

**REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE
DEVELOPMENT, PRODUCTION AND STOCKPILING
OF BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) AND
TOXIN WEAPONS AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION**

Distr.
GENERAL
BWC/CONF.I/C/SR.9
26 March 1980
ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 18 March 1980, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. VOUTOV

(Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

Consideration of the draft report of the Committee of the Whole (continued)

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 Official Records Editing Section, room E.6108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (continued)
(BWC/CONF.I/CRP.1/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN introduced the revised version of the draft report and proposed, in order to save time, that it should be considered paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1-6

2. Paragraphs 1-6 were adopted.

Paragraphs 7-8

3. The CHAIRMAN said that four alternative texts for the two paragraphs had been proposed but a consensus had apparently been reached on the fourth alternative, subject to the words "it was" in the last sentence being replaced by the word "they". If that alternative was adopted, paragraph 8 would be omitted.

4. Paragraph 7, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 9

5. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that in the last sentence the word "events" should be replaced by the word "developments", in order to conform to normal usage.

6. Paragraph 9, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 10-12

7. Paragraphs 10-12 were adopted.

Paragraph 13

8. Mr. CREKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that it would be more correct in the last sentence to say "Other participants" rather than "Another participant".

9. Paragraph 13, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 14

10. Ms. SEGARRA (Secretary-General of the Conference) said that in the second sentence the words "microbial and toxin agents" should be replaced by "toxins and microbial agents".

11. Paragraph 14, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 15

12. Mr. MIKULAK (United States of America) considered that in the existing text the wording of the first sentence gave the impression that the opinion expressed therein was that of the Conference. It would be more correct to say "it was widely noted" instead of "it was generally recognized".

13. Mr. MARK (Switzerland) pointed out that the heading "Articles V-VII" had been omitted before paragraph 15.

14. Paragraph 15, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 16

15. Paragraph 16 was adopted.

Paragraph 17

16. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the word "amendments" in the last sentence should be in the singular.

17. Paragraph 17, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 18

18. Paragraph 18 was adopted.

Paragraph 19

19. Paragraph 19 was adopted.

Paragraph 20

20. Mr. BASHIR (Pakistan) noted that the Mongolian delegation's proposal had been incorporated in paragraph 26, even though his delegation had expressed the view that it would be preferable to avoid excessively direct references. He therefore requested that reference should be made in the body of paragraph 20 to the relevant statement by his delegation and proposed that the following sentence should be added after the first sentence: "One participant referred to certain reports alleging the use of chemical weapons in certain regions of the world".

21. Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) explained that his delegation's only concern was to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention. A convention could not be effective unless all States accepted and approved it. It was therefore of the greatest importance that States possessing substantial military arsenals and the nuclear-weapon States should accede to the Biological Weapons Convention. Contrary to what the delegation of Pakistan seemed to think, there was a direct link between the Convention and the nuclear Powers. Those Powers were all permanent members of the Security Council, and they therefore bore primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. If the Convention was indeed a

first step towards international peace and security, as had been claimed, it followed that the permanent members of the Security Council must accede to it. However, in order to avoid delaying the work of the Committee, his delegation would agree to the replacement of the words "nuclear weapons States" in paragraph 26 by the words "the permanent members of the Security Council".

22. Mr. DUMEVI (Ghana) reminded members that the goal sought was to ensure the universality of the Convention. In his opinion, therefore, not too much significance should be attached to the reference made in paragraph 26, on the proposal of the Mongolian delegation, to the scientifically and technically advanced States and the nuclear-weapon States. If those terms were deleted, paragraph 26 would nonetheless reflect the objective sought, namely, universal accession to the Convention.

23. Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) said that he still did not see the connexion between the proposal by the delegation of Pakistan and the proposal which his own delegation had made at the previous meeting. Did the delegation of Pakistan mean that it opposed the accession of the nuclear Powers to the Convention? If so, a sentence to that effect could be added.

24. Mrs. BOROTOWSKY (Cuba) said she failed to understand the Pakistan delegation's point, since paragraph 26 took account of its suggestion. In any case, Pakistan was not, as far as anyone knew, a nuclear Power or a militarily powerful State. What was certain was that many delegations had expressed the idea in question and it was therefore logical to reflect it in paragraph 26. Furthermore, paragraph 20 concerned only chemical weapons and her delegation could not see why paragraph 26 was being discussed at present. The text of paragraph 20 gave a perfectly accurate account of the Committee's deliberations and there was no need to change it.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that there was no point in pursuing the discussion. Paragraph 26 had been drafted in such a way as to take account of the Mongolian delegation's statement. As for paragraph 20, the delegation of Pakistan had proposed an amendment on which the Committee must take a decision.

26. Mr. MIKULAK (United States of America) said that he was not satisfied with the wording of the first sentence of paragraph 20. Instead of "the predominant view" it would be more correct to say "many participants expressed the view". Other participants had in fact expressed a contrary view and that should also be taken into account, for example by inserting after the first sentence the following sentence: "Others expressed the view that the provision was being effectively implemented". Since the following sentence had been supported by a large number of delegations, the opening words might be amended to read: "The view was widely expressed that the conclusion of an agreement ...".

27. Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) agreed to the proposal by Pakistan, since that appeared to be the wish of the Committee. He requested the Pakistan representative to agree in turn to his own proposal concerning article XIV as reflected in paragraph 26.

28. Mrs. FREYRE-PENABAD (Argentina) raised the question whether the Committee wished to retain both the seventh and eighth sentences of paragraph 20 or only one of them. If both were retained, it would be more accurate to delete the words "A number of other participants" from the beginning of the eighth sentence since in fact only one delegation had expressed that view, which had been supported by a few others.

