(ii) States would report to the Interim Scientific Commission all seismic events which they judged to be "doubtful" in nature, i.e., all events not identifiable by them as earthquakes or other natural phenomena, non-nuclear explosions, etc.;

(iii) The Interim Scientific Commission would undertake an investigation to determine the nature of the "doubtful" event, making use of all agreed means at their disposal including a request, upon a decision by a majority of the members of the Commission, for an on-site inspection at the reported locale of the event in question;

(iv) Should the request for an on-site inspection be refused, the state in whose territory the "doubtful" event had occurred would be required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of two-thirds of the members of the Commission that it was not a nuclear test;

(v) In the event that the state in question failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Commission that the event was not a nuclear explosion, other parties to the interim arrangement would be free, upon notice of __ (days/weeks) to withdraw from the arrangement.

(*Note*: It may be argued that this system has the disadvantage of giving the eight neutral members of the Commission a decisive role in judging whether a violation has been committed, which the nuclear powers might be reluctant to accept. If this difficulty were considered likely to block agreement, it could be provided simply that any state would have the right to withdraw if it was not satisfied that another party had established that a "doubtful" event was not a nuclear explosion, or, as a further alternative, that the arrangement would terminate automatically if two such events had occurred and no satisfactory explanation had been provided. However, there are also disadvantages in these approaches: first, if only one unexplained event were required, it might be thought that it was being made "too easy" for states to withdraw from the arrangement; second, if two or more unexplained events were required, it would be very difficult politically, after one "suspicious" event had already occurred, for a nuclear power to remain a party to the arrangement in the absence of any assurance that another party had not violated it.)

4.(a) The Interim Scientific Commission would examine and make recommendations with respect to the extent and composition of the permanent network of detection and identification stations needed for the collection of data on and reporting of all events which could be suspected of being nuclear weapons tests, and for making positive identification of the nature and origin of such events, wherever possible.

(b) The Commission would also make recommendations as to the eventual composition of the Permanent International Scientific Commission, its procedures, and the standards of instrumentation necessary for the operation and coordination of all elements of the system provided for in sub-paragraph 4(a) above.

(*Note*: There would appear to be no reason why the Interim Scientific Commission should not make the technical recommendations referred to above; some of the functions set out in paragraph 4(b) may be considered, however, to be essentially political and outside the proper competence of the Interim Commission.)

5. If, after the expiry of the initial period of six months, no agreement enabling the signature of a comprehensive treaty had been reached, and in addition there had been no agreement to extend the interim arrangement for a further period of three months, a special session of the United Nations General Assembly would be convened to review the progress of the negotiations and to make recommendations concerning future negotiations.

6. If agreement was reached on a mutually acceptable system for verifying compliance with an international treaty including the prohibition of underground nuclear tests, a comprehensive treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments would be opened for signature by all states.