

(Mr. Dubois, Canada)

It is also the Canadian view that our current deliberations and future negotiations must continue to include the contributions that other non-seismic technologies can make to CTB verification. Let me be clear on this point. While it is our position that all of these various options are on the table and merit serious consideration, they should not constrain our rapid progress to conclude a CTB. In fact, it is our firm belief that a package of seismic and non-seismic verification measures could be put together and ready to go within a relatively short period of time.

As an active participant in the GSE, Canada supports the role for a seismic monitoring network, although a number of the parameters of the network will need further refinement as the work of the GSE progresses. Furthermore, Canada supports continued exploration in the CD of the relevance of the methodology and the parameters of a hypothetical network for radionuclides monitoring.

The 1991 Swedish draft text specifies the establishment and operation of a satellite image processing centre which would serve as a means by which States parties might acquire data from available satellite systems. Canada strongly endorses such a monitoring system. Delegations will remember that in May 1993 the Canadian CD submission on non-seismic technologies significantly updated the understanding of the types of sensors and imagery available from current commercial satellite systems and how these systems are evolving. The CD should continue to examine the role of overhead imagery for CTBT verification.

A number of non-seismic technologies and their potential applications, which were included in the Canadian submission to the CD in May 1993 and the subsequent presentations, clearly have relevance to verifying a CTBT. Canada will continue to support the CD in its exploration of these methodologies and consider making further submissions on selected ones in the search for an effective yet affordable verification regime.

Clearly, in 1993, the understanding of the performance and design requirements of a seismic network has advanced considerably, through the work of the GSE and active contributions of its individual participating States. The 1992 Verification Conference in Montebello, Quebec, made a particularly significant contribution in this regard. Major gaps in knowledge remain, however, and these relate to four items: (a) assessments of effectiveness; (b) detection standards; (c) other design parameters; and (d) cost, including cost-effectiveness. The GSE will need some direction from the CD on these matters, if it is to move to fill these knowledge gaps as it proposes to do through testing the concept by January 1995.

The Canadian submission to the CD in May 1993 and subsequent presentations sought to fill some of the information gaps, both with regard to chemical detection from the air and at ground level, and with regard to the other technique of surveillance of atmospheric radionuclides. In both of these cases, much work needs to be done, in order to determine performance capabilities, effectiveness and cost parameters. Much of the required