



**MEETING REPORT**  
**(Draft)**

**25<sup>th</sup> NATIONAL RCA  
REPRESENTATIVES MEETING**

**26-28 May 2003  
Hotel Galadari,  
Colombo, Sri Lanka**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Annexes	3
List of Acronyms	4
Inauguration of the Meeting	5
1. Session 1 .	6
1.1 Statement by the Outgoing Chairperson	6
1.2 Election of the Chairperson and appointment of Rapporteurs	6
1.3 Statement of the Incoming Chairperson	6
2. Adoption of Agenda	6
3. 31 <sup>st</sup> RCA GC Report	
a. Adoption of the Report	
b. Matters arising from the 31 <sup>st</sup> RCA GC Meeting	7
4. Presentation of IAEA/TC Strategy	7
5. Presentation of the Programme in East Asia and the Pacific (SH-TCAPS)	8
6. Presentation of RCA Programme in 2003/2004	8
7. Presentation of RCA Annual Report 2002	9
8. Implementation Issues in 2002	10
9. Information and Communication	11
10. Proposed Projects for 2005/2006	13
11. RCA Regional Office	14
12. Evaluation of the RCA as a vehicle for TCDC and technology transfer mechanism	15
13. Policy Level Meetings	16
a. 26 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of National RCA Representatives	16
b. 32 <sup>nd</sup> RCA General Conference	16
c. Quadra-Partite Meeting	16
14. Other Matters	16
a. Co-operation with other organizations	16
b. Presentation by FNCA Co-ordinator	17
c. Implementation of RCA Vision	17
d. Sustainability and Self-reliance of Nuclear Institutions	17
e. Harmonization of non-RCA projects	17
f. RCA Logo	17
g. Acronym for RCA Office in Korea	17
h. Responsibility, Authority and Accountability in the RCA	17
15. Acknowledgement	17

16. Presentation of the Draft Meeting Report	17
17. Closing	18

## **ANNEXES**

Annex 1. List of Participants

Annex 2. Welcome address by the Chairperson of the Atomic Energy Authority of Sri Lanka

Annex 3. Speech of Chief Guest, Dr.D.A. Nethsinghe

Annex 4. Message of the Hon. Minister for Science and Technology of Sri Lanka

Annex 5. Opening remarks of DIR-TCPA

Annex 6. Statement by the Outgoing Chairperson

Annex 7. Revised Agenda

Annex 8. Additional agenda item number 14 h

Annex 9. TC Strategy- DIR-TCPA's presentation.

Annex 10. Presentation on East Asia and the Pacific TC Programme

Annex 11. Presentation on 2003-2004 RCA Programme

Annex 12. Terms of Reference of the Task Force

Annex 13. Presentation on 2002 RCA Annual Report

Annex 14. Presentation on Implementation Issues

Annex 15. Presentation on 2005-2006 Project Proposals

Annex 16. Presentation on RCARO

Annex 17. Report from the Advisory Committee

Annex 18. Presentation by Dr. Sueo Machi, FNCA Co-ordinator

Annex 19. Presentation on Sustainability and Self-reliance of Nuclear Institutions

## ACRONYMS

AFRA	African Regional Co-operative Agreement for Research, Development and Training Related to Nuclear Science and Technology
ARCAL	Regional Co-operative Agreement for the Advancement of Nuclear Science and Technology in Latin America and the Caribbean
ARASIA	Co-operative Agreement for Arab States in Asia for Research, Development and Training Related to Nuclear Science and Technology
DIR	Director
ESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission For Asia and the Pacific
FNCA	Forum for Nuclear Co-operation in Asia
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
LC	Lead Country
LDR/HDR	Low Dose Rate/High Dose Rate
MS	Member State
RCA	Regional Co-operative Agreement for Research, Development and Training Related to Nuclear Science and Technology
RCARO	RCA Regional Office
RRU	Regional Resource Unit
TC	Technical Co-operation
TCAPS	East Asia and the Pacific Section
TCPA	Division for Africa, and East Asia and the Pacific
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

