

11. In accomplishing its task, the Working Group, from February to April 1981, carried out another substantive and more detailed examination of the issues to be dealt with in the negotiation on a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Last year's report to the Committee of the Working Group (CD/131/Rev.1) and the USSR-US Joint Report on the Progress in the Bilateral Negotiations on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons of 7 July 1980 (CD/112) were of great assistance in this endeavour.

#### Scope of the convention, definitions, criteria

12. As regards the scope of the Convention three alternatives were presented in the outline (see Annex I). The first of these, which proposes the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling, acquisition, retention and transfer of chemical weapons, received the broadest support. The second, which suggested a more comprehensive prohibition, including also planning, organization and training for the use of chemical weapons, met with considerably less support, mainly because of the verification difficulties it would entail. Views were expressed that the subject should be discussed more in depth. The third alternative, according to which also the use of chemical weapons should be prohibited, was supported by several delegations, but criticized by others, who feared that it would diminish the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Still others thought that it would be possible to find a compromise formula in establishing a link between the Geneva Protocol and the Convention. In this connection it was also suggested that a link between the scope of the Biological Weapons Convention and that of a chemical weapons convention should be established wherever appropriate.

13. The issues of definitions and criteria were also extensively discussed. In that connection valuable clarification was given as to the intentions behind the suggestions contained in the Joint Report. This contributed to a greater degree of understanding of those suggestions, which should facilitate future negotiations on these specific issues.

14. There seemed to be convergence of views that the difficulties in defining chemical warfare agents, especially with reference to their single and dual purpose character, could be overcome by stipulating, with the help of a general purpose, quantity and toxicity criteria, that chemicals must not be produced for other than non-hostile purposes or military purposes not involving the use of chemical weapons. No chemical would then need to be labelled a chemical warfare agent. The toxicity criteria would serve to delimit those chemicals, the production of which will have to be more or less strictly regulated and verified. The group of the most toxic chemicals, the 'supertoxic lethal chemicals', had been defined so as to include mustard gas.

15. One difficulty regarding the toxicity criteria was found to derive from the lack of acceptable methods for determining toxicity limits for incapacitating and