



Monitoring Agency (ISMA), which would rely on a specific type of technology (surveillance satellites), would seem to fall into this category. Or an IVO could be established for the purpose of conducting the entire verification process in relation to only one particular agreement, for example, a chemical weapons convention. It is conceivable that, over time, such agreement-specific IVOs could serve as stepping-stones toward the creation of a general IVO with broader responsibilities. This might, for example, permit more economical use of verification-dedicated resources.

It should be noted that none of the concepts outlined above involves monitoring activities by states in relation to agreements to which they are not themselves parties, nor by any other agent, except as expressly authorized by agreement of the parties. The presumption throughout has been that the principle of acceptability rules out such monitoring activity and that all aspects of the verification process must be expressly accepted by all parties to an agreement.

Fortunately, the international community already has some (all too limited) experience with verifying multilateral arms control agreements which can serve as a base and guide for further pioneering. Of greatest interest as a model of an agreement-specific IVO is the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) system of safeguards which verify the non-proliferation commitments of its member states under the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The IAEA has, with impressive success, confronted and coped with all the kinds of generic problems that have been cited here. It has done this, moreover, in direct relationship with a technology sector of unique sensitivity from both commercial and military perspectives. The IAEA has undoubtedly had a key role in maintaining a high level of international confidence in the NPT as one of the more successful international security measures of our time. Its organization, procedures and techniques merit careful study.

Finally, the existing and potential role of the United Nations must be seriously

considered and addressed. As pointed out in paragraph 114 of the UNSSOD I Final Document:

'The United Nations, in accordance with the Charter, has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament. Accordingly, it should play a more active role in this field and, in order to discharge its functions effectively, the United Nations should facilitate and encourage all disarmament measures — unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral — and be kept duly informed through the General Assembly, or any other appropriate United Nations channel reaching all Members of the Organization, of all disarmament efforts outside its aegis without prejudice to the progress of negotiations.'

There is a need to translate principle into practical application. You, Mr. Secretary-General, have demonstrated that initiatives can help bridge the gap between prohibition and verification and, in turn, build a stronger involvement of the United Nations.

Our study has identified a number of other ways in which the United Nations might acquire an enhanced role in the verification process. First, it could give further consideration in the General Assembly or the Disarmament Commission to the essential role that verification plays in the arms limitation process, and therefore, in international security.

Second, the United Nations could examine the possibility that individual nations or groups of nations possessing verification expertise could offer such capabilities to the international community for use in the verification of multilateral agreements.

Third, the United Nations could undertake research and examination of the organizational structures, procedures and techniques which might be devised and further developed for use by IVO-type organizations, utilizing the rich body of documentation generated over the years in the Conference on Disarmament and elsewhere.

Fourth, the United Nations could provide greater assistance, advice and technical expertise to negotiators in the regional arms control and disarmament process with a view to combining international mechanisms with regional measures for verification (e.g., the control system of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which utilizes safeguards from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as well as the control measures provided by the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL)).

Fifth, on a responsive basis, the United Nations might involve itself in the formulation and execution of verification provisions within agreements. Where a need exists, the United Nations should be prepared to help bring together verification expertise and encourage states to develop procedures through which this expertise can be applied in actual agreements.

And finally, given the appropriate flexibility, the United Nations could secure a stronger role in future regional arms limitation agreements. Should one or more arms limitation agreements be developed in any one region for which a space-based remote sensing system could be an appropriate verification technology, it would be both reasonable and cost-effective for this space-based verification capability to be generated by a group of capable nations and provided for use under the auspices of the United Nations or a regionally-based IVO in the context of the agreement(s).

Excellency, with or without legal provisions for verification purposes, nations will strive to collect information on the military activities of other nations which are perceived as relevant to their own national security. Such efforts have always been, and will continue to be, a predictable aspect of national behaviour. Adequately verified arms control and disarmament agreements, however, could provide the means whereby certain of these basic information needs can be met under conditions where interference is minimized, sovereignty is respected and distrust is largely dispelled. Similarly, it is clear that