### **Inauguration of the Meeting**

The 25<sup>th</sup> National RCA National Representatives Meeting was held at the Galadari Hotel, in Colombo, Sri Lanka from 26<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> May 2003. 31 participants from the 17 RCA Member States (MSs), including 14 National RCA Representatives attended the Meeting (Annex 1). The IAEA was represented by Mr. Manase P. Salema, Director, Division for Africa, East Asia and the Pacific (TCPA), Department of Technical Co-operation of the IAEA, Mr. M. N. Razley, Head, East Asia and Pacific Section, and Acting RCA Co-ordinator, and Ms. M. Tan of the same Department (TCPA).

Prof. R. Hewamanna, Chairperson of the Atomic Energy Authority of Sri Lanka welcomed the delegates to the 25<sup>th</sup> National RCA Representatives Meeting and expressed her sincere thanks to the delegates of the RCA Member States and the IAEA for their participation. (Annex 2)

Dr. D. A. Nethsinghe, Chairman, Advisory Committee of Atomic Energy Authority, officiated as the Chief Guest and addressed the inaugural session. He congratulated Prof. Rohini Hewamanna on her recent appointment as the Chairperson of the Atomic Energy Authority and commented on the recent developments of the Authority. He stressed on the importance of Science and Technology for sustainable development and on the relevance of regional cooperation. He summarized some of the achievements of the RCA and commented on the IAEA as a role model for the transfer of S&T and good management. (Annex 3)

The Message from the Hon. Minister for Science and Technology was read by Mr. P. Subasinghe, Additional Secretary of the Ministry. He welcomed the National Representatives on behalf of the Government of Sri Lanka and conveyed the Government's support for the activities of the RCA that would bring tangible benefits for the people of Sri Lanka in a cost effective manner (Annex 4)

Mr. Manase P. Salema Director TCPA, speaking on behalf of the IAEA, expressed his thanks to Sri Lanka, the host country, for the warm welcome and hospitality rendered to participants of the 25<sup>th</sup> National RCA Representatives Meeting. He mentioned that RCA has been a valuable mechanism for capacity building and technology transfer relating to nuclear applications since 1972. He cited that it was the first regional agreement to be formed and served as a model for the establishment of similar

agreements such as ARCAL for Latin America, AFRA for Africa, and most recently, ARASIA for West Asia. In closing, he expressed his best wishes for a successful meeting and renewed his commitment to support RCA, including, working closely with RCA MSs in exploiting the power of the atom for the good of the region and mankind in general (Annex 5).

## **Session I**

### **1. Election of Chairman and Rapporteurs**

#### **1.1 Statement by the Outgoing Chairperson (Annex 6)**

Outgoing Chairman, Mr. Chang-Woo Kim, Director of Atomic Energy International Co-operation Division, Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST), Republic of Korea, expressed his gratitude to the Government of Sri Lanka for its efforts in preparing for the 25th National RCA Representatives Meeting. He observed that the RCA has made significant progress and developments since its inauguration in 1972. He expressed sentiments that both the RCA and Sri Lanka would continue to enjoy fruitful development and that the RCA programme would continue to contribute significantly to the technical cooperation in nuclear energy among the RCA Member States.

Commenting on the significant events of the RCA during the past year, he spoke of the Scientific Forum held to celebrate the 30th Anniversary of the RCA and the inauguration of the Regional Office in Korea in March 2002.

He reiterated his thanks for the support and collaboration extended to him over the past year by the RCA Member States and the Agency.

#### **1.2 Election of the Chairperson and appointment of Rapporteurs**

Pakistan proposed Prof. R. Hewamanna, Chairperson of the Atomic Energy Authority of Sri Lanka to be the Chairperson of the Meeting. Bangladesh seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by the Member States.

#### **1.3 Statement of the Incoming Chairperson**

The incoming Chairperson, Prof. R. Hewamanna, took the Chair and welcomed the delegates and thanked the outgoing Chairman, Mr. Chang-Woo Kim of the Republic of Korea for his leadership in running the affairs of the RCA during his tenure.

