

---

**Seventh Review Conference of the States Parties  
to the Convention on the Prohibition of the  
Development, Production and Stockpiling  
of Bacteriological (Biological) and  
Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction**

21 October 2011

Original: English

---

Geneva, 5–22 December 2011

Item 12 of the provisional agenda

**Follow-up to the recommendations and decisions  
of the Sixth Review Conference and the question of  
future review of the Convention**

**Biological Weapons Convention Implementation Support  
Unit: future planning**

**Submitted by South Africa**

**I. Current arrangements**

1. The BWC ISU was established by the Sixth Review Conference in 2006, and "funded by States Parties for the period from 2007-2011". It became operational in August 2007, based in the Geneva Branch of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, with three full-time staff, as specified in the mandate.
2. The ISU is funded entirely by BWC States Parties, through the budget of the annual Meeting of Experts and Meeting of States Parties of the 2007-2010 intersessional process, and in 2011, the budget of the Seventh Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee. The budget for the 2007-2010 intersessional process was approved at the Sixth Review Conference in 2006 (see BWC/CONF.VI/4); the budget for the Review Conference was approved at the Meeting of States Parties in December 2010 (see BWC/MSP/2010/5/Rev.1). The budget for the ISU consists of the salary costs for the three staff, plus a small amount for travel (\$10,000 or \$20,000) and office equipment (\$5,000).
3. This method of funding is convenient, but means that only the States Parties that participate in the meetings in a given year actually pay a share of the cost of the ISU for that year. As there is no provision for an ISU in the BWC itself, there is a question over whether it would be possible to require all States Parties to pay assessed contributions for an ISU.
4. Some States Parties have made voluntary contributions to the ISU, generally for specific projects within the ISU's mandate (for example, workshops on national implementation, awareness-raising, or CBMs).
5. The Office for Disarmament Affairs provides a significant measure of administrative support for the ISU without charge, including office space, telephones, photocopying, travel processing, etc. The basis for this is the annual General Assembly resolution on the BWC (most recently 65/92) which requests the UN Secretary-General "to continue to render the

necessary assistance to the depositary Governments and to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Review Conferences".

6. Although the ISU is administratively based in ODA, and its staff are administered by ODA, on policy matters it belongs entirely to the BWC States Parties, and its work is directed exclusively by them, through the Chairman of the intersessional process or the President of the Review Conference.

## **II. ISU experience 2007-2010**

7. The ISU has proved largely successful in operation, and is popular with States Parties across the geographic and political spectrum. It clearly met a genuine need, and demand for its services soon outstripped its very limited capacity. The mandate has proved to be sufficiently flexible to cover all ISU activities requested by States Parties; the ISU has not found the current mandate to be restrictive in practice.

8. The main restriction on ISU activities has been human and financial resources. This restriction is mainly due to the fact that the ISU budget and structure for the last five years was based on assumptions rather than proper planning, which resulted in underestimation of activities as well as costs. The lack of planning was due to lack of management information and time for planning during the Review Conference. This situation was acceptable for the last five years, however, it should not be acceptable for the future since all the management information of the last five years is available and time can be found for planning and budgeting.

## **III. Possible future arrangements**

9. Any decision on the future structure and size of the ISU will need to be closely linked to the tasks that States Parties decide need to be carried out over the period 2012-2016. A variety of potential new functions have been mentioned by States Parties over the last year, however, there is no agreement on the role and functions of the ISU yet. As mentioned before it will not be acceptable to base the structure and budget for the ISU on assumptions again. The ISU structure and budget should be based on proper planning once there is consensus on its role and functions. Since this will only be achieved towards the end of the Review Conference it is clear that there will not be sufficient time during the Review Conference to do proper planning.

## **IV. Proposal**

10. It is proposed that:

(a) the Review conference decides on the functions of the ISU and based on those functions determine a budget until the end of 2012;

(b) the Review Conference instructs the ISU and interested States Parties to do detailed planning with relation to the structure and budget for 2013 till the next Review Conference for approval by the Meeting of States Parties at the end of 2012.