

While openness is the surest means to begin the process of confidence-building regarding military-related activities, the straightforward exchange of information may not in itself be sufficient. We will have to accept that some form of on-site inspection is required to bolster such exchanges by providing the initial means of establishing the accuracy of such information and helping to clear up any potential ambiguities resulting from different interpretations of the same data. This means that we may have to consider much more intrusive and, in some cases, "challenging" instruments and procedures of arms control and disarmament verification...

Similarly, we require further thought on developing a regime that is not simply a forum in which one lodges complaints about alleged non-compliance, but one in which we can go further to take concrete steps in actually resolving doubts about compliance...

We need to recognize that extending the scope of current CBMs and future verification measures to embrace research activities at all centres at which there are Biological Safety Level BL4 and BL3 containment units may not in fact capture all those centres at which work is being done on the micro-organisms of concern for the Convention... [H]ighly lethal work on toxins is being done mainly in chemical, and not such "specialized" microbiological contain-

ment laboratories. Even those research centres specializing in protection and prophylaxis do not always have the bulk of their work directed against biological weapons per se. Perhaps we might consider declarations that list *all* facilities considered to be at the BL4 or BL3 containment levels, since not all countries subscribe entirely to World Health Organization guidelines.

It may be the case that on-site inspection would have to be complemented by the exchange of scientists or permanently-placed foreign scientists at declared facilities... Also, in the area of information exchange, there could be a declaration of listings of bacterial and viral cultures and toxin stocks held in declared facilities. In addition, one could ensure that there is a full exchange of publications, including in-house ones, between declared laboratories. States should provide details of national BW defence programs. Further, there could be, as some have suggested, an exchange of information on national regulations concerning health and safety at labs and facilities handling pathogenic organisms, genetically-manipulated organisms, or toxins...

We may be reaching that stage in the maturation of the BTWC...where we should consider concrete measures to improve adherence and support. There could be incentives to join and disincentives to remain apart. This would involve

considering what concrete measures might be undertaken to improve scientific and technical cooperation between and among states parties for peaceful purposes. The flip side of this is that export controls on BW-relevant technologies may have to be considered in introducing a greater inducement for adherence to the Convention.

More controversially, one might look at whether thresholds or limitations could be imposed (and effectively verified) to give quantitative boundaries to activities involving development and production of agents or equipment for prophylactic or protective purposes....

Clearly there is room for carrying out national trial inspections, much along the lines of those that have been carried out in the context of the CW negotiations. What might be particularly promising in monitoring declared facilities is the use of "audit trails" similar to those used in the pharmaceutical and other industries. This could prove to be a less intrusive, but nevertheless effective, means of confirming that only permitted activities were occurring at the inspected facility...

Over the next few days we will undoubtedly hear a variety of proposals for strengthening the confidence-building aspects of the BTWC. Some will argue that the only way to really strengthen confidence is to negotiate a detailed, intrusive and tough verification



Participants at the Netherlands conference on the BTWC. Canadian representatives Ms Mary Ellen Kennedy (Health and Welfare Canada), Mr. John Barrett (EAITC) and Ambassador Peggy Mason are seated on the table, first through third from the left.