

- the question of costs of a future verification system, including in relation to its capabilities;
- the question of an implementing agency, its powers and functions and costs;
- the intimate inter-relationship between verification techniques applicable and the scope of Convention obligations; and,
- the issue of a possible mix of national and international means of verification, including in terms of cost effectiveness.

In addition to the issues listed above, India stressed that the verification system to be developed must be non-discriminatory in character in the sense of providing equal rights and obligations to the States Parties to the proposed treaty including equal access. Some other delegations expressed a similar view.

24. The work of the Conference's Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts, which is currently developing plans to test its revised concepts for an international seismic monitoring network in 1995, was generally appreciated. Various views were expressed on whether it was necessary or desirable to review the relationship of the Ad Hoc Committee to the Ad Hoc Group, including to take account of future negotiation requirements flowing from decisions to be taken by the Conference.

25. The issue of whether an existing organization or a newly-created institution would be the implementing agency for the future agreement continued to evoke keen interest among delegations. Specifically on the table was the proposal contained in the Swedish draft CTBT (CD/1202) that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) be entrusted with verification of compliance with the treaty. Questions on the role that IAEA might play were raised during the discussions. Bearing in mind that it was still very early to identify a particular implementing agency for a future ban, the Ad Hoc Committee decided to recommend to the Conference that a representative of the IAEA be invited to provide relevant information to it.

Non-seismic verification technologies

26. During the second and third parts of the session, a variety of non-seismic technologies for verifying a future CTBT was examined for the first time in the framework of the Ad Hoc Committee. Presentations on specific technologies were made either by experts themselves, as part of their national delegations, or by members of delegations, based on consultations with national experts. The Ad Hoc Committee used this exercise to identify technologies which might be useful to a verification system, and to gather information from experts on the advantages and disadvantages of such non-seismic technologies. The Ad Hoc Committee did not draw conclusions on the technologies presented. Nevertheless, these discussions provided the Committee with a basis for ongoing work, including on the possible interrelationship of seismic and non-seismic verification technologies.

27. The Ad Hoc Committee heard an overview of the subject by the delegations of Sweden and France which sought to place the discussion of individual non-seismic verification technologies in a broader context.