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Abstract - Large amounts of chemical munitions were disposed of in the seas and other bodies of water around the world. Some of these once remote dumping sites are now being disturbed as a result of expanding economic activities. The likelihood of human contact with dumped chemical munitions increases accordingly. The Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) was opened for signature in January 1993 and entered into force in April 1997. One important disarmament aim is the worldwide destruction of all chemical weapons (CW). The CWC, however, does not specifically encourage parties to the convention to remedy sites with CW dumped in bodies of water. The paper introduces the concept of chemical weapon under the CWC and describes the different classes of CW and their respective declarations and destruction obligations. It then analyses how the CWC deals with CW dumped at sea and in internal waters and discusses some of the legal issues that arise if such weapons are recovered. The paper concludes with some recommendations to remove ambiguities surrounding the status of recovered dumped munitions under the CWC.

Introduction

The Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) was opened for signature in January 1993 and entered into force in April 1997. One important disarmament aim is the worldwide destruction of all chemical weapons (CW). To this end the CWC contains detailed instructions on how to destroy CW and related production facilities, imposes precise deadlines (including many interim deadlines) for the destruction requirements.

A party to the CWC is prohibited to eliminate its CW stockpile through open-pit burning, land burial or dumping in any body of water. In this way the convention sets environmental standards for the destruction methods. In addition, the latter two methods are also unacceptable on the grounds that the destruction process must be essentially irreversible.

Tonnes of chemical munitions have been disposed of in the seas and other bodies of water across the world after the end of both World Wars. Furthermore, munitions recovered from the former battlefields and even modern CW were sea-dumped. International awareness of the potential ecological consequences of these dumping operations has meanwhile grown. Moreover, some of these once remote dumping sites are now being disturbed as a result of expanding economic activities, such as fishing, harbour expansions and the laying of deep-water cables and pipelines. The likelihood of human contact with dumped chemical munitions increases accordingly.
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A party to the CWC is prohibited to eliminate its CW stockpile through open-pit burning, land burial or dumping in any body of water. In this way the convention sets environmental standards for the destruction methods. In addition, the latter two methods are also unacceptable on the grounds that the destruction process must be essentially irreversible.

Tonnes of chemical munitions have been disposed of in the seas and other bodies of water across the world after the end of both World Wars. Furthermore, munitions recovered from the former battlefields and even modern CW were sea-dumped. International awareness of the potential ecological consequences of these dumping operations has meanwhile grown. Moreover, some of these once remote dumping sites are now being disturbed as a result of expanding economic activities, such as fishing, harbour expansions and the laying of deep-water cables and pipelines. The likelihood of human contact with dumped chemical munitions increases accordingly.
The CWC does not ignore the problem of CW dumped in water. However, it does not specifically encourage parties to the convention to remedy such situations. It also recognises the problem of the haphazard retrieval of such munitions, and therefore it establishes a special framework for declaring and destroying these CW whereby it allows state party discretion over decisions to invoke the destruction obligations.

This paper introduces the concept of chemical weapon under the CWC and describes the different classes of CW and their respective declaration and destruction obligations. It then analyses how the CWC deals with CW dumped at sea and in internal waters and discusses some of the legal issues that may arise if such weapons are recovered. The paper concludes with some recommendations to remove ambiguities surrounding the status of recovered dumped munitions under the CWC.

**Chemical weapons in the Chemical Weapons Convention**

One of the central components of the CWC is the destruction of CW and the prevention of future (re)armament with such weapons. The verification regime of the treaty is geared towards these goals. It includes on-site inspections of CW stockpiles and CW destruction facilities by teams of international inspectors of the Technical Secretariat of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) in The Hague.

Inspectors also visit commercial industrial plants and facilities run by government agencies (including the military) that handle chemicals specified in the CWC in order to ascertain that no prohibited activities take place in them.

The parties to the CWC must continuously collect information on activities of relevance to the convention occurring on their territory and report such information to the Technical Secretariat. In order to be able to implement this vast undertaking the CWC contains an elaborate definition of CW. This definition does not encompass every type of munition or agent that national military doctrines may have considered to be a means of chemical warfare; the definition serves the objectives of the CWC [1]. Article II of the CWC defines CW as follows:

"Chemical Weapons" means the following, together or separately:

- Toxic chemicals and their precursors, except where intended for purposes not prohibited under this Convention, as long as the types and quantities are consistent with such purposes;
- Munitions and devices, specifically designed to cause death or other harm through the toxic properties of those toxic chemicals specified in subparagraph (a), which would be released as a result of the employment of such munitions and devices;
- Any equipment specifically designed for use directly in connection with the employment of munitions and devices specified in subparagraph (b) [2].

