

Ms. RAUTIO (Finland): I have asked for the floor today to report some conclusions of the national trial inspection carried out in Finland in March this year. The full report of the inspection has been circulated in the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons as working paper CD/CW/WP.233.

Though not a member of the Conference on Disarmament, Finland undertook a national trial inspection in a civilian chemical facility to implement the initiative of the Ad hoc Committee. Since Finland has no facilities producing scheduled chemicals, the inspection was carried out at a plant producing carbamate-type pesticides. The main purpose of the trial inspection was to try to find evidence of the previous production of a chemical which was not currently produced. The inspected facility produces two structurally closely related pesticides, one of them in large quantities and the other in a relatively small quantity, and only during short production periods during the year. The latter was chosen to be a mock schedule [1] chemical. The production of this chemical had been stopped two months before the inspection.

The most important result of the inspection was that it revealed clear proof of the now ceased production of the mock schedule [1] substance. This proof was obtained by analysis of wipe samples, air samples and waste samples, while the samples taken from the process did not bear any traces of the previous production. Samples were analysed both on the site and in an off-site laboratory using different analytical methods. The correlation between the results obtained by the different methods and between the on-site and the off-site analyses was very good.

On the basis of the Finnish national trial inspection the following conclusions can be presented: Firstly, the samples taken from the ongoing process may not be sufficient to confirm the non-production of scheduled chemicals between inspections. As a complementary measure, samples should also be collected from the air, from wastes and from surfaces in the premises, including warehouses for raw materials and finished products. The further development of the corresponding methods and instrumentation deserves due attention in our future work.

Secondly, as the number of samples to be taken out of the facility should be as small as possible, the necessary analyses should be performed on-site. These on-site analyses should be performed by the inspectors, with their own instruments. Although many modern chemical facilities use for process control purposes the same type of instruments as those that the inspectors will be using, these should not be relied upon for verification purposes. In order to be able to identify listed compounds reliably, the equipment should have pre-recorded identification data in its computer on all chemicals listed under the convention. This of course is not the case with process control equipment. Moreover, the sophistication and individual characteristics of