

Our governments have already decided upon the final conclusion: to rid the world of chemical weapons through a global, comprehensive and verifiable convention. At the sharp end of the negotiations from whence I come, our task is to ensure *to the extent possible* that the legal document, and the organization responsible for monitoring compliance with the obligations of that document, give proper expression to the high ideals and demanding objectives that have been set. As we approach the twentieth year of addressing the issue in increasing degrees of detail and complexity, it is certainly an understatement to say that the task is not an easy one. Furthermore, there have been and still are few beacons upon which we can take bearings in negotiating these waters.

CW negotiators have already looked to the IAEA for models of subsidiary agreements which, under the overall convention, would then provide the basis for separate negotiations with each State Party in establishing the detailed framework for inspections of specific chemical facilities. Guidance has been provided on other matters as well, including:

- the privileges and immunities of inspectors;
- general rules governing inspections and the conduct of inspectors;
- provisions for the employment and emplacement of monitoring equipment on-site; and
- provisions for the secure storage on-site of instruments and documentation.

These certainly are all important matters and they indicate the level of detail at which much time is now spent. In fact, the negotiations jump back and forth from one level to another, which has provoked the comment in some quarters that many of the details can be worked out by a preparatory commission, after the agreement has been tabled and, possibly, even after being opened for signature. Perhaps I can play the devil's advocate in saying that this debate will intensify in the next year and take on the character of principle vs pragmatics. In some quarters, it is sometimes suggested, there is an almost theological belief that all details must be nailed down, even though we all recognize that various procedures, and perhaps even the convention itself, will need to be revised in the light of experience and technological developments. It is, after all, supposed to be a convention of unlimited duration. Whatever your point of view, this is an evolving debate, which I hope we will all bear in mind as we consider many of the practical organizational, operational and administrative matters which may apply to the body that will be established,