Taking the history of chemical warfare into account, the CWC identifies three periods of CW production. The first period ends in 1924 and includes World War I. The second one runs from 1925 until 1945, the year in which the Axis Powers were defeated in World War II. The third period begins on 1 January 1946 and continues until the present.
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Based on these time delimitations Article II specifies two subcategories in addition to CW, namely "old chemical weapons" (OCW) and "abandoned chemical weapons" (ACW). There are two classes of OCW, namely (a) CW that were produced before 1925 [3], and (b) CW produced in the period between 1925 and 1946 that have deteriorated to such an extent that they can no longer be used as CW [4].

Abandoned chemical weapons are CW left behind by one state after 1 January 1925 on the territory of another state without the latter's consent [5]. Old chemical weapons produced before 1925 can thus never be considered as ACW. Chemical weapons produced between 1925 and 1946 can be ACW; CW produced after 1945 cannot be OCW because of the time specification.

Obligations with respect to the elimination of chemical weapons

A primary objective of the CWC is the world-wide elimination of CW stockpiles. A key requirement is the essential irreversibility of the destruction process so that the munitions and other devices can no longer be used [6]. The CWC also explicitly prohibits three methods for CW disposal: open-pit burning, dumping in any body of water, and land burial [7].

Ecological considerations obviously played a role in these exclusions. However, the CWC also contains specific provisions for dealing with CW dumped at sea and buried on land before certain dates (see below), which would be purposeless if dumping in water or land burial were permitted ways of CW disposal.

In addition, any authorisation of sea-dumping would have been in contravention of international environmental and maritime law, notably of the 1972 Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter (the so-called London Convention) and the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) [8].

The CWC is primarily concerned about the CW that were produced after 1 January 1946, and the reporting and destruction requirements, and the verification procedures for these munitions (as well as for their production facilities and storage sites) are very detailed [9]. The reporting and destruction requirements for OCW are significantly different [10]. States parties must destroy OCW under the general destruction obligation in Article I of the CWC [11].

Old chemical weapons manufactured before 1925 are subject to inspection by the Technical Secretariat, upon which they become toxic waste (which exempts them from the CWC definition of CW). The state party in question must then destroy or otherwise dispose of this toxic waste in accordance with its national legislation [12].

The reporting and destruction requirements for OCW produced between 1925 and 1946 are more elaborate as the Technical Secretariat must determine the non-usability of these CW. A state party must to the greatest extent possible submit information to the Technical Secretariat on a level of detail similar to that for CW produced after 1945 [13].

If, following one or more inspections, the Technical Secretariat confirms their status based on the non-usability criterion, then the state party will destroy them as OCW, which offers the possibility of a more flexible destruction regime than for CW produced after
1945 [14]. If, in contrast, the Technical Secretariat cannot confirm their non-usability, then the state party must destroy these CW according to the provisions for CW manufactured after 1945 [15].

It should be noted that the CWC definition of CW consists of three parts, so that the criteria apply to these parts together or separately. This signifies that the condition of non-usability must be determined for each part, as for instance, the agent may have retained much of its toxicity despite corrosion of the shell casing [16]. Those parts that do not meet with the non-usability specification must be destroyed in accordance with the CWC provisions for CW manufactured after 1945.

Under the CWC the disposal of ACW is the responsibility of the abandoning state [17]. However, the specific destruction requirements for the abandoning state party depend on whether the ACW meet the criteria for OCW or not. These criteria are the production of the CW between 1925 and 1945 and the determination of their non-usability.

This has two important implications. First, as the concept of ACW applies only to CW manufactured after 1 January 1925 the disposal of chemical munitions recovered from the World War I battlefields and dumps (as toxic waste) is the responsibility of the states that recover them (e.g., Belgium, France and Italy) and not of the countries that manufactured or fired them.

Second, ACW produced after 1945 can never be considered as OCW even though their condition may have deteriorated to such an extent that they can no longer be used. They must be destroyed according to the requirements for CW manufactured after 1945. For the abandoning state party, the determination by the Technical Secretariat that ACW are OCW may significantly reduce the cost of verification and destruction.

