

---

**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**

15 May 2012  
English  
Original: French

---

**Geneva, 5–22 December 2011**

**Summary record of the 3rd meeting**

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Thursday, 22 December 2011, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. van den IJssel ..... (Netherlands)

**Contents**

- Request to participate in the work of the Conference
- Credentials of representatives to the Conference
  - (b) *Report of the Credentials Committee*
- Preparation and adoption of the final document(s)
- President's closing statement
- Closing statements by delegations
- Closure of the session

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Editing Unit, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this Conference will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Conference.

*The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.*

#### **Request to participate in the work of the Conference**

1. **The President** announced that, just a few days earlier, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) had submitted a request to participate, as an observer, in accordance with rule 44, paragraph 4, of the rules of procedure.
2. *The Conference acceded to the request.*

#### **Credentials of representatives to the Conference**

*(b) Report of the Credentials Committee (BWC/CONF.VII/6)*

3. **Mr. Duarte** (Portugal), speaking as Chairman of the Credentials Committee, introduced the report which the Committee had adopted on 21 December 2011 (BWC/CONF.VII/6). He drew the Conference's attention to paragraph 7, subparagraph (a) of which listed the States parties whose formal credentials in due form had been communicated by midday on 21 December, subparagraph (b) of which listed the States parties which had submitted copies of their representatives' credentials and subparagraph (c) of which listed States parties which had indicated the names of their representatives by notes verbales. The name of any State party which had submitted credentials in due form since then would be added to subparagraph (a).
4. *The Conference took note of the report of the Credentials Committee issued as document BWC/CONF.VII/6.*

*Estimated costs of the 2012–2015 intersessional programme (BWC/CONF.VII/4/Rev.1)*

5. **Mr. Lennane** (Secretary-General of the Conference) said that the secretariat had drawn up a revised estimate (BWC/CONF.VII/4/Rev.1) taking account of the comments made by delegations with regard to the first estimate and of their wish that the budget for the 2012–2015 intersessional programme should be no higher than that of the 2007–2010 intersessional period. Although the figures showed a nominal increase, the assumptions forming the basis of the calculations had been exactly the same. That was true of conference services, the Implementation Support Unit, staff, travel costs, and equipment and supplies.
6. **Mr. Gil Catalina** (Spain) commented that, on comparing the cost estimate of the 2007–2010 intersessional programme with that of 2012–2015, it was obvious that the annual amount had risen from \$721,700 in 2006 to some \$1,387,000 in 2011. Could such a spectacular increase really be explained by inflation and fluctuations in the exchange rate? The actual annual average cost of intersessional work, as computed at the end of 2010, amounted to \$736,106 for the period 2007–2010. His delegation would be prepared to accept an annual budget of \$736,000 for the period 2012–2015, unless the secretariat could provide a convincing explanation of how it had arrived at the estimate of \$1,387,000 per annum.
7. **Mr. Lennane** (Secretary-General of the Conference) said that, at an informal meeting of the plenary Conference, he had circulated a paper showing that the cost of work in 2010 and 2012 would be identical if the exchange rates and the United Nations salary scale for 2011 were applied to 2010. The difference between the estimates for the two periods was due more to the dollar's loss in value against the Swiss franc — the dollar had fallen from 1.21 for 1 franc in 2006 to 0.9 in 2011 — than to the gradual increase in United Nations salary scales. The revised estimate under consideration corresponded only to the maintenance of the intersessional programme without any changes.

8. **Mr. Duarte** (Portugal) noted that there had been a net increase of more than half a million dollars between actual expenditure in 2010 — the year when the global financial crisis had begun — and estimated expenditure for 2012. As that would be difficult to explain to his Government, he encouraged the secretariat and delegations to find an answer to that conundrum.

9. **Mr. Lennane** (Secretary-General of the Conference) objected that the actual costs in 2010 could scarcely be compared with the estimated costs for 2012. The secretariat estimated the costs of conference services and other costs by applying the financial and budgetary rules of the United Nations. It had no leeway in that respect. It was up to States parties to suggest a solution, for example by deciding to reduce the number of staff in the Implementation Support Unit, or the length of meetings.

