

(Mr. Dietze, German Democratic Republic)

As regards verification of compliance with the prohibition of chemical weapons production outside the framework set by article VI, this should, in our view, be ensured, in the first place, by means of challenge inspections. A provision to this effect, however, has not been agreed upon so far. The basic ideas set forth in the "Ekeus Paper" (document CD/881, pages 141 and 142) have not been developed further since 1987. Therefore, the next logical step would be to seek understanding in principle on challenge inspection and to include relevant provisions in article IX of the draft convention. All efforts undertaken by the Chairman of the Committee on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador Morel, to this effect deserve our unqualified support.

It is, in fact, high time in our view for delegations to disclose their positions on such questions as: the right to request an on-site inspection at any time and anywhere; the mandatory character of such an inspection without a right of refusal; the procedure to be applied in case agreement on arrangements alternative to full and comprehensive access cannot be achieved; and the procedure after submission of the inspection report. In this way, it would be possible to bridge existing differences of opinion which have surfaced on this matter and to draft a mutually agreed text of article IX, part 2.

The question whether additional verification provisions are necessary beyond the framework established by article VI and the means of challenge inspection has been discussed to date without conclusive results being attained. If the general opinion tends to deem it necessary that the verification system be supplemented, we, for our part, will join in efforts to search for a generally acceptable and effective solution. It is our understanding that such measures shall correspond to defined additional verification needs and shall require no disproportionate additional costs.

I am underlining this since we should avoid formulating additional measures in the form of a costly and detailed mechanism similar to the one applied with articles IV, V and VI. On the basis of the provisions set out in article VI, it would suffice to outline the general framework for supplementary measures. It should be incumbent upon the organs of the future organization to render the procedure most effective by making use of the experience gathered in the implementation of the Convention. Here we need to clarify which supplementary measures would be eligible, routine inspections or inspections initiated by member States. Two possible approaches have been outlined in the working paper of the Federal Republic of Germany (CD/869) and in the working paper of the United Kingdom (CD/909).

At the present stage of negotiations, we believe the discussion ought to be focused on practical problems. What we have in mind in this context is to consider the possibility of concentrating additional routine verification measures, for example, ad hoc checks, on a relatively small number of facilities which on account of their technological parameters pose a risk to the convention. In this way, the available financial resources of the future Organization could be efficiently used for particularly sensitive facilities. To select such facilities would be the task in our view of the Technical Secretariat of the Organization.