**Chemical weapons dumped at sea or in other bodies of water**

In the last century dumping at sea, in deep lakes and other waters or land burial were fairly common and cheap ways of eliminating CW. Especially after both World Wars the former belligerents applied these methods on a large scale in order to discard huge quantities of chemical munitions from the battlefields, storage sites and production facilities. They were also economic disposal modes for obsolete or deteriorated CW, or chemical munitions recovered from former battlefields [18].

However, growing environmental awareness led to doubts concerning the soundness of these disposal methods. The 1958 Convention on the High Seas, which included some provisions regarding marine pollution, proved inadequate [19]. Sea-dumping, however, first became illegal in a regional setting with the entry into force of the 1972 Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping From Ships and Aircraft in April 1974 [20]. Although Article 9 permits exceptions in the case of force majeure or extreme emergency, it cannot be invoked lightly [21].

A similar global regulation followed with the entry into force of the London Convention in 1975. A protocol to the convention expounds the notion of dumping and after its entry into force it will extend the prohibition to dumping in internal waters [22]. UNCLOS, which entered into force in 1994, obliges parties to take measures to prevent, reduce and control pollution of the marine environment by means of, *inter alia*, dumping [23]. As
noted earlier, the CWC totally prohibits such disposal methods (in addition to open-pit burning).

Regarding past CW disposal operations, the CWC distinguishes between CW buried on land and CW dumped at sea. As many states have a legacy of CW disposal, the CWC has created certain exemptions for both categories. While practical considerations guided the formulation of the relevant provisions (e.g., incomplete historical records, or the impossibility to recover the munitions), the overriding concern is the assurance that all CW remain unusable. Consequently, the specific modalities for land-buried and sea-dumped CW differ.

A party to the CWC is not required to submit national declarations or destroy CW buried on its territory, provided that these weapons were buried on its territory before 1 January 1977 and that they remain buried. The exemption applies to OCW and CW manufactured before 1977 [24]. At the First Conference of the States Parties, held on 6-24 May 1997 following the entry into force of the CWC, the term “territory” was defined as including the land territory and all internal waters of a state party [25]. Internal waters include rivers and mouths of rivers, lakes, canals, ports and permanent harbour systems and (under specific conditions) embayments [26].

If CW are thus recovered from such internal waters, they will have to be assessed against the criteria for OCW in order to determine which section of Part IV of the Verification Annex applies. However, the clause “buried on its territory” indicates that the paragraphs in Articles III and IV of the CWC regarding land-buried CW do not apply to ACW.

The declaration and destruction obligations for ACW, which depend on their production dates, remain even in the case that such CW were buried before 1977. As explained in the previous section, the criteria for ACW do not apply to CW manufactured before 1925. Thus, the disposal of World War I CW dumped in the waterways near the frontlines would be the responsibility of the state party that recovers them.

Sea-dumped CW are also the subject of exemptions. States parties are not required to submit declarations or destroy CW that were dumped at sea before 1 January 1985 [27]. The term “sea” is understood to include the high sea, the territorial sea and archipelagic waters of a state party. The border line between the territorial sea and the land territory (with its internal waters) of a state party is determined in accordance with the relevant rules of international maritime law [28]. The territorial sea starts at baseline on the land mass, which in most cases corresponds with the low-water line on the coast or straight lines connecting two base points across estuaries, deeply indented coasts, and so on [29].

Sea-dumped CW fall under a different regime than land-buried ones. The relevant passages in the CWC do not contain clauses like “in its territorial sea” or “which remain dumped”. This has some important consequences. The exemption of declaration and destruction requirements is extended to sea-dumped CW that have been recovered for whatever reason.

As an immediate consequence, the time delimitations regarding CW production to distinguish between CW and OCW are without object. Furthermore, sea-dumped CW can never be considered as ACW, even if they were dumped in the territorial sea of another state. The opposite case would have led to legal tangles, as the producer or former
possessor of the sea-dumped CW is not necessarily responsible for their disposal at sea. Especially after World War II, the Allied Powers conducted or coordinated the dumping of Axis chemical munitions in the Baltic and Adriatic Seas.

If a coastal state wishes to clear a dump site, then under the CWC it is solely responsible for the financial costs and the disposal of the munitions (which might be storage on land, as there are no destruction requirements). A former possessor or a state responsible for the dumping operations may contribute financial and technical assistance on a voluntary basis, but is not obliged to do so under the CWC.

Sea-dumped CW may also be destroyed under water. This occurs as part of ordnance-clearing operations at undersea dump sites with mixed high-explosive and toxic munitions. As the CWC remains silent on the destruction of sea-dumped CW, such operations are constrained only by the relevant provisions regarding the preservation of the marine environment under international maritime law and safety considerations for the divers [30].

