

(Mr. Turbanski, Poland)

A still deeper analysis is needed with regard to the issue of super-toxic lethal chemicals (STLC), which at present are not used in CW production, but their future use for that purpose cannot be totally excluded today. As is known, some STLCs are being produced by the pharmaceutical industry, others in small quantities in research laboratories. I think that a clearer picture of this question is needed in order to solve comprehensively the STLC issue in the convention.

More attention should also be paid to multinational corporations, as they create some additional specific questions in the context of the verification of non-production of CW.

There has been a promising development of Group B in a very difficult and sensitive area of elimination both of chemical weapons and of the CW production facilities.

I think everybody would agree that further rapprochement of positions was achieved with regard to the content of relevant declarations as well as to the process of elimination and its control. It has to be noticed that formulations of Articles IV - Measures on Chemical Weapons and V - Measures on Chemical Weapons Production Facilities, together with relevant annexes, though still in some instances heavily bracketed and footnoted, show a clearer picture of this difficult part of the convention than was the case last year.

The results achieved in Group B, especially with regard to production facilities, would be very helpful in working out a still outstanding definition of production facility.

What seems to be more and more perceptible is a comprehensive blue-print of indispensable provisions concerning the whole process from declarations up to final elimination of CW stocks and CW production facilities. That is why we see in the present text of these articles obvious signs of progress. No doubt we have gained momentum in our work on these issues, and this momentum should not be lost.

One of the crucial outstanding issues is still the question of challenge inspection. There has been some conceptual rapprochement of positions which, however, does not suffice at present for working out a mutually acceptable solution. I think I would commit no mistake by saying that there seems to be general agreement that challenge inspection should not occur in everyday practice but rather in exceptional circumstances. There is, however, not enough clarity as to what is really meant by these exceptional circumstances. The need to resort to challenge inspection would depend very much on the efficiency of the whole system of verification including systematic on-site inspection. The better the routine verification system, the lesser, to our mind, the probability that challenge inspection would be needed. In short, we think that having a clear and precise picture of the whole system of so-called routine verification would help in final construction of the concept of challenge inspection.

Let me also, Mr. President, dwell briefly on some organizational aspects of our future work. The methods of work should always be in keeping with the stage of progress achieved. What is proper for today may not necessarily be