

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

clearly on issues upon which we do appear to agree? Or, as Italian Ambassador Aldo Pugliese said in his speech of 20 July, should we not seek an approach "aimed at disposing of the solution of the most important issues in the shortest possible time while setting temporarily aside the cases of less vital character"?

In this context, we strongly endorse the efforts of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee to incorporate in appendix I of the "rolling text" the essentials of the challenge inspection régime. We also hope that the essentials of an ad hoc verification régime can soon be developed. It is, as Ambassador Bogumil Sujka of Poland, said in his statement of 25 July, the overall pattern of the verification régime that, most of all, should be consolidated.

But there is also the question how agreement should be nailed down. On the basis of the text adopted in February this year, we have agreed that the "rolling text", and in particular appendix I, may be used for further negotiations, but not more. We believe that the Conference could take one further step and accept a recommendation that appendix I should be adopted as a design acceptable to members and "as a basis for further negotiations on the convention".

In spite of progress made these last months, the verification régime remains the main stumbling-block and, in that context, the proposed challenge inspection régime constitutes the major challenge with which we are faced. It is important for the main elements of a challenge inspection régime to find their proper place in the "rolling text", before we adjourn in the last days of this month. Main elements are, in our view: the right to request a challenge inspection, "anywhere, at any time", in order to dispel doubts about compliance; the challenge inspection should be mandatory and the country to which the request is addressed should be under the obligation (and therewith have the right) to demonstrate compliance; access to the site should be granted at very short notice; the report of the international inspection team should be considered in an appropriate way by the Executive Council. These are, in our view, the major characteristics of challenge inspections, which, together with routine inspections under article VI, form the backbone of "strict and effective international control".

In addition, attention must be paid to ambiguous situations, not covered under the present article VI, which would not necessarily require a high-profile challenge inspection. We support in principle suggestions made for other types of inspection, ad hoc and at short notice, apart from the procedures to clarify ambiguous events that are at present foreseen under article IX, part 1.

Permit me for a moment to touch upon the results of the national trial inspections in the Netherlands, on which I made a brief introductory statement on 27 June this year. The trial inspections conducted in the Netherlands demonstrated not only that specific chemical substances cause a risk, but also that certain facilities, with or without modification, are capable of producing chemical weapons. Under the present régime of article VI these facilities do not have to be declared. We would be in favour of extending the scope of article VI so as to cover facilities that, due to the nature of the