The First Conference of the States Parties decided that CW buried on land after 1976 or dumped at sea after 1984 fall under the strict declaration requirements for CW. In addition, the declaration could include supplementary information to facilitate the Technical Secretariat’s evaluation of the submission, such as the exact date of the burial or dumping, the way in which the CW were buried or dumped, the present condition of these CW, and an assessment of the risks they might pose to the environment [31].

Following a decision by the Third Conference of the States Parties in November 1998, it was clarified that the Technical Secretariat shall inspect CW buried on land after 1976 or dumped at sea after 1984 on the basis of these declarations, provided that the CW are accessible. Challenge inspections, which according to Article IX of the CWC any state party may request in case of a serious non-compliance concern, also apply to such weapons [32].

To date there are no confirmed cases of burial or sea disposal of CW after the specified dates. The CWC (including decisions by the annual Conference of the States Parties) does not address the question of the destruction of CW buried on land after 1976 or dumped at sea after 1984, although it can be expected that, should such a case be declared by a state party or be confirmed by means of a challenge inspection, the Executive Council and the Conference of the States Parties of the OPCW will take the necessary decisions.

Discussion

The CWC does not specifically encourage states parties to recover CW that were dumped in internal waters or at sea. In the eventuality of such recoveries there are different declaration and destruction requirements.

For CW dumped at sea before 1985 there are no declaration or destruction obligations. Even if a state party decides to declare sea-dumped CW to the OPCW, there are no other responsibilities that automatically follow from this declaration. The distinctions between CW, OCW and ACW are irrelevant. In contrast, a state party must submit detailed declarations about its disposal of CW at sea after 1984.

However, in the absence of confirmed cases of such dumping activities there are as yet no specified follow-on obligations for states parties (with the exception of those relating to
inspections by the Technical Secretariat). Any future OPCW decision on remediation will have to take the physical ability to recover these weapons into account.

Chemical weapons dumped in internal bodies of water fall under the provisions of land-buried CW. States parties are not required to declare or destroy any CW that were disposed of in internal waters before 1977 as long as they are not recovered. (This exemption from the declaration and destruction obligations does not apply to ACW.) If CW dumped in internal waters are recovered, they must be declared. The follow-on obligations regarding their destruction depend on the determination by the Technical Secretariat of their status as OCW or CW.

Chemical weapons dumped in internal waters after 1976 must be declared in detail. As with CW dumped at sea after 1984, there are no specific follow-on obligations regarding remediation, although it is conceivable that in the eventuality of such a declaration the Executive Council will take a decision in line with the obligations regarding land-buried CW. The physical ability to recover these weapons (e.g., from deep lakes) will also influence the decision.

It was noted that CWC prohibits three methods of CW disposal: open-pit burning, dumping in any body of water, and land burial. The prohibition is contained in the Verification Annex, Part IV (A) [33], which means that it applies to CW manufactured after 1945, CW produced between 1925 and 1945 that do not meet the non-usability criterion, and ACW.

Old chemical weapons that were produced before 1925 or between 1925 and 1946 provided they meet the non-usability criterion are considered to be toxic waste. As such, they are exempted from the definition of CW. It is at the discretion of a state party to decide how it disposes of toxic waste. Depending on its national legislation, open-pit burning, dumping and burial may be conceivable options.

The dumping at sea of toxic waste may be restricted under international environmental or maritime law, but these international agreements focus mainly on minimising the consequences of marine pollution or contain an emergency clause. Stricter regulations have not yet entered into force. In addition, some of these international agreements have attracted the ratification or accession of only a small subset of parties to the CWC.

A similar vagueness exists with respect to retrieved CW that were dumped at sea before 1985. These weapons, irrespective of their date of production or origin, are fully exempted from declaration and destruction requirements.

As a consequence, a state party may dispose of these weapons without notification of the Technical Secretariat and might thus consider open-pit burning, land burial (including dumping in internal waters) or re-dumping at sea, or even storage on land. Re-dumping at sea might be subject to international environmental and maritime law (especially if the weapons were first moved onto land, e.g., for repackaging). Dumping in internal waters is not yet subject to an international prohibition as the 1996 Protocol to the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution has not yet entered into force [34].

Nevertheless, the issue raises some legal questions under the CWC. If such recovered sea-dumped CW were to be buried on land or dumped in internal waters or at sea, this would necessarily have happened after the dates specified in the CWC that determine the
exemptions for land-buried or sea-dumped CW. In other words, bearing in mind that the
mere act of retrieval does not generate new responsibilities for states parties, can items that
were totally exempt from the declaration and destruction obligations under the CWC
become the subject of CWC regulations?

