

18. Also under this item, the Ad Hoc Committee heard a statement by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts, which brought it up to date on the work of the Ad Hoc Group at its 36th session, focusing in particular on the costs of a future seismic network as they relate to system capability.

19. The Ad Hoc Committee also took up, in accordance with the mandate given to it at the start of the 1993 annual session, a consideration of existing proposals. Under this item, several delegations commented on aspects of the draft for a CTBT put forward by Sweden on 3 June 1993 (CD/1202-CD/NTB/WP.19). A summary of the discussion on this item is found below.

Structure and scope

20. With regard to the issue of the scope of a future agreement, all delegations stressed that it was essential that a future CTBT be universally applicable, to non-nuclear-weapon States as well as to nuclear-weapon States, and effectively and internationally verifiable. Only in this way could the agreement make an effective contribution to the prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects.

21. In its 1991 report to the Conference, the Ad Hoc Committee dealt with the issue of whether to include in the prohibition nuclear tests for peaceful purposes (PNES). Sweden revised its proposed draft for a CTBT (see CD/1202), to include the obligation of a State Party to prohibit "any nuclear-weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control". Several delegations welcomed Sweden's inclusion of PNES within the scope of the prohibition of nuclear explosions.

22. With regard to the question of a threshold nuclear test ban, the United States' delegation, for its part, clarified that its President had rejected the option of a 1-kiloton threshold agreement and would be seeking a comprehensive, not a limited or threshold, test ban.

Verification and compliance

23. There was general recognition that in order to ensure compliance with a future CTBT, an effective, internationally applicable verification system would be required. The Committee did not consider the scope of or the requirements for a verification regime. A number of delegations noted that, depending on future decisions on the scope of the prohibition and on requirements of the verification regime, much work remained to be done in this area. At the same time, a number of delegations registered their view that adequate verification technologies were already available. A view was also expressed that remaining difficulties might be more political than technical in nature. The question was raised as to whether the verification regime should cover possible nuclear explosions and preparatory activity in all environments. Some of the issues that preoccupied delegations during the session were those relating to:

- the substantial role that a global seismic monitoring network would have, especially in the underground test environment;
- the possible use of additional non-seismic verification technologies (see below) for the detection of nuclear tests in various environments including in relation to the question of evasion; and their possible use for the detection of pre-testing preparations;