In this issue:

- CWC resolution passed by UN General Assembly
- . Climate Change meeting
- CFE ratifications

### CWC at the UN

On 30 November, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution by consensus in support of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The text of the resolution is reproduced elsewhere in this issue.

**CWC** preparations

In the minimum of two years before the CWC enters force, a Preparatory Commission for the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons will have to be established. It is not yet decided how the Commission will operate.

The rules of procedure for the Preparatory Commission have yet to be drawn up. According to British Foreign Minister Douglas Hogg 'Any decision on whether such rules should be made public before being formally adopted will be for all states involved in drawing them up.'

British signature

Following some confusion over the timetable for Britain's signing of the CWC (following a Foreign Office statement that Britain would be 'an early signatory'), Douglas Hogg has stated 'The United Kingdom fully intends to be an original signatory of the Chemical Weapons Convention.'

Climate Change INC meeting

The Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) on Climate Change met from 7 to 10 December in Geneva. Now that the Climate Convention has been signed, the task of the INC is to prepare for the first Conference of the Parties (CoP) to the Convention. Given the rather vague nature of much of the wording in the Convention, there is a lot for the INC to do in the next year. In Geneva the Committee tried to decide on which jobs it would tackle and in what order.

Under the terms of the Convention, the INC decided that it must address the following main topics:

- Methodologies. These need to be specified at the first CoP.
- Communication and review of implementation by the developed country Parties (in Annex 1 of the Convention).
- Financial mechanism and financial and technical co-operation.
- · Procedural, legal and institutional matters.

The Committee agreed that, as before, it would divide itself into two working groups, the first of which will address the first two items, and the second of which will address the last two.

The main bone of contention at the meeting was when to discuss methodologies and at what level of detail. At one extreme, most of the OECD countries, the Small Island States and the Sahel States wanted methodologies agreed as a matter of urgency and in considerable detail. The G77 were essentially neutral on the topic but stressed that they needed practical methodologies which could be applied in their countries. The OPEC states, led by Saudi Arabia which has not signed the Convention, did not want to discuss methodologies at all.

The EC and US proposed a quick start on implementation, with the US announcing that they had both published a draft national report and ratified the Convention. Ten nations have now done so and it became clear to the Committee that there was a good prospect of the Convention coming into force (50 ratifications required) well before the originally anticipated date of mid-1994. The work of the INC subsequently assumed an urgency which it initially lacked.

Several OECD nations informally advocated discussion of the adequacy of present commitments to emission stabilisation with a view to introducing a Protocol on cuts in emissions, possibly prior to the Convention coming into force, as in the case of the Montreal Protocol to the Vienna Convention. The US, however, refused discussion of this matter so it was dropped, in spite of the fact that Bert Bolin (Chair, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) told the Committee that they really must cut emissions if climate change is to be avoided. Moreover, the first CoP must, under the terms of the Convention, review present commitments.

The INC had an informal meeting with Mohamed El-Ashry (Chair, Global Environment Facility, GEF) who informed them that restructuring of the GEF had begun and that the Facility should prove adequate as the interim (and he hoped the long term) funding mechanism for the Convention. Much to the interest of the developing countries, he also mentioned that the restructured Facility would not have a membership fee — although he also mentioned that ability to pay would be assessed.

The Committee finally returned to the vexed problem of methodologies and when to discuss them. It was agreed that Working Group 2 of the INC should meet in March and that the Plenary should also meet, solely to discuss the election of officers. Various reasons, including Ramadan, prevented the Saudis and allied Islamic states from discussing methodologies at the next meeting. It was thus tentatively decided that Working Group 1 should not meet. The OECD nations then decided to

hold a meeting on methodologies at, coincidentally, the same time and place as the INC (15 to 21 March in New York).

Towards the end of the last afternoon, the UK (on behalf of the EC) managed to get the entire text of an earlier submission included in the Conference Report, complete with its references to methodologies and implementation. Finally, almost unnoticed, the US introduced another matter for the next Plenary to consider, thereby leaving the way open for the introduction of many more, in addition to the original one item. Consequently the next INC can consider whatever it wishes, and probably will.

M. Ripert (Chair, INC) announced that he will stand down at the next meeting. He will be missed.

### **Future Meetings**

#### INC

15 to 21 March 1993, UN, New York. Working Group 2 and Plenary. OECD meeting on methodologies.

16 to 27 August 1993, UN, Geneva. Plenary and both Working Groups.

#### IPCC (edited list):

8 to 12 February 1993, CIGG Geneva: Working Group II.

February 1993, date and place to be decided (TBD) Brazil: IPCC Workshop on Emission Inventories (WG I).

March 1993 TBD, Lusaka, Zambia: IPCC Workshop on Emission Inventories (WG I).

29 to 30 June 1993, UN, Geneva: IPCC ninth session.

#### Other climate-related meetings

14 to 16 April 1993, UN, Geneva: Intergovernmental Meeting on World Climate (WMO, UNEP, FAO, UNESCO, IOC, UNDP).

8 to 19 November 1993, UNEP, Nairobi: 5th CoP to Montreal Protocol and 3rd CoP to the Vienna Convention.

