

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

This year new ideas have been introduced concerning the verification of the chemical industry. I note with great satisfaction the converging positions on the inclusion of "capable facilities" under article VI and appreciate that delegations do not reject the exploration of new ideas.

My delegation welcomes the fact that a substantial part of the chemical industry seems to be prepared to provide free access for international inspectors. Such an approach would considerably facilitate the definition of "capability". If a somewhat narrower concept is considered desirable however, my delegation believes that the exemption of certain kinds of production is the least complicated way to go.

A verification regime building upon an extended scope of declarations and nominations by States parties would constitute an important confidence-building measure, which would provide a possibility to demonstrate compliance with the convention. In the view of my delegation, declarations should be linked to production, present or planned.

The inspection site should in our view correspond to an entire plant site. From this follows that an inspection could include a variety of procedures depending on the nature of the site. The aim of an inspection should be to verify the declaration. A relatively simple inspection procedure should be the basis, with the possibility of increasing the intrusiveness, if the inspectors deem it necessary. The number of inspections possible within a given budget would then be significantly higher compared with the system currently outlined in the "rolling text".

The selection of facilities for inspection under article VI must be performed in such a way that the security concerns of States parties are taken into account. We do not, however, understand the reasoning behind a pre-determined concentration on inspections of schedule 2 facilities. In fact, my delegation does not believe that a risk assessment can be based on simple technical criteria. Thus, a selection by the technical secretariat based on such criteria would not be sufficient for singling out the most relevant facilities. A State party should take its own decision as to which facility it considers should be inspected. This must be the basis. It is conceivable, however, that inspections proposed by States parties could be complemented by inspections initiated by the technical secretariat according to agreed guidelines.

There has been much discussion about anonymous nominations. The preference for such nominations for inspections builds upon two different presumptions: first, that anonymity would avoid creating bilateral political problems and, second, that it would not be correct to single out one State party among several having made the same nomination. The list of nominated plant sites could be included in the annual report of the technical secretariat with an indication of the number of nominations for each of them.