She proceeded to nominate Mr. H. M. N. R. Bandara, and Mr. C. Jayatungaarachchi, of the Atomic Energy Authority as rapporteurs to the Meeting. The Meeting unanimously approved the nominations.

## **2. Adoption of Agenda**

The Chairperson introduced the proposed Agenda for the Meeting (Annex 7). Australia proposed an item for inclusion dealing with responsibility, authority and accountability in the RCA under Any Other Business and a written proposal was circulated (Annex 8).

**The Meeting adopted the provisional Agenda with the addition of an item under Other Matters proposed by Australia (See Annex 7 for the revised Agenda)**

### **3. 31<sup>st</sup> RCA General Conference Meeting Report**

#### **a) Adoption of the Report**

The Chairperson referred to the 31<sup>st</sup> RCA General Conference Meeting Report and invited the Meeting to adopt it. Australia drew the attention of the Meeting to a number of editorial errors in the Report and volunteered to correct them.

**The Meeting adopted the draft RCA GC report, subject to editorial corrections, which Australia offered to carry out.**

#### **b) Matters arising and follow-up actions**

Mr. M.N. Razley introduced the agenda item on Matters Arising and follow up actions from the 31<sup>st</sup> RCA General Conference Meeting. He briefed the Meeting on the follow up actions undertaken and mentioned that some items would be discussed under the appropriate agenda items later in the Meeting.

### **4. Presentation of IAEA / TC Strategy (Annex 9)**

Mr. M.P. Salema, Director TCPA, made a presentation entitled "IAEA TC strategy: Focusing on Member States". He explained the key elements of the IAEA TC Strategy and clarified the IAEA's TC Project criteria. Speaking on the meaning and implications of the TC Strategy, he stated that the focus was on the MSs and that the IAEA recognized the central role of the country programme. He noted that regional programmes must be built on strong country programmes, which should be the foundation of solid regional programmes.

He went on to say that recognition of the central role of the Member States and their competence, transparency in developing and applying concepts, and transparency during operation were essential ingredients of TC Strategy. He said that the concept of central criterion would become clearer to the MSs in time. He also said that the use of simple terminology would lead to increased transparency and that the Agency's presence in the project process was in a service mode but it also has a duty to protect standards.

During the discussion that followed, Australia recalled that the model project criteria arose from RCA initiatives in 1992 to get more end user focus in projects and the RCA therefore supported model

project criteria. He sought further clarification on the Agency's planned "top down" approach. India raised the question on whether the current TC approach would be able to address the current safety and security concerns. Bangladesh commented on the desirability to have a regional programme framework (RPF) to complement the country programme framework. In response, Mr. Salema said that the Agency would be pleased to learn from Member States. Regarding safety and security, he commented that although there were Basic Safety Standards (BSS), there were no security standards as yet. He agreed that an RPF would be an excellent idea.

## **5. Presentation of the Programme in East Asia and Pacific. [Annex 10 ]**

In presenting the Technical Cooperation Programme in the East Asia and the Pacific, Mr.M.N. Razley observed that the TC fund was levelling off. For 2003-2004, Mr. Razley pointed out that number of projects and resources for Footnote a/ projects had decreased. The Chairperson noted that some of this information would be useful background for discussion under several other agenda items.

During the discussion, Pakistan highlighted the need for capacity building. Australia suggested that upstream work was needed to determine the areas best suited for regional co-operation. Regarding the levelling off of funds and the large rollover of projects and budgets from previous years, Australia suggested that there was a need to closely look at the absorptive capacity of Member States and the delivery capacity of IAEA. India commented on the need to revisit the issue of RCA and non-RCA projects under a later agenda item. Mr. Razley noted that some of issues raised by the National RCA Representatives would be discussed under appropriate items of the Agenda.

