

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

discussing alternative measures. We welcome this change. At the same time, the United States continues to argue that alternative measures are unworkable in some cases, for example in cases of suspicion relating to concealed CW stocks. Ambassador Hansen said on 7 April: "It seems obvious that only inspection of the bunker will permit an inspector to determine whether or not there are chemical weapons inside". He also asked the Soviet delegation to explain what alternatives could be used in such a case.

I can say the following in this connection. In our view, if concealed stocks are suspected, alternative measures providing a satisfactory answer can be found (if, naturally, full access is unfeasible). For one thing, one cannot exclude that the challenging State could be satisfied if provided by the challenged party with information allaying its concern. For another thing, it is well known that one of the characteristics of CW stocks is that they require systematic maintenance, monitoring of the condition of munitions and containers with chemical agents, and preventive and protective measures. CW storage facilities require ventilation systems, special sewerage, air filtering and waste water treatment installations, monitoring instruments, etc.

In this context, observation of a suspicious site from outside to detect activities relating to maintenance of CW stocks and the presence of systems for the protection of the maintenance personnel and the environment can be regarded as a possible alternative measure. Collection of air and effluent samples around the facility's perimeter and in the vicinity of treatment installations can provide definite information about whether or not CW stocks are present. On the face of it, one also cannot exclude the possibility of automatic sampling inside storage facilities. Such methods could be discussed in the negotiations. Possible alternative measures in each particular case may vary. It appears, therefore, that the challenged party will be able to find a way of proving compliance (if, of course, it has not violated the convention) even if it does not agree to let inspectors enter the bunker.

Of course, in the discussion of the idea of alternative measures the question arises as to what the procedure should be if the challenging party and the challenged party cannot come to an agreement on the procedure for inspection or resolve the disagreement in a way satisfactory to both parties. This is the so-called "last word" problem: in the final analysis, who should decide how the inspection should be conducted?

Some delegations believe that it is the challenging party which should have the "final say". We believe such a solution would be too simplistic and, in practice, it would not facilitate the joint search for an agreement and the resolution of a controversial situation. It would be much more appropriate to resolve this problem as envisaged in the British paper, which says that in the event that the challenging State considers the alternative measures proposed by the challenged State to be unsatisfactory, the obligation of the latter to convince the challenging State that it is in compliance with its obligations will continue to apply.