

## 2.0 Outline of a Verification Procedure

### 2.1 General Considerations

It goes without saying that a prompt on-site inspection by an international team of experts would be the most effective way to confirm or to refute an allegation of the use of chemical weapons. This does not mean that investigations involving interviews and medical examinations of refugees in neighbouring countries, or the medical examination of victims in hospitals to which they have been evacuated, are not also worthwhile. On the contrary, all such activities will contribute to the determination of what may have transpired and, it is hoped, contribute either directly or indirectly to a reduction in human suffering (even if the result of unexplained natural phenomena).

Clearly, the need for a prompt on-site investigation does not presuppose a violation. Nevertheless, the very act of making an allegation promotes an emotive response on the part of the world public and on the part of the accused. Add to this the fact that an on-site inspection would likely require some form of local cease-fire, and it is conceivable that a complainant could be making the allegation for a variety of reasons. While a refusal to cooperate in an investigation cannot in itself be taken as confirmation of the allegation, repeated instances of such behaviour could not help but undermine the accused party's credibility, since such behaviour would be consistent with what one would expect should the allegation be correct. It is expected that, in the context of a future chemical weapons convention as it is currently being negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament, there will eventually