## **6. Presentation of RCA programme in 2003/2004. [Annex 11]**

RCA Programme for 2003/2004 was presented by Mr. Razley. During the subsequent discussion, particularly that related to effective communication, Australia suggested that Lead Country Co-ordinators should be encouraged to seek assistance of other Member States in carrying out their roles. India proposed for stakeholders to be electronically networked to facilitate the delivery of RCA Programme.

Korea suggested that a Task Group be formed to solve the communication problems. Japan supported this proposal and requested the Task Group to consider the action plan contained in their earlier proposal which had been presented at the 24<sup>th</sup> National RCA Representatives Meeting in Seoul, Republic of Korea in 2002. Bangladesh also endorsed the setting up of a Task Force. Australia suggested that appropriate terms of reference for the Task Force should be framed. It was agreed that a committee comprising of National Representatives of Australia, India, Japan, the

Philippines and the RCARO draft the terms of reference of the Task Force and present it to the Meeting for consideration on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day.

**A committee comprising of National Representatives of Australia, India, Japan, the Philippines and the RCARO was formed to draft the terms of reference of the Task Force and present it to the Meeting for consideration of on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day ( 28 May 2003)**

The proposed terms of reference were accepted by RCA Member States and a Task Force comprising of Australia, Malaysia, New Zealand and the Philippines was formed. The Terms of Reference of the Task Force are given in Annex 12 The IAEA Secretariat and the RCARO were to provide the necessary assistance to the Task Force.

**The Meeting appointed Australia, Malaysia, New Zealand and the Philippines as members of a Task Force to look into the management issues of the RCA, according to the Terms of Reference adopted by the Meeting and report to the next Meeting of National Representatives.**

The attention of the Meeting was drawn to the Agency's need to have complete contact information, including addresses, for all those involved in RCA projects. The Member States were requested to review and update the list of programme stakeholders that had been circulated to them prior to the Meeting and inform the RCA Office of any corrections. The updated list will be circulated by e-mail and posted at the RCA website.

National RCA Representatives were asked to confirm hosting of a number of regional events. Mr. Salema drew the attention of Member States to the considerable amount of financial resources required to fund meetings and suggested that Member States look at this matter. China informed the Meeting about its current problems in scheduling of events it had agreed to host and suggested that other MSs might consider taking up some of these postponed events.

**Member States were requested to consider taking up some of the 2003 postponed events that were previously scheduled to be held in China.**

## **7. Presentation of RCA Annual Report 2002 (Annex 13)**

Mr. Razley informed the Meeting that the draft RCA Annual Report for 2002 was circulated to the Member States on 6 March 2003 and posted at the RCA website but no comments have been received up to now. Mr. Razley proposed a schedule and a time frame for submission of success stories for the Annual Report, as in Annex 13, which was accepted. After deliberation, the Meeting agreed that the RCA Annual Report should be published in the TC Website with editorial inputs by the Philippines. The Meeting also agreed that the RCARO, with the assistance of the RCA Office,

should prepare a brochure on RCA success stories using a format to be provided by the RCA Office. It was also decided that success stories would be grouped into the thematic areas.

**RCA MSs agreed to the deadline as stipulated in Annex 13 to facilitate the completion of the Annual Report before the 32<sup>nd</sup> RCA GC Meeting. The Meeting decided that the 2002 RCA Annual Report should be published in the TC Website with editorial inputs by the Philippines. The RCA Secretariat was requested to prepare a format for reporting of success stories.**

The Chairperson referred to Australia's suggestion that professional writers should be used for the preparation of pamphlets detailing RCA success stories. It was decided to implement this through a workshop where professional writers could train the staff from the communications or publicity departments of MS's Nuclear Institutes.

