

irritating chemicals. In view of the assumed scientific development in this context, it was suggested that the Convention should stipulate possibilities to introduce new criteria for incapacitating effects.

16. Some delegations emphasized the necessity of elaborating standardized testing methods and procedures for establishing a toxicity spectrum.

17. The issue of other criteria was discussed, and different opinions were expressed about the necessity for any specific further criterion.

18. The need for and definition of different concepts like "chemical warfare agents", "chemical weapons", "chemical weapons system" etc. were discussed, but it was felt that only future negotiations could determine to what extent those concepts should be used in the Convention.

19. On the issue of possible exceptions from the prohibitions it was stated that peaceful chemical production and research as well as protective activities should not be described as exceptions, since they would together account for the overwhelming amount of chemical activities. Thus, they would not have to be referred to as exceptions in a convention.

20. It was held that certain types of chemicals, e.g. riot control agents and herbicides, are prohibited in war under the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Their widespread use in peacetime would, however, make it impossible to cover them by a prohibition of production, not least due to verification difficulties. On this issue views diverged.

21. The amount of production of supertoxic chemicals to be allowed for certain purposes were discussed. A number of delegations questioned the necessity of allowing an annual total production of one ton of such agents. With the obligation to make a detailed declaration of such production, including its purpose, and a clarification that the total would be an aggregate for all supertoxic chemicals for non-hostile military purposes, the issue seemed less controversial.

Declarations, Destruction.

22. On the issue of declaration of possession of specific materials, facilities and activities and of plans for disposals of materials and facilities there were differing views as to the timing and content of such declarations. The confidence building effects of such declarations, if undertaken already at the negotiation stage, were pointed out.

23. Some delegations emphasized that destruction and dismantling were to be regarded as the most important elements of the scope of the Convention and that this should be reflected already in its title.

24. Concerning the time required for destruction or conversion of declared stocks and destruction or dismantling of means of production, note was taken of the indication in the Joint Report that such activities may take up to 10 years. There were differing views whether the means of production instead of being destroyed or dismantled could also be temporarily converted for peaceful production. Some delegations felt that conversion of production facilities should be permitted only to make these facilities suitable to be used for the purpose of destroying stocks of chemical weapons.