

(Mr. Kosin, Yugoslavia)

The system of international control and verification should be rational - i.e. cost-effective and efficient. We consider it fully justified to raise the question of how to control and verify facilities that would not be subject to routine or challenge inspection, bearing in mind that both of these kinds of inspection obviously have their own limitations. A number of suggestions and opinions on that question have been put forward. They offer quite a solid base for establishing a common framework acceptable to all.

The starting-point on this question must be an understanding that, once established, an international mechanism to oversee the implementation of the convention should have specific responsibility, including the capacity to take action on its own initiative and preserve its independence vis-à-vis any State party to the convention. On the other hand, the strict obligation of States parties to respect the ban on chemical weapons production fully should be verifiable through declarations in a national register, e.g. of any facility that could represent a potential risk for the convention. To this end, the international inspectorate should include these facilities too in the draft annual programme of control. A schedule for inspections might also be based on the quota system, leaving the final choice of facilities and dates to be decided upon by the international inspectorate. The international inspectorate could take into account, for example, not only general risks for the convention, but also specific requests, suggestions and suspicions from various sources.

In spite of the different approaches still existing in the Conference with regard to the question of "challenge" inspection, we consider the largest part of this question as agreed upon, especially the part formulated in the "Ekéus paper". However, an important question in this domain remains open. The final judgement should be the responsibility of the international organs, and not only the concern of the States parties involved. Otherwise, we might ask ourselves what would be the real role of the Executive Council or of the Conference of States Parties. Of course, any politicization of the final judgement on the outcome of the inspection and its content should be avoided.

Although the question of the composition of the Executive Council has not been fully addressed so far, we consider that its solution should reflect our common concern for the universality of the convention. The first condition should be the full equality of all States parties. Membership in any organ or body of the future international mechanism should not be treated as a privilege. We are, however, aware that the composition of an international organ cannot avoid some reflection of realities and divisions in our world, and has to provide the necessary balance aimed at the elimination of political partiality and tension. This might be achieved through adequate political and regional representation. Any additional criteria or a different approach should be supported by relevant and valid reasons.

In our current negotiations on article XI, relating to economic and technological development and co-operation, some differences still exist. It seems, however, that these differences are in a way artificial. The convention in itself will represent simultaneously a result and an instrument of international co-operation. It will be, in itself, an incentive for co-operation in economic and technological development. In short, the