The RCARO commented that part III of the Annual Report would be a set of tables containing statistics and highlighted the need to have a segment in the Report on TCDC. The Philippines suggested that Malaysia, as the Lead Country on TCDC could assist in the synthesis of a segment on TCDC

**Regarding the success story brochures, it was agreed that the Agency would be requested to organize a workshop for MSs technical writers at which they could obtain professional expert advice on how to format and prepare success stories.**

## **8. Implementation Issues in 2002**

Mr. Razley informed the Meeting of the various implementation issues encountered RCA projects.(Annex 14) He drew the Meeting's attention to the number of events without host agreements and requested RCA MSs to consider hosting them. He also inquired whether it might be possible to host events without a formal host Government agreement. The Meeting decided that the current practice of requiring a host Government agreement should continue.

Japan sought advice on a mechanism through which their local operating costs could be recovered from their extrabudgetary funds. Mr. Razley informed the Meeting that the Agency followed the instructions of the donor in the disbursement of funds. Australia offered to share its experience with Japan on this matter.

Australia commented that from their experience there were merits in using electronic means for nomination forms rather than using hard copies but was not certain whether the Agency had to have signed documents in order to demonstrate that they were correctly authorised. Regarding this issue ,

the Meeting was informed that nomination forms sent to the Agency were acceptable to by e-mail, as long as it came from the National Representative.

**The Meeting decided that the current practice of requiring host agreements should be continued based on requirements of respective countries (i.e separate agreements for individual events or one single agreement for all events to be held during the year). The Meeting also agreed that Member States could submit nomination forms electronically through their respective National Representatives.**

Korea requested the Agency to provide details of its outsourcing policy. The Meeting was informed that the Agency policy on outsourcing had not been finalized. However, MSs were being encouraged to consider organizing RCA events through outsourcing. Korea requested information on whether the policy of outsourcing would permit secondary outsourcing to RCARO. The Meeting was informed that it is not possible for IAEA to outsource activities or events directly to RCARO. However, it would be possible for RCARO to take up the outsourced event/activity if the Government of the Republic of Korea designated it as the host institute.

**The Meeting agreed that the outsourcing of activities would be carried out on a case-by-case basis.**

Mr. Razley also suggested that there was a need to evaluate the current RRUs. Pakistan requested information on the utilization of RRUs. The Meeting requested each Project Committee to report on utilization of their RRUs to National RCA Representative Meeting. The meeting felt that the Project Coordinators' Meeting (PCM) would be the most appropriate forum to decide about the RRUs.

The Philippines suggested that hosting of events should be open to all MSs and not just those with RRUs. Bangladesh agreed with the Philippines on the above mentioned suggestion.

The Meeting noted that there were 13 rollover projects. The Secretariat was requested to provide reasons for rollover projects. Mr. Razley informed that this information will be provided at the RCA GC Meeting.

**The Meeting decided that Project Committee Meeting is the most appropriate forum to decide about the RRUs and their utilization and report to the Meeting of the National RCA Representatives, and hosting events should be opened to all the MSs**

In response to a request made, Mr. Razley defined the terms “new”, “continuation”, “extension” and “rollover” projects. He said that the projects that are planned to be implemented over a period beyond the implementation cycle of two years are considered “continuations” to the next cycle; projects that have been initially planned for two years and subsequently extended with new funds allocated after the end of the two-year period are called “extensions” and projects that have not been able to implement the planned activities and have not achieved their objectives as a result during the period they are planned for, and therefore continued beyond the planned period are called “roll-over” projects.

## **9. Information and Communication**

Malaysia referred to the following recommendations of Project Committee Meeting on the Electronic Networking and Outreach project, which was held in Mumbai in December 2002 and requested the Meeting to decide on these recommendations:

1. Transfer the RCA Home Page to RCARO.
2. Pending the decision of the Meeting of National RCA Representatives, Malaysia should continue to maintain the Members Only RCA Home Page with the Regional Office focusing on the Home Page for the public.

