

(Mr. Reese, Australia)

The inspection was conducted at a multi-purpose complex of an agricultural chemical company, the major purpose of which is the production of trifluralin and other herbicides. At present the company produces no chemicals currently listed under schedule [2] of the "rolling text", but for the purpose of the inspection Dinitro was treated as a schedule [2] chemical. The declared activity at the facility during the inspection was the production of herbicide from Dinitro.

The inspection was conducted in accordance with the provisions contained in the annex to article VI [2] of the "rolling text", and preparations for the inspection were made on the basis of the Chairman's working paper CD/CW/WP.213. In this regard, I should like to record my delegation's appreciation for the efforts of the delegation of Sweden, and particularly Ambassador Hytenius, for their positive contribution to the conduct of national trial inspections and their continuing involvement in the evaluation of these inspections.

To assist in the evaluation process, Australia's report follows the outline provided in the Chairman's working paper. The report also contains a number of conclusions and observations, including comments on models for agreement, a suggested check-list of equipment relevant to the production of schedule [1] and [2] chemicals, and a note on the inspection team's use of a vapour monitor to check for the absence of vapour of schedule [1] chemicals during the course of the inspection.

My delegation, in fact, has been able to highlight a number of these conclusions and observations in the course of the informal open-ended consultations Ambassador Hytenius has been conducting over the last two weeks. I would none the less draw the attention of the Conference to a few specific practical findings of our inspection.

Firstly, careful attention must be given to the composition of the inspection team, and particularly to the possible need to include in the team one or more auditors. As a rough guide, it was estimated that it would take four to five man-days to conduct a complete audit of the documentation relevant to a declared schedule [2] chemical; and depending upon the complexities of use of the declared chemical within a facility being inspected, an appropriate inspection team might therefore consist of one chemist, one chemical analyst, one chemical engineer and two auditors, to enable the inspection to be completed in less than one week.

Secondly, our inspection demonstrated the usefulness of a chemical agent monitor during the inspection, and its acceptability to the company illustrates the potential for modern instrumentation to assist in tackling some confidentiality problems.

Thirdly, a video recording of the inspection, which was done during this inspection, could be a useful tool for the conduct of subsequent inspections, subject to measures to protect the confidentiality of information.