10. **The President** suggested that the estimated costs of the 2012–2015 intersessional programme should be discussed again after the secretariat and the delegations concerned had been consulted.

#### **Preparation and adoption of the final document(s) (BWC/CONF.VII/CRP.2)**

##### *Draft final document of the Seventh Review Conference*

11. **The President** invited delegations to consider whether any additions or amendments should be made to the draft final document (BWC/CONF.VII/CRP.2), which had been issued in English only.

##### *Part I (Organization and work of the Conference)*

##### *Section C (Participation at the Conference)*

12. **Mr. Lennane** (Secretary-General of the Conference) invited the delegations of all States parties whose names had been omitted from any of the paragraphs in the section to inform the secretariat at the end of the Conference in order that it could make the necessary amendments. In the light of the decision taken at the start of the meeting, a reference to the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control should be added in paragraph 26.

##### *Section F (Conclusion of the Conference)*

##### *Paragraph 36*

##### *Dates of meetings in 2012*

13. **Ms. Kennedy** (United States of America) said that, after consulting the secretariat, the Depositaries of the Convention, on whose behalf she was speaking, had agreed to recommend that in 2012 the Meeting of Experts should be held from 16 to 20 July and the Meeting of States Parties from 10 to 14 December.

14. *Those dates were approved.*

##### *Nomination of the Chairman of the meetings in 2012*

15. **Mr. Benítez Versón** (Cuba) said that the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States proposed the Ambassador of Algeria, Mr. Idriss Jazaïry, as Chairman of the meetings in 2012.

16. **The President** noted that there were no objections to that proposal.

17. *Mr. Jazaïry (Algeria) was designated Chairman of the meetings in 2012.*

18. **The President** said that paragraph 36 of part I of the draft final document would have to be supplemented accordingly.

*Part II (Final Declaration)*

*Preamble*

19. **The President** said that, after consultations, a correction had been made to subparagraph (vii) of the preamble to the Final Declaration. The end of the subparagraph should read “and other relevant United Nations resolutions” instead of “and the relevant United Nations resolutions”.

*Annex I (Revised forms for the submission of the confidence-building measures)*

20. **The President** announced that a correction had to be made to the heading of the last column of the declaration form shown on page 25 of the draft final document (BWC/CONF.VII/CRP.2, Declaration form on Nothing to Declare or Nothing New to Declare for use in the information exchange), which should read “Year of last declaration if nothing new to declare” instead of “Year of last declaration”. With regard to confidence-building measure D, mentioned on page 36 of the draft final document, the text under the heading “Confidence-Building Measure ‘D’” should be deleted apart from the word “Deleted”, since it had been decided to do away with the form in question.

*Annexes II to IV (Agenda of the Conference, Rules of Procedure of the Conference and List of documents of the Conference)*

21. **The President** said that the annexes in question had not been amended.

*The meeting was suspended at 4.40 p.m. and resumed at 5.15 p.m.*

*Part III (Decisions and recommendations)*

22. **The President** suggested that paragraph 38 of part III of the draft final document (p. 24, sect. I, Finances) should be supplemented in order to make it clear that any increase in the estimated costs of the 2012–2015 intersessional programme was due solely to fluctuations in the exchange rate and inflation. The phrase “noting that these estimated costs were prepared on exactly the same basis as the estimated costs for the 2007–2010 intersessional programme, and therefore represent zero real growth, with any nominal increase due solely to currency and inflation factors” should be added at the end of the first sentence in the paragraph. He took it that the Conference wished to accept that additional wording and to adopt the budget presented in document BWC/CONF.VII/4/Rev.1.

23. *It was so decided.*

24. *The draft final document of the Seventh Review Conference (BWC/CONF.VII/CRP.2), as orally amended and supplemented, was adopted.*

**President’s closing statement**

25. **The President** said that everyone had risen to the occasion by demonstrating the ambition, flexibility and realism that were necessary for the successful conclusion of the Seventh Review Conference. The Conference’s success was good not only for the Biological Weapons Convention but also, more broadly speaking, for multilateralism and Geneva as the disarmament capital. He thanked the Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole, the Credentials Committee and the Drafting Committee, as well the regional group coordinators, the members of the Bureau and the facilitators, for their invaluable assistance throughout the Review Conference.