Viet Nam supported the transfer of the RCA Homepage from Malaysia to the RCARO and said that having two Homepages should be avoided. The Philippines said that it also favored having a single Homepage at the RCARO. Pakistan expressed the view that it was a simple matter to link the RCARO Homepage and RCA Homepage using a hyperlink. Several other Member States were of the view the recommendation of the Project Committee Meeting on ENO to transfer the RCA Homepage to RCARO was premature as the RCARO was in an interim period of operation. It was noted that the RCARO Homepage and the RCA Homepage served two different purposes (i.e. Public access and member only access). The Meeting decided that Malaysia should continue to maintain the Members Only RCA Home Page. Malaysia requested all material from the MSs for posting on the Homepage and sought the co-operation of MSs in getting this in a timely manner.

In response to discussions on measures to increase use of the Homepage by MSs, Australia informed the Meeting that it very rarely visited it because there was little information of relevance to the day-to-day running of RCA. Pakistan suggested that Australia could list the services that it wished to have on the Homepage that would induce frequent use of the facility.

India proposed the utilization of the Web-Site for new IT applications such as e-learning. Australia cautioned about the promotion of the use of e-learning in a regional setting and suggested that the special requirements for documentation written for the majority of the regional users who would have

English as a second language imposed special limitations and required a long term approach. Australia also suggested that e-learning ought to be needs based.

Republic of Korea volunteered to be an Assisting Lead Country since RCARO is in Korea. India said it would be pleased to have Republic of Korea as another Assisting Lead Country. The Meeting welcomed the offer of Republic of Korea.

**The Meeting decided that Malaysia should continue to maintain the “members only” Homepage and RCARO Homepage would be for public access. The Meeting noted that Malaysia would be assisted by India and Republic of Korea .**

Australia observed that the ENO project did not take advantage of the technologies it was promoting and there was no evidence of the use of tele-conferencing for example. Malaysia responded that not all participating countries had similar advanced infrastructures.

Australia referred the statement by Mr. Salema where he mentioned the high drain on RCA financial resources because of the high number of meetings and proposed that in the 2003-2004 ENO project programme should conduct activities electronically and report to the next National RCA Representatives Meeting about both the successes and the limitations in the use of electronic media for such purposes. Malaysia agreed to the proposal and said they would report their experiences.

**Malaysia was requested to report at the next National RCA Representatives Meeting on its experiences on the successes and limitations in the use of electronic media for conducting activities of the ENO project in 2003-2004.**

The RCARO gave a demonstration of their Homepage to show how they were linked to other organizations. The Meeting was informed that there had been a considerable number of visits to RCARO Homepage and consequently the RCA had received wide publicity

#### **10. RCA Proposed Projects for 2005/2006.**

Mr. Razely presented the proposed RCA projects for 2005-2006.(Annex 15). This was followed by presentations from Lead Countries (LCs) on their thematic sector areas in which they detailed their proposed projects for 2005-06. These were:

✍✍China: LC for Agriculture,

✍✍Japan: LC for Human Health,

☞☞ New Zealand: LC for Environment,

☞☞ Republic of Korea: LC for Energy and Research Reactors and Radioactive Waste Management

☞☞ India: LC for Industry,

☞☞ Australia: LC for Radiation Protection

☞☞ Malaysia LC ENO.

Japan and China were congratulated for their efforts in preparation of the project proposals by convening National Advisory Committees. Pakistan commented that it had submitted four proposals but they were not included in the presentation. For the Human Health thematic sector Australia noted that the Lead Country had not included two projects that had been allocated funding beyond 2004 in the Board approved documents for the 2003-04 cycle. It was requested that these two projects should be included in the 2005-06 project listing. Japan agreed to take into consideration the comments made and requested MS to cooperate in the project formulation. Japan stated that it would follow TC Strategy and RCA Operating Rules and Guidelines in formulating the project proposals. Australia said that, as an Assisting Lead Country, it stood ready to provide support to Japan for the preparation of the 2005-06 project proposals.

The RCARO referred to the proposal on Dengue by a Technical Officer from the IAEA and requested clarification as to whether the IAEA could submit proposals. Japan explained that although the proposal on Dengue came from the IAEA, it was done at the request of an Expert Advisory Group Meeting.

