

# **Executive Council**

Eighty-Fifth Session 11 – 14 July 2017

EC-85/DG.27 6 July 2017 ENGLISH only

## NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

# COMMENTS AND VIEWS RECEIVED ON THE 2016 VERIFICATION IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

- 1. On 30 June 2017, the delegation of the United States of America delivered to the Technical Secretariat a Note containing comments and views on the 2016 Verification Implementation Report (VIR) (EC-85/HP/DG.1, dated 15 May 2017).
- 2. As requested by the delegation, the above-mentioned Note is herewith circulated to all Member States of the OPCW, in its original English version.

Annex: Comments of the United States of America on the 2016 VIR

#### **Annex**

# COMMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE 2016 VIR



U.S. DELEGATION TO THE ORGANIZATION FOR THE PROHIBITION OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS

The Hague, the Netherlands



-U-Ku/20/17 June 30, 2017

RECEIVED
3 0 JUN 2017

**Declarations Branch** 

Mr. Philippe Denier
Director of Verification
Technical Secretariat
Organization for the Prohibition
of Chemical Weapons
Johan de Wittlaan 32
2517 JR The Hague
The Netherlands

Dear Mr. Denier:

Enclosed please find the U.S. comments on the 2016 Verification Implementation Report (VIR). We kindly request that the enclosed comments be circulated to States Parties.

Sincerely,

Kenneth D. Ward Ambassador

U.S. Permanent Representative

to the OPCW

Enclosure: As stated

#### **UNCLASSIFIED**

#### DoD Comments to the 2016 VIR

The following comments are provided for accuracy and clarification. The changes are provided in generally the same form as the TS uses for the VIR corrigendum, with the addition of an explanatory note for U.S. Delegation understanding. All of the U.S. changes are Unclassified.

The Technical Secretariat (TS) has done a phenomenal job of amassing all this data. There are few errors with US (DoD-related) data, and those few are fairly minor. The TS is to be congratulated. With that understanding, the following comments are provided:

## Page 29, paragraph 4.52

For "...declaring a new CWSF..." read "...declaring a new CWSF at the RCWDF..."

Explanation: "Declaring a new CWSF" begs a question or gives the appearance that we've suddenly found a stockpile of CW that we haven't previously declared, whereas "declaring a new CWSF at the RCWDF" is technically correct and merely denotes that more recoveries (meaning old stuff) have been made.

# Page 29, paragraph 4.54

<u>For</u> "...the RCWDF at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii..." <u>read</u> "...the RCWDF at Tooele Army Depot-South Area, Utah, and Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst, New Jersey..."

Explanation: The RCWDF-TEADS and RCWDF-JBMDL conducted destruction of recovered CW in 2016, as reported in the 2016 annual report, not Schofield Barracks – this is a holdover from the 2015 VIR.

#### Page 30, paragraph 4.57

For "81,019" read "81,020".

Explanation: We had this same comment last year, and it was corrected in the Corrigendum (EC-82/HP/DG.1/Corr.1, dated 7 July 2016), but apparently missed again.

## Page 30, paragraph 4.58

For "44.996 MTs of HD" read "44.997 MTs of HD".

Explanation: The extended figure is 44.996940 MTs, which rounds to 44.997 MTs. Apparently, the author truncated vice rounding the figure, which does not comport with the rounding rules used throughout the document.

# Page 79, Annex 3

In the Annex Title, for "2015" read "2016", and for "31 March 2016" read "31 March 2017".

#### **UNCLASSIFIED**

Self-explanatory.

#### Page 120, Annex 6

In the last column heading, <u>for</u> "APD (MTs) 1 Jan – 31 Dec 2015" <u>read</u> "APD (MTs) 1 Jan – 31 Dec 2016".

Explanation: Simply a carryover from the 2015 VIR – heading was not changed (see other tables in Annex 6).

In the row for common name "Lewisite (L)", in the column entitled "Remaining",  $\underline{\mathbf{for}}$  "0.001"  $\underline{\mathbf{read}}$  "0.000".

Explanation: This was also corrected in the 2015 VIR Corrigendum (EC-82/HP/DG.1/Corr.1, dated 7 July 2016), but it has been missed again. The total Lewisite destroyed since EIF is an extended 11.757436 MT and the withdrawn is an extended 0.034305 MT. Added together, the sum equals 11.791741 MT or, when rounded, 11.792 MT, matching the declared quantity, and meaning that we have none remaining, as indeed we do not.

In the row for common name "UNK", in the column entitled "Remaining", <u>for</u> "0.000" <u>read</u> "0.001".

Explanation: At the end of 2016, there were still two 75mm RCW projectiles awaiting to be destroyed at the CTF/MAPS, each with a nominal fill of 0.00061 MT, together totaling 0.00122 MT or, when rounded, 0.001 MT of Unknown fill.

### Page 122, Annex 6

Correct heading in table. Should read: "Destroyed in 2016", rather than "Destroyed in 2015".

## Page 127, Annex 7

In the row for CWDF "Pueblo Chemical Agent Destruction Pilot Plant (PCAPP)", in the column entitled "Date of APD", for "18-Oct-2016" read "27-Oct-2016".

Explanation: The 2017 Annual Plan for Destruction of CW was sent to the Technical Secretariat under NACS #2016049, dated October 27, 2016.

In the row for CWDF "Recovered Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility", in the column entitled "Activities Declared in Annual Declarations", <u>for</u> "0.250457 MTs" <u>read</u> "0.593210 MTs"

Explanation: The 2016 ARD (NACS #2017007, dated February 22, 2017), page 4 explicitly states that we destroyed 0.593210 MT of Unknown agent at the RCWDF, which matches the quantity verified as destroyed in the Annex 7 column preceding the ARD column.