

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

Our efforts should, indeed, be called inspection exercises, as we have not taken all necessary steps required for a real international inspection. The United States delegate, Ambassador Friedersdorf, made a similar remark this morning. We conducted two exercises in order to highlight some problems which we encountered in the negotiations recently. These problems are related in particular to the objectives of an inspection. For example: Is this inspection required because we are afraid that a declared schedule [2] compound is being misused? Or is it required primarily because the production equipment of the declared plant is suitable for the production of schedule [1] chemicals? In short: is the inspection concerned with the chemicals or with the equipment?

In fact, in our view, it concerns both. In article VI of the present "rolling text" more attention has been given, however, to misuse of particular chemicals and not so much to that of equipment: a plant that produces non-toxic schedule [2] chemicals will be brought under routine inspections, even when it is clearly incapable of producing super-toxic chemicals. On the other hand, under the currently envisaged régime, a plant that is perfectly suited for large-scale production of super-toxic chemicals will not have to be declared and routinely inspected as long as it does not produce or process one of the scheduled chemicals.

I would like to suggest that different objectives call for different approaches. In the Dutch verification exercises we have therefore pursued two different tracks. In one exercise we monitored the batch processing of a schedule [2] chemical in one reactor of a very versatile multi-purpose plant. Before the inspection took place, a facility attachment was negotiated with the plant management. In the second exercise we verified the non-production of chemical warfare agents in the whole chemical complex, consisting in fact of more than 100 reactor vessels. This inspection had an ad hoc character, i.e. it was not based on an agreed facility attachment. Both exercises were carried out satisfactorily, but they also gave us quite some food for thought, as will be clear from the working papers.

For example, a question that may seem purely technical at first sight, but which in fact is crucial for the relevance of routine inspection under annex [2] of article VI, is the definition of "facility". Do we mean one reactor with associated equipment? Do we mean all reactors within one building? Or do we mean the whole chemical complex?

The reports on trial inspections conducted so far show that all three interpretations have been used. The implication is that the scope of those trial inspections that have used the broadest interpretation might be 100 times or even 1,000 times as wide as when the most restrictive interpretation has been used. The relevance and feasibility of routine inspection is therefore highly dependent on a clear definition of "facility".

During the ad hoc exercise in the whole chemical complex we studied some specific characteristics of a plant that is capable of producing chemical warfare agents. A list of some possible characteristics is included in CD/925. We hope that our suggestions will be discussed in the relevant