In the case of a negative answer, how does this affect the decisions taken at sessions of
the Conference of the States Parties with respect to CW that have been buried after 1976 or
dumped at sea after 1984? In fact, a negative answer would raise the far more fundamental
question whether the sea-dumped CW still fall within the purview of the General Purpose
Criterion (GPC) of the CWC. It will be recalled that Article II, § 1 considers all toxic
chemicals and their precursors, as well as the munitions designed for their employment on
the battlefield as CW, unless they are intended for purposes that are not prohibited under
the convention [35]. The negative answer would thus amount to stating that a munition
loses its characterisation as chemical weapon by the mere fact of having been dumped into
a sea. This clearly cannot have been the intention of the negotiators of the CWC.

In the case of a positive answer, will state parties face the detailed declaration
requirements for CW disposed after the CWC-specified dates, and which follow-on
responsibilities will govern their destruction?

Particularly regarding land-buried recovered sea-dumped CW, will the specific
declaration and destruction requirements for OCW and CW then become applicable
(especially in view of the possibility that recovered sea-dumped CW might fail the non-
usability criterion)?

Furthermore, will a state party then be in a position to declare such weapons as ACW,
as the fresh obligations might entail considerable costs with respect to the destruction
operations and verification of CW?

If a state party decides to store the recovered sea-dumped CW, does this act make it a
CW possessor (again, especially in the light of the non-usability criterion), perhaps
requiring a fundamental change in its original declarations and leading to the assumption
of totally new and costly destruction obligations?

If storage of retrieved sea-dumped CW does not lead to a disposal obligation, how can
this outcome be compatible with the core obligations in Article I of the CWC not to acquire
or stockpile CW and to destroy CW in the possession of a state party?

Recommendations

These and possibly many other questions highlight the uncertainties regarding the status of
CW dumped in bodies of water. Many of the issues raised in this paper may appear
academic and of secondary importance in the light of the current difficulties in
implementing the CWC. Indeed, no legal problems will surface as long as these weapons
remain untouched.

However, it cannot be assumed that the present situation will not change. The
continuing development of economic activities affecting the sea bed will increasingly
disturb dump sites and require their remediation. Furthermore, there are concerns about the
impact of the deteriorating munitions on the marine environment and on human safety.
Initiatives to remedy munition disposal sites in the Baltic Sea are being set up in the context of the NATO Partnership for Peace programme, scientific programmes to assess the condition of sea-dumped CW in European waters are in progress of being coordinated internationally and may eventually lead to policy recommendations, and Italy has indicated that it wants to clear CW from the Southern Adriatic. It is not inconceivable that similar initiatives will be developed for other parts of the world.

In the light of these developments, it is recommended that the OPCW considers the status of recovered sea-dumped CW under the CWC. It is clear that the categorisation of such munitions as chemical weapons in the full sense of Article II of the CWC will stifle any initiative to remedy the marine dump sites. Hence, it may be advisable to create a separate status for these weapons, perhaps analogous to the exemption as toxic waste, but supplemented with more stringent declaration and verification conditions, especially with regard to CW that might still be usable. In this context, the OPCW may wish to treat all recovered sea-dumped CW uniformly and discard the distinction between classes of CW based on their production date. This would not "penalise" a state party for recovering sea-dumped CW, but merely require it to destroy the weapons in accordance with its national legislation and require the Technical Secretariat to certify their destruction.

Related to the issue of sea-dumped CW, the OPCW may wish to study the interconnection between the CWC and international environmental and maritime law beyond the mere definitional aspects of terms. Similarly, it may wish to explore opportunities of collaboration with the international bodies created under the relevant agreements.

Furthermore, the OPCW may wish to support initiatives at environmental remediation of CW dump sites through Article XI of the CWC. The UNCLOS, the Oslo and London Conventions and the 1996 Protocol to the London Convention contain provisions on global and regional cooperation and on scientific and technical assistance and exchanges with respect to the marine environment that may serve as examples [36]. In this way the OPCW would invest in a small, but visible way in the long-term public stakes in the CWC, while contributing to the strengthening of international norms regarding environmental protection.

Note
The positions in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of SIPRI. The author wishes to thank Julian Perry Robinson, Thomas Stock and Ralf Trapp for their constructive comments on an earlier draft.
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