documents of the plenary sessions at the first Review

Meeting (other than National Reports) shall be made available in English, French, Russian and Spanish.

18. Pursuant to Rule 39(5)(a) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, and following requests from certain delegations, the Meeting decided that interpretation would be available in French for presentation and discussion of the French National Report, and in Spanish for presentation and discussion of the National Reports of Spain and Argentina. Pursuant to Rule 39(5)(b) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, and following requests from certain delegations, the Meeting decided that interpretation would be available in Russian for the whole of the meeting of Country Group 4, of which Belarus and Ukraine were members.

19. Pursuant to Rule 11(i) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, the Meeting recommended a budget for the first Review Meeting as contained in Annex IV, noting that such a budget would make it possible to accommodate existing requests for interpretation referred to in paras. 17 and 18. It was noted that there remained some uncertainty in the budget depending, *inter alia*, on requests for interpretation that could be received from new ratifiers.

20. The Meeting decided on a provisional timetable for the first Review Meeting as contained in Annex V, recognising that this would be subject to refinement closer to the Review Meeting date. A revised and optimised version identifying the dates of presentation of National Reports would be communicated to Contracting Parties within one month of the Organizational Meeting

21. The Meeting also decided that:

(a) Co-ordinators and Rapporteurs would meet separately before the Review Meeting on 22-23 September 2003 to consider questions received and to review the overall approach to Country Group discussions. The President and Vice-Presidents of the Review Meeting would be informed of the date of the meeting.

(b) Officers for the Review Meeting would meet on Sunday afternoon, 2 November 2003, preceding the Review Meeting to finalize a consistent approach to the review process, taking into account any trends in the questions and comments of the Contracting Parties on National Reports and to agree upon the approach to reporting the Groups' findings at the main plenary session. The Secretariat would be invited to assist the Officers in developing a consistent approach.

(c) The names of National contact points, their postal and Email addresses and telephone numbers, for submitting questions and comments on the National Reports should be communicated to the contact point in the Secretariat, Mr. Gordon Linsley (Email: G.Linsley@iaea.org), not later than 5 May 2003.

(d) The number of hard copies of each National Report to be received by the Secretariat by 5 May 2003 was set at fifty (50). National Reports so received should be distributed to Contracting Parties, through their missions in Vienna, not later than Friday, 9 May 2003. If Contracting Parties make their National Reports available on the Internet, they are encouraged to inform the Secretariat of the relevant Web address. The Secretariat will place these links on its Web page (<http://www-rasanet.iaea.org/conventions/waste-jointconvention.htm>) concerned with the Convention.

(e) As provided for in Section VIII of the Guidelines Regarding the Review Process and confirmed at the Preparatory Meeting, questions and comments on National Reports must be received by Contracting Parties and relevant Country Group Co-ordinators not later than 3 September 2003. Questions and comments communicated during the review of National Reports would be treated as confidential, although some Contracting Parties indicated that they would make publicly available answers to questions received on their own National Reports, without indicating the Contracting Party posing the questions. Contracting Parties were encouraged to provide written answers to all questions received one week in advance of the start of the Review Meeting.

22. Noting the relevance of this Convention to all Member States of the IAEA, covering as it does radioactive wastes from, *inter alia*, medicine and industry as well as the nuclear fuel cycle, the Meeting encouraged the Secretariat to use its resources to promote ratification of the Convention. The Meeting noted in particular the opportunities to communicate with developing countries afforded through its Technical Co-operation programme and encouraged the development of material for distribution highlighting the benefits to countries of ratifying the Convention. The Secretariat was further requested to draw the Convention formally to the attention of all IAEA Member States, possibly by a letter with the report of this meeting attached.

23. The Meeting requested the Secretary to transmit this Report and its Annexes to the Director General of the IAEA, thereby informing him of the decisions taken at the Meeting.

24. The Meeting expressed its sincere gratitude to the Secretariat for the excellent services provided in support of the Meeting.

25. Finally, the Meeting agreed to this Report by the President of the Organizational Meeting, and requested the Secretary to make available to the public this Report and its Annexes.