The Chairperson invited views from the MSs on the reduction of the number of projects. India observed that, if the number of project had to be reduced, only those that met the real needs of the region should be taken up, with the others left to make up the national programmes.

Some discussion was held on prioritization and the mechanisms for prioritization. Bangladesh expressed the view that it is not possible to address all important areas to the region in one cycle. Pruning the numbers of projects inevitable and due consideration should be given to this during up-stream work in order to reduce the number of projects to a reasonable level in future programme cycles.

Australia observed that Member States performed enormous amount of work and spent an enormous amount of time preparing project proposals and the secretariat too spent enormous amount of resources during formulation of projects. If the budgetary constraints were to prevent MSs from introducing new projects in 2005-06, the time should be used to seriously consider the evaluation of the existing projects. Australia requested MSs to address this issue. Bangladesh agreed with Australia. Mr. Razley suggested that the Meeting provide policy guidelines to LC Coordinators and

advise them to refer to the various declarations made at international level in the process of project prioritization and finalization.

India referred to the remarks made by Mr. Salema at the Meeting regarding safety and security concerns and requested Australia to include security concerns in their projects on safety. Mr. Razley informed the Meeting that the Secretariat briefed MSs on security concerns at the Radiation Protection Meeting in Dhaka in 2002 and the 24<sup>th</sup> National RCA Representatives Meeting in Seoul and that the IAEA was currently considering introducing a non-RCA project on security with possible funding from the Nuclear Security Fund.

**The Meeting agreed that the LCs should review on-going projects for the purpose of continuing or extending them for the next project cycle as well as prioritizing the projects for the 2005-2006 programme. Lead Country Co-ordinators were requested to review the project proposals received. Concerted efforts from Lead Country Co-ordinators were expected to significantly reduce the number of new proposals for the 2005-2006 TC cycle.**

The Chairperson requested views on whether the LC Coordinators Meeting should be held in August 2003. Australia emphasized the need to have the Meeting, even if there were no new projects and referred to previous proposals to use this time to thoroughly assess the existing projects. In response India remarked that although there was a possibility that there might not be any new projects, MSs still needed to do the upstream work.

**The Meeting agreed that the LCC Meeting was necessary. The Secretariat was requested to provide the details of 2005-2006 projects including LCC evaluation report prior to the LCC Meeting in August 2003.**

## **11. RCA Regional Office.**

The Chairperson invited the RCARO to present its report. (Annex 16).

The Meeting expressed its appreciation to ROK Government for its support to the RCARO and commendable work done by RCARO during its first year of operation.

The Chairman of the RCARO Advisory Committee, Bangladesh, was invited to report on the recommendations of the Committee. Bangladesh tabled the records of the Advisory Committee Meeting held in Colombo (Annex 17) and drew attention to the observations made by the IAEA Office of Legal Affairs. MSs were asked to consider the draft resolution for adoption.

The Working Paper was also brought to the Meeting's attention for their endorsement. China recalled it had proposed that the position of Programme Officer could be opened to the MSs in the

situation when the Director, RCARO is a person from host country. China commented that RCARO was a regional office and MSs had a responsibility for its operation and to contribute to its operation. Pakistan observed that the RCA Office at the Agency appears to be subservient to the RCARO and the responsibilities of the two offices should be clearly defined as envisaged in the original agreement to set up the regional office. Australia requested that all issues that need to be resolved should be in written form and this was accepted. Japan commented on the relationship between the RCA Office and RCARO and suggested that good co-operation could overcome any overlapping or conflict. Japan enquired whether the documents prepared by the Advisory Committee conformed to the Korean legal system requirements. RCARO thanked to MSs for their valuable comments. All MSs agreed to consult their respective authorities on the draft resolution and forward their response to the Advisory Committee in writing.

