

(Mr. Morel, France)

clearer and more coherent and usable presentation of the lists and the guidelines for each of them. This work is encouraging in particular in making it possible to incorporate in the overall consideration of the problem of lists the old and difficult question of "schedule [4]", and also to develop more coherent, better structured and more accurate schedules, in particular by deleting the products which hitherto appeared in the "rolling text" (CD/881) under the heading "to be discussed". The other aspect of the work of Group No. 4 dealt with the devising of a simplified structure for the presentation of the annex to article VI [1]. Two successive reviews were carried out in this regard, so that the question came before the Group twice for in-depth work, and the latest result offers in particular a possible solution for the very sensitive question of the production of schedule [1] chemicals outside the single small-scale production facility.

Group No. 5, chaired by Mr. Krutzsch, dealt with the transition, a topic which at the outset may have seemed less familiar and less conventional, but one which quickly found its place, I think, because it met a need. The Group accomplished very useful work in this regard, which comprised two components. The first concerns assistance and protection against chemical weapons, and here there are two aspects: on the one hand, the text, on which substantial work was done in an endeavour to move beyond the two alternatives that at present appear in the "rolling text" in order to prepare a draft - and the work that has begun on this, notably a draft on the provision of assistance at the request of a State party, is well under way and should be continued. In addition, and above and beyond the text, there is the question of the very principle of assistance, which now, thanks to the contributions from many delegations and a very lively debate, enjoys much clearer understanding among all delegations as to the *raison d'être* and the role of this essential assistance machinery during the 10-year period. The second component of Group No. 5's work covered the question of the preparatory period. Here too, the concept was perhaps a little vague, but it has become familiar and has proved very useful by making it possible in particular to identify and examine closely the question of confidence-building measures and the role that they can play even before the convention comes into force to achieve true universality in accession to the convention. The Group has also been concerned with economic and technical development, and here it has run into a familiar difficulty which may be summed up in a question: Should we seek a compromise on a text which may seem to be almost ready, or should we go back into substantive issues? The question has been asked, and it will be taken up again during the summer part of the session. Of course, the Group also had consultations on the vital question of undiminished security during the transition period, which were conducted with a view to the methodical treatment of this issue during the next part of the session.

How can the work accomplished so far best be described? In a word, I would say that it was work in depth. We worked on the foundations, and if we have not really seen the building rise into the sky, it must be said that without solid foundations, nothing can be done.

In this way I come to the second aspect, the general assessment of the state of the negotiations. The rapid outline I have given of the activities of the Ad hoc Committee and the working groups might seem to fall short of the ambitions set forth by the Paris Conference at the beginning of the year,