

13. Against this background, the Ad Hoc Committee adopted on 18 February 1993 a schedule for its first part only (CD/NTB/CRP.16). It began its work with general debate followed by discussions on verification and compliance and structure and scope as requested by the Conference in its mandate cited above.

14. During the course of general debate, upon a special request of the Ad Hoc Committee's Chairman, the nuclear-weapon States outlined their policies in respect of nuclear testing and a comprehensive nuclear test ban. The updates received from the nuclear-weapon States were highly appreciated by the other members of the Ad Hoc Committee. (The policies of the nuclear-weapon States were also elucidated at the following plenary meetings of the Conference: China - 645th plenary on 4 March and 650th plenary on 25 May; France - 657th plenary on 29 July; the Russian Federation - 640th plenary on 2 February and 658th plenary on 5 August; the United Kingdom - 658th plenary on 5 August and the United States - 657th plenary on 29 July). Upon the invitation of the Chairman, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts briefed the Ad Hoc Committee on the work of the Group during its 35th session when the Committee addressed the questions of verification and compliance.

15. There was a widely held view that, while seismic monitoring should form the core of future CTBT verification, monitoring by seismic means alone might not give confidence in compliance with a test ban. The Ad Hoc Committee therefore found that there was a need to begin an exploratory exercise on verification technologies, other than seismic, that could be useful for the verification system for a future CTBT. The Ad Hoc Committee, upon different proposals put forward by Australia and Germany on the subject, decided to devote the entirety of the second part of the session to an exploration of such non-seismic technologies (CD/NTB/CRP.16/Add.1). In order to enhance the technical level of the discussions, it was requested that delegations in a position to do so be assisted by technical experts. Twenty expert presentations were delivered over the course of the second and third parts of the session in this unprecedented substantive consideration of non-seismic verification techniques, covering a wide range of technologies.

16. The third part of the session began after important announcements had been made by the United States, France and the Russian Federation, on the issue of moratoria and on their policies on a CTBT, which were widely welcomed. These announcements are reflected in plenary statements made on 29 July and 5 August (see CD/PV.657 and 658). The discussions in the Ad Hoc Committee during the third part of the session were dominated by the process in the Conference which led to the 10 August decision to give the Ad Hoc Committee a negotiating mandate and for the Chairman of the Committee to hold consultations on how to organize its future work.

17. In parallel to those discussions, the Ad Hoc Committee continued to pursue its agreed agenda for the third part of the session (CD/NTB/CRP.16/Add.2). It began a discussion to consider the possible interrelationship of seismic and non-seismic verification technologies. As it was considered that the results of these discussions might have far-reaching consequences, some delegations believed it was premature to have in-depth talks on them. A suggestion was made to consider, for each of the possible environments in which a nuclear explosion could take place, holding a two-to-three day meeting of experts and delegates with a view to considering the entire range of questions involved in verifying a particular environment.