ANNEX I

JC/OM.1/P.01

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

**Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the
Safety of Radioactive Waste Management (Joint Convention)
Organizational Meeting of the Contracting Parties
7 to 11 April 2003, Vienna, Austria
IAEA Boardroom, C04, Vienna International Centre**

AGENDA

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Election of President and Vice-President of the Organizational Meeting
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Secretary of the Meeting
5. Special requests, if any
6. Credentials of Participants
7. Invitations to intergovernmental organizations to attend the Organizational Meeting as observers, if any
8. Establishment of Country Groups
9. Election of the President and two Vice-Presidents of the Review Meeting
10. Election of Country Group Co-ordinators
11. Selection of Country Group Rapporteurs and Chairpersons
12. Recommendation of other Officers for the Review Meeting
13. Invitation of any observers to the Review Meeting
14. Decision on whether or not to hold topic sessions
15. Decision on languages for plenary sessions of the Review Meeting pursuant to Rule 39(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules
16. Filing of requests for interpretation during Country Group Sessions pursuant to Rule 39(5) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules
17. Decision on languages of documents for the plenary sessions of the Review Meeting pursuant to Rule 39(6) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules
18. Recommendation of a Budget for the Review Meeting
19. Establishment of provisional timetable for the Review Meeting
20. Meeting report
21. Any other business

ANNEX II

JC/OM.1/P.02

List of Nuclear Power Plant Reactors of Contracting Parties and Contracting States of the Joint Convention

Country	Total
United States	136
France	71
United Kingdom	45
Germany	36
Canada	25
Korea, Republic of	18
Ukraine	17
Sweden	12
Spain	10
Belgium	7
Slovakia	7
Bulgaria	6
Czech Republic	6
Switzerland	6
Finland	4
Hungary	4
Argentina	2
Netherlands	2
Romania	1
Slovenia	1
Latvia	0
Luxembourg	0
Morocco	0
Norway	0
Poland	0
Austria	0
Belarus	0
Croatia	0
Denmark	0
Greece	0
Ireland	0
(Future ratifier 1)	
(Future ratifier 2)	

ANNEX III

Composition of Country Groups for the First Review Meeting

JC/OM.1/P.03

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
United States	France	United Kingdom	Germany	Canada
Belgium	Spain	Sweden	Ukraine	Korea, Republic of
Slovakia	Bulgaria	Czech Republic	Switzerland	Finland
Slovenia	Romania	Netherlands	Argentina	Hungary
Latvia	Luxembourg	Morocco	Norway	Poland
Greece	Denmark	Croatia	Belarus	Austria
Ireland	(Future ratifier 1)	(Future ratifier 2)		

ANNEX IV

JC/OM.1/P.06

Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management

**Organizational Meeting of the Contracting Parties
7 – 11 April 2003
Vienna, Austria**

BUDGET ESTIMATE (US\$)

1st Review Meeting

3 – 14 November 2003

Interpretation*:	100.000
Translation:	14.000
Various: (conference service officers, overtime, copying and printing)	6.000
	<hr/>
	120.000

*The amount of \$ 100 000 is an upper estimate.

Actual interpretation costs for the 1st and 2nd Review Meetings under the Convention on Nuclear Safety, in 1999 and 2002, were \$ 70 000 and \$ 130 000 respectively.

ANNEX V

Provisional Timetable for the First Review Meeting

		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Monday	3-Nov	Plenary				
Tuesday	4-Nov	United States	France	United Kingdom	Germany	Canada
Wednesday	5-Nov	Slovakia	Spain	Sweden	Ukraine	Korea, Republic of
Thursday	6-Nov	Belgium	Bulgaria	Czech Republic	Switzerland	Finland
Friday	7-Nov	Slovenia	Romania	Netherlands	Argentina	Hungary
Saturday	8-Nov					
Sunday	9-Nov					
Monday	10-Nov	Latvia Greece	Luxembourg Denmark	Morocco Croatia	Norway Belarus	Poland Austria
Tuesday	11-Nov	Ireland	(Future ratifier 1)	(Future ratifier 2)		
Wednesday	12-Nov	Plenary				
Thursday	13-Nov	Plenary				
Friday	14-Nov	Plenary				