**Closing statements by delegations**

26. **Mr. Jazaïry** (Algeria) said he regretted that participants' ambitions had not matched the huge challenges posed by the manifold threats from biological weapons. It ought to have been possible to agree on inspection measures to ensure compliance with all the provisions of the Convention and to discuss ways of strengthening the Implementation Support Unit. However, the situation had not been such as to encourage everyone to shoulder the political and financial burdens inherent in the promotion and universalization of the Convention. It would have been preferable to focus on undertakings and on honouring them in good faith, but the negotiations had suffered from North/South divergences.

27. Algeria approved of the effective bolstering of the Convention by means of a legally binding multilateral mechanism. He was particularly grateful to the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States for the trust they had placed in him by nominating him Chairman of the meetings in 2012.

28. **Mr. Benítez Versón** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States, said that at the Conference the members of the Group had demonstrated their firm commitment to strengthening the Convention in the belief that that instrument was and must remain a useful contribution to international peace and security. It was essential to adopt a balanced approach to all aspects of the Convention, including regulation, application and promotion. In that connection, the Group was pleased that the Conference had completed a comprehensive review of the functioning and implementation of all the provisions of the Convention. The Group believed that the real, full, non-discriminatory implementation of article X was essential if the aims of the Convention were to be achieved. The Conference had made it possible to take a step in that direction through the adoption of several decisions on that subject. The Group was also gratified to note that the question of more cooperation and assistance would be kept under review throughout the intersessional period. He hoped that, at the end of that review, further practical measures would be adopted in order to give full effect to article X. Lastly, the Group considered that the Conference's decisions concerning the 2012–2015 intersessional period laid the foundations for progress towards the implementation of all aspects of the Convention through a balanced, consensual approach.

29. **Mr. Endoni** (Nigeria) said that he fully endorsed the comments made by the representative of Cuba on behalf of the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States. He wished to pay tribute to the calm, efficient manner in which the President had steered the Conference. His delegation was disappointed that it had been unable to secure the retention in the final document of its proposal regarding the establishment of a fellowship programme for capacity-building in developing countries, the purpose of which was to provide education and training opportunities for national officials involved in efforts to implement the Convention, which should be a key element of the Convention. It looked forward to cooperating with the States parties and hoped that common ground could be found during the intersessional period with regard to its undeniably relevant proposal.

30. **Mr. Woolcott** (Australia), speaking on behalf of the Western Group, thanked the President for his strong, realistic and consultative leadership, which had shepherded the complex negotiations to a consensus outcome. He said he was pleased that, owing to the unstinting efforts of the leadership team, coordinators, all the delegations, the secretariat and the conference services, the final document reflected the careful balance between security and health considerations which the Convention required. His delegation was looking forward with great interest to the new intersessional process which was designed to strengthen further the implementation of the Convention and to meet the significant challenges of the twenty-first century.

31. **Ms. Bleoancă** (Romania), speaking on behalf of the Eastern European Group, said that she commended the efforts which the President had made all through the past year and his role in steering the Seventh Review Conference towards a successful outcome. She also wished to congratulate all those who had contributed to that success. She was particularly grateful to the Implementation Support Unit for its fruitful collaboration.

32. **Mr. Mallikourtis** (Greece) thanked the Implementation Support Unit for its efforts to address the budgetary concerns expressed by his delegation. He said that Greece could not agree to a further rise in operating costs, notwithstanding the impact of fluctuating exchange rates, owing to pressure on its public finances and the austerity measures which had been put in place. It therefore welcomed the logical compromise which had finally been reached on the provisional budget.

