

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

order to simplify the exercise. Moreover, we have recognized gaps in the inspection procedures, as well as some specific procedures that need to be improved. In our view, these point to the need for considerable further work on procedures at the national level. The principal objectives of our exercise were to evaluate the ability to determine whether schedule [1] chemicals had been produced in the particular facility; to evaluate the ability to determine whether the facility had produced types or quantities of schedule [2] chemicals not included in its declaration; and to estimate costs, determine physical constraints on inspections, measure the impact of an inspection on a facility, and evaluate the preparation needed for an inspection. In carrying out the exercise, the inspection was governed by a mock facility agreement that was based on the model in the "rolling text". A separate document contained detailed inspection procedures for schedule [2] facilities. The inspection team consisted of six persons, five chemical engineers and an analytical chemist. Three of the chemical engineers had past chemical weapons production experience, and two had commercial backgrounds. The team engaged in three types of activities during the trial: examination of process equipment, auditing of records, and collection and analysis of samples.

An initial visit was made during December 1988, lasting slightly more than a day. The actual inspection took two and a half days. The analysis of samples is still being carried out, and the results of the exercise are still being evaluated. Accordingly, our delegation is not now in a position to comment on how adequate the provisions in the "rolling text" are with regard to routine inspections. Nevertheless, some of our preliminary findings do warrant discussion. First, with regard to the area to be inspected, it will be difficult to define this area precisely, because of the complexity and flexibility of modern multipurpose plants. Our delegation believes that further discussion of this issue is warranted. Second, with regard to planning for an inspection, the exercise demonstrated that a very thorough initial visit is essential for effective inspections. This aspect of the "rolling text" may, therefore, need to be strengthened.

Third, with regard to the general approach to an inspection, a joint government-industry trial exercise does not, of course, reflect the tensions that will undoubtedly arise during the course of an actual inspection, making the inspection more difficult. The implications of this difference between trial and actual inspections need to be analysed. In addition, our trial inspection demonstrated that routine monitoring by inspectors must be supplemented, in some cases, by continuous monitoring by instruments in order to foil attempts to conceal production that is not documented in the permanent records of the facility. Also, the cross-checking of records from suppliers and customers needs to be considered. Fourth, the inspection of equipment proves to be especially useful in assessing whether the declared areas of the facility have the capability to produce schedule [1] chemicals.

Fifth, records audit was the most time-consuming aspect of the exercise. It is primarily useful in checking whether input and output match. However, such material balance is not sufficient basis for reaching the conclusion that quantities have been correctly declared, because unrecorded production could take place. Sixth, with regard to sample analysis, it is clear that careful