

be pressed to – at the very least – retain signatory status.⁴⁵

- The IMS/IDC verification systems should have a target of 2005 for full implementation. Comprehensive and effective verification will provide the strongest argument for non-ratifying states to move forward.

⁴⁵This is particularly important in the context of the status of American signatory/ratification. As a signatory state, the United States could seek to remove itself from the Treaty provisions by indicating its intention not to be party to the Treaty. However, after the failed Senate vote on the CTBT in 1999, the Treaty remained as a “pending” treaty in the US Senate, which means that it may be considered at a later date by the Senate, and cannot be removed by the executive level of government. The Treaty is in effect the legal “property” of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee until it is reconsidered by the Senate, or sent back to the President. In the United States, the CTBT abides in a “legal limbo” meaning that US signatory status prevails, at least for the time being.