33. **Ms. Kennedy** (United States of America), hailing the unwavering commitment displayed by the President over the past year and the remarkable efficiency of the three members of the Implementation Support Unit, commented that, in view of current global financial constraints, the delegations had reason to be happy with the outcome of the Review Conference. Three new topics had been chosen from several interesting proposals as standing agenda items for forthcoming meetings. Confidence-building measures had been updated for the first time in 20 years. The establishment of a sponsorship programme was being studied. Two Vice-Presidents had been elected and a database had been set up for the purposes of cooperation and assistance. It was to be hoped that the Conference on Disarmament would be inspired by the vigour of the negotiating process and the cooperative spirit which had been shown.

34. **Mr. Amano** (Japan) said that Japan was deeply attached to achieving the aims of the Convention. For that reason, he was pleased that many of the working papers which Japan had submitted, often in close collaboration with other countries, and which sought to strengthen the Convention, had been reflected in substance in the final document. He wished to pay tribute to the President's personal qualities and professionalism and to thank the Implementation Support Unit for its tireless efforts to ensure that delegations arrived at a consensus.

35. **Mr. Wang Xiaoning** (China) said that, after three weeks' work, the Review Conference, which had been carried along by its President's enthusiasm and diplomatic talents, had examined the progress made in implementing the Convention over the five previous years and had adopted a work programme for the next quinquennium. That meant that the Review Conference had been a success.

36. **Ms. Jaquez Huacuja** (Mexico) paid tribute to the President's diplomatic and political skills in steering the work of the Seventh Review Conference. She said that, while the final document had fallen short of Mexico's expectations, it illustrated the success of the consultations and was a step forward, albeit a modest one, towards the goal pursued by all delegations, that of general and complete disarmament. Her delegation was, however, concerned that the Conference had been unable to give its seal of approval to the results of the 2007–2011 quinquennium. She hoped that, in the future, the Conference would find ways of overcoming the obstacles that had entailed such a retrograde step.

37. **Mr. Shahkerian** (Islamic Republic of Iran) associated himself with the statement made by the representative of Cuba on behalf of the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States. He said that the first signatory States (including his own country) had intended the Convention to be a comprehensive, verifiable international instrument totally banning another category of weapons of mass destruction, namely chemical weapons. His delegation was concerned to note that the deadline for destroying chemical weapons, 29 April 2012, would not be met. The absence of an explicit timetable within the framework of

the Chemical Weapons Convention was an immense challenge to the viability and integrity of that instrument.

38. **Mr. Kam Woon-an** (Republic of Korea) commended the prodigious efforts made by the President. He welcomed the adoption of a document incorporating the different strands of opinion which had been expressed. He said that the time had come to look for means of actively implementing the provisions of the final document of the Conference over the next five years.

39. **Mr. Yermakov** (Russian Federation) commented that the Seventh Review Conference was a milestone in the sphere of multilateral disarmament in that it had offered everyone an opportunity to clearly state their position. Despite their diverging views, it had enabled all the delegations to agree on the multilateral strengthening of the Convention. That was a major achievement which augured well for the pursuit of deliberations in 2012.

40. **Mr. Danon** (France) welcomed the adoption of a final document which was balanced in that it dealt with all matters in a universally acceptable manner. He said that, as the trap of a confrontation between blocs or a bloc mentality had been avoided, the Conference had a road map for the future.

41. **Ms. Adamson** (United Kingdom) commended the invaluable contributions made by Richard Guthrie of the BioWeapons Prevention Project, who had produced daily reports of the work of the Review Conference, by all the representatives of civil society and by other partners who had provided much intellectual stimulus for the debates. She said that, more widely speaking, participants had shown that they could listen to each other, express opposing views and craft a document which crossed all boundaries.

42. **Ms. Mehta** (India), **Mr. Khamees Al Yammahi** (United Arab Emirates) and **Mr. Khan** (Pakistan) welcomed the outcome of the Seventh Review Conference, which had been the fruit of the ceaseless efforts of the President and all speakers.

#### **Closure of the session**

43. The President emphasized the importance of the contribution made by the Implementation Support Unit to the success of the Conference. He declared the 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 closed.

*The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.*