**The Meeting agreed to discuss the draft resolution in the 32<sup>nd</sup> RCA GC Meeting with the view to adopt the resolution. All issues that need to be resolved should be submitted to the Advisory Committee in writing, before the 32<sup>nd</sup> RCA GC.**

## **12. Evaluation of the RCA as a vehicle for TCDC and technology transfer mechanism.**

The Chairperson requested information about evaluations done on the RCA programmes. Australia recalled that the RCA/UNDP project had been evaluated by the UN JIU and in its 1995 report. The results showed that the RCA had achieved the highest rating.

Mr. Salema provided information on the evaluation procedure used in IAEA. He explained that the work plan for evaluations in 2003 did not include any evaluation of the RCA and he wanted to know whether MSs would like to have such an evaluation if it could be arranged. Bangladesh proposed that an independent evaluation of RCA programme be undertaken by the Agency.

**The Meeting agreed to request that the RCA programme be submitted for evaluation in 2003.**

## **13. Policy Level Meetings.**

### **a) 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of National RCA Representatives**

Pakistan offered to host the National RCA Representatives Meeting in 2004. Australia announced that it would not be ready until at least 2006. Thailand agreed to consult with home authorities but would provisionally volunteer to be the alternate host.

**b) 32<sup>nd</sup> RCA General Conference.**

After protracted discussion most MS agreed Friday, the 12<sup>th</sup> September 2003 to be the tentative date for the meeting. The RCA Secretariat offered to explore whether it would be possible and agreed to consult further on the matter.

**The RCA Secretariat would explore the possibility of holding the RCA GC on Friday, the 12<sup>th</sup> of September 2003.**

**c) Quadra-Partite Meeting**

The Meeting agreed to present success stories in the Environment and Industry thematic sectors. The LC New Zealand and India will collate the information. The three Chairs (Sri Lanka, Republic of Korea and Pakistan), the respective LC Co-ordinator and the RCA Co-ordinator will attend, with the RCARO, as observers.

**14. Other Matters.**

**a) Co-operation with other organizations**

Bangladesh and RCARO informed the Meeting about their experiences with external donor organizations.

**The RCARO would form an expert group to work out on how to create a fund to attract interaction of external donor agencies.**

**b) Presentation by FNCA Coordinator (Annexure 18)**

Dr. Sueo Machi FNCA Coordinator of Japan gave a presentation on the Progress of the FNCA Projects. In the ensuing discussion India observed that the goals of the FNCA and the RCA match. Research was identified as an area for synergy. The Meeting commended the presentation by Dr. Machi and appreciated the work of FNCA. The Meeting noted that RCA would continue to work closely with FNCA to further enhance areas of synergy between RCA and FNCA programmes.

**c) Implementation of RCA vision**

The Meeting decided to defer this item.

**d) Sustainability and Self-reliance of Nuclear Institutions. (Annex 19)**

The Meeting decided to defer this item.

**e) Harmonization of non-RCA projects**

The Meeting decided to defer this item.

**f) RCA Logo**

The Chairperson requested views from the Meeting on this subject. New Zealand requested redesigning of the logo to show all the RCA MSs.

**The Meeting agreed to the redesigning of the RCA logo and the RCARO agreed to provide a draft design.**

**g) Acronym for the RCA Regional Office in Korea.**

The Chairperson invited views on this. Korea gave some clarifications. India expressed the view that this should not be reconsidered at this juncture as some of the legal documents have already been drafted. Bangladesh agreed with India. The Member States accepted this view and decided that the current acronym, RCARO, should remain.

**h). Responsibilities, Authority and Accountability in the RCA**

The Meeting agreed that discussion on his item be deferred.

**15. Acknowledgement**

On a proposal made by Pakistan, the Meeting decided to convey its appreciation to Dr. C. R. Aleta for his service as the RCA Co-ordinator.

**16. Presentation of the Draft Meeting Report**

The Meeting reviewed the draft meeting report prepared by the rapporteurs and adopted the text of the report in principle subject to the incorporation of the comments and editorial corrections<sup>17</sup>.

**Closing**

The Meeting concluded at 19:30 hr on 28 May 2003 with a word of thanks to the Chairperson and to the host country Sri Lanka.