

can only be achieved by visits. As a minimum, one site could again be randomly selected for inspection by a combined national and international team (non-technical) at the end of the five years. Alternatively all declared sites might be visited at the end of the five years. Inspection once a year would be more desirable but not essential. No sampling would be required. A declaration announcing completion of the task, confirmed by the inspectors, might be expected from each nation at a five year review conference. Failure to complete the task in five years should not constitute a violation of the treaty, if the nation could show that the process was well underway and proceeding on a definite schedule. However, a nation requiring such an extension of time might be required to admit international inspectors to its sites on a semi-annual basis thereafter.

4. Destruction of existing agent and weapon stocks. One approach to this problem might be to accept non-verification assuming that any nation admitting to the possession of CW agents and weapons in a declaration would be compelled to destroy them. Monitoring would be carried out by national agencies, however a few international visits to the site might perhaps be arranged by the nation in question for publicity purposes.

If such non-verification of stock destruction is considered inadequate for treaty purposes, then a much more intrusive and technical means would be required. Technically, the United States may represent the most difficult verification case due to the extreme containment required by its environmental protection laws. Fortunately suitable technology has been developed for the CAMDS */ system and has been released internationally. This or similar contained systems may also be used by other nations. Because of the containment, remote systems including national technical means or black box monitors will not verify the actual destruction of agents. Even periodic visits to storage and destruction sites, with sampling, will not ensure that stockpiles are being completely destroyed (rather than being moved to another hidden site). Monitoring of the process must be virtually continuous with periodic spot sampling and analysis. Inspection teams must be adequately trained, have access to laboratory space, and at least some members must be from the international community.

There has been general agreement that stock destruction would require ten years and this has been confirmed in reports of United States/USSR bilateral discussions (CD48). As a suggested schedule, the first five years might be allowed for building of destruction plants after which stocks could be destroyed at the rate of 20 per cent per year. This would allow retention of weapon ratios till destruction was completed.

B. Activities to be Banned and Verified

5. Development of new agent/weapon systems. Nations with current stocks will already have developed weapons and would require little further work. However development activities could be readily hidden and it would be very difficult to separate work of offensive intent from that for legitimate defensive purposes.

*/ CAMDS - chemical agent and munition disposal.