### **CFE** update

In the 120-day baseline inspection period of the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty the United Kingdom carried out 21 inspections in former Warsaw Treaty Organization states. Seven inspections were carried out in the UK.

VERTIC would be pleased to hear from anyone with equivalent inspection figures for other states.

There appears to have been some confusion over the CFE timetable. This has arisen because the Treaty provisionally entered into force on 17 July, before all states had ratified. It has been confirmed that, notwithstanding the fact that the CFE Treaty came into force formally only on 9 November, all dates for the equipment reduction and inspection periods will be taken from July.

# **CFE Ratifications**

(The treaty was signed in Paris on	19 November 1990)
Czech and Slovak Federal Republic	5 August 1991
Hungary	4 November 1991
The Netherlands	8 November 1991
Bulgaria	12 November 1991
United Kingdom	19 November 1991
Canada	22 November 1991
Poland	26 November 1991
Norway	29 November 1991

Belgium Germany† Iceland Denmark Luxembourg United States of America France Romania Italy Spain† Georgia Moldova Greece† Turkey‡ Azerbaijan Ukraine Portugal Russia Armenia Belarus Kazakhstan	17 December 1991 23 December 1991 24 December 1991 30 December 1991 22 January 1992 29 January 1992 24 March 1992 21 April 1992 22 April 1992 3 July 1992 4 July 1992 8 July 1992 8 July 1992 9 July 1992 9 July 1992 9 July 1992 9 July 1992 14 August 1992 3 September 1992 12 October 1992 30 October 1992

# EC and nuclear non-proliferation

Following the decision at the Maastricht European Council that nuclear non-proliferation was an area where member states might take joint action under the Maastricht Treaty, preparatory work has begun on specific initiatives that might be taken. This work is to be completed by the entry into force of the Treaty.

In addition, the European Non-Proliferation Working Group has met twice since the beginning of July. It has specifically decided that in order to assist the International Atomic Energy Agency to fulfil its safeguards obligations, the EC and its member states will provide the IAEA with additional information on production inventories and international transfers of nuclear material and on exports of certain relevant equipment and non-nuclear material.

This information will be provided on a voluntary basis, starting in 1993.

# **UK** export controls

The United Kingdom is to abolish import and export controls on thousands of endangered species, although the changes will not affect those species covered by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES).

The changes relate to the UK Endangered Species (Import and Export) Act, which has no equivalent in some other EC states. Once the barriers between EC states are removed, this act will become unenforceable.

#### Export of Goods (Control) Order

The latest UK Export of Goods (Control) Order has been laid before the Houses of Parliament and is expected to enter into force on 31 December.

# CoCom meeting

The current policy of the states participating in the Co-ordinating Committee on Multilateral Export Controls (CoCom) is to provide those proscribed destinations that have embarked on political reform with progressively wider access to CoCom-controlled goods, as they establish effective export controls. To this end, an 'informal co-operation forum on export controls' has been established.

The first meeting of this new informal forum was in Paris on 23–24 November. The meeting was attended by 42 states (17 CoCom members, New Zealand, 5 neutral European and 19 East European and former Soviet states).

A US official was cited in *Defense News* as indicating that the liberalization of export controls does not extend to the new Yugoslav republics, China, North Korea or Vietnam.

# START II

On 14-15 December, the American and Russian Foreign Ministers met in Stockholm at the time of the CSCE ministerial meeting. It is understood that the two Ministers discussed the possibility of finalising the START II agreement so that it can be signed before President Bush leaves office on 20 January.

START II, in its current draft form would reduce strategic nuclear warheads to 3,000 to 3,500 on each side with no multiple-warhead ICBMs.

### **United Nations activities**

The United Nations General Assembly has been very busy in recent weeks with resolutions which relate to international security and disarmament issues.

#### 1995 NPT conference

The first Preparatory Committee meeting for the 1995 NPT extension conference is to be held on 10–14 May 1993 in New York.

A United Nations General Assembly resolution in support of the preparatory arrangements gained the support of 133 states with no sates voting against, however India and Cuba abstained.

Nuclear testing

A resolution urging the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its work towards a comprehensive nuclear test ban attracted 136 votes in favour (including Russia), with 1 against (US and 4 abstentions (UK, France, China and Israel). France had voted against a similar resolution in the last UN session.

#### CWC resolution

[The following resolution text has been reproduced from a draft text which the editor understands to be identical to the final resolution.]

Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction

The General Assembly,

Recalling the long-standing determination of the international community to achieve the effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction, as well as the continuing support for measures to uphold the authority of the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925, as expressed by consensus in many previous resolutions,

Recalling in particular its resolution 46/35 C of 6 December 1991, in which the Assembly strongly urged the Conference on Disarmament, as a matter of the highest priority, to resolve outstanding issues so as to achieve a final agreement on a convention on prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling

and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction during its 1992 session,

Bearing in mind the Final Declaration of the Conference of States Parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol and Other Interested States, held in Paris from 7 to 11 January 1989, in which participating States stressed their determination to prevent any recourse to chemical weapons by completely eliminating them,

Determined to make progress towards general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, including the prohibition and elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction,

Convinced, therefore, of the urgent necessity of a total ban on chemical weapons, so as to abolish an entire category of weapons of mass destruction, and thus eliminate the risk to mankind of renewed use of these inhumane weapons.

Welcoming the draft Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction adopted by the Conference on Disarmament and contained in its report dated 3 September 1992, the result of many years of intensive negotiations, which constitute an historic achievement in the field of arms control and disarmament,

Convinced that the Convention, particularly as adherence to it approaches universality, will contribute to the maintenance of international peace and improve the security of all States, and that it therefore merits the strong support of the entire international community,

Convinced further that the implementation of the Convention should promote international trade, technological development and economic cooperation in the chemical sector, in order to enhance the economic and technological development of all States parties,

Determined to ensure the efficient and cost-effective implementation of the Convention,

Recalling the support for the prohibition of chemical weapons expressed in the declaration by representatives of the world's chemical industry at the Government-Industry Conference against Chemical Weapons, held at Canberra from 18 to 22 September 1989,

Bearing in mind the relevant references to the Convention in the Final Document of the Tenth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Jakarta from 1 to 6 September 1992,

Welcoming the invitation of the President of the French Republic to participate in a ceremony to sign the Convention in Paris on 13 January 1993,

- Commends the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, as contained in the report of the Conference on Disarmament dated 3 September 1992;
- Requests the Secretary-General, as Depositary of the Convention, to open it for signature in Paris on 13 January 1993;
- Calls upon all States to sign and, thereafter, according to their respective constitutional processes, to become parties to the Convention at the earliest possible date, thus contributing to its rapid entry into force and to the earliest achievement of universal adherence;
- Further calls upon all states to ensure the effective implementation of this unprecedented, global, comprehensive and verifiable multilateral disarmament agreement, thereby enhancing

cooperative multilateralism as a basis for

international peace and security;

 Requests the Secretary-General to provide such services as may be requested by the signatory States to initiate the work of the Preparatory Commission for the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons;

 Requests the Secretary-General, as Depositary of the Convention, to report to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session on the status of signatures and

ratifications of the Convention.

### **Vertic News**

Verifying the Non-Proliferation Treaty

A new VERTIC study, Verifying the Non-Proliferation Treaty, by Owen Greene, was launched on 3 December. The launch of the report was covered in the British quality press.

The report examines the weaknesses of existing safeguards and proposals for reform to reduce the risk of proliferation at both declared and clandestine facilities. It also discusses the challenges for verification by ex-nuclear states that inherently pose special proliferation risks, and by the spread of nuclear materials and sensitive technologies.

The report proposes a range of measures that, taken together, would greatly improve the reliability of the non-proliferation regime in the 1990s, and argues against some proposals that have recently gained credence.

Financial support for this report was gratefully received from the Ploughshares Fund (San Francisco).

Copies of the report are available from the VERTIC office, price £10.

Climate Change meeting

VERTIC's John Lanchbery attended the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee meeting on 7–10 December in Geneva. His report of what happened there appears on the front page of this issue.

Trust & Verify in 1993

The road to hell is paved with good intentions...

As many readers may have gathered, the publishing schedule for *Trust & Verify* has been rather erratic at times. It is the editor's intention to publish to a stricter timetable in 1993.

Trust & Verify will be published 10 times in 1993, coming out on a roughly 5 week schedule. The editor would like to encourage more readers to submit items for possible inclusion.

Copy dates for 1993:

Issue	Date
January/February 22 Ja	nuary
March 26 Feb	
April 2	April
May 7	May
June 11	June
July/August 23	July
September 27 A	ugust
October 1 Oc	tober
November 5 Nove	
December 3 Dece	ember

Trust & Verify should be dispatched from the VERTIC office about 10 days after the copy date. VERTIC is a relatively small organization, which leads to limits on the resources that it is able to commit to Trust & Verify and this may lead to unavoidable changes in the publishing schedule.

Trust & Verify is edited and produced by Richard Guthrie with additional reporting by John Lanchbery and Philip McNab © VERTIC 1992

Trust & Verify

Trust & Verify is produced by VERTIC 10 times a year. Anyone wishing to contribute information for inclusion in Trust & Verify, or to comment on its contents, should contact the VERTIC office.

**Voluntary Subscriptions** 

The production of *Trust & Verify* entails considerable cost to VERTIC so we would welcome a subscription of £12 (individual) or £20 (organization) for a year's issues. Payments may be made by cheque or credit card. Thank you to those who have sent a subscription.

8 John Adam Street London WC2N 6EZ Telephone 071 925 0867 Facsimile 071 925 0861 What is VERTIC?

VERTIC is an independent organization aiming to research and provide information on the role of verification technology and methods in present and future arms control and environmental agreements. VERTIC coordinates six working groups comprising 21 UK consultants and 11 overseas advisors. VERTIC is the major source of information on verification for scientists, policy makers and the press. VERTIC is funded primarily by grants from foundations and trusts and its independence is monitored by an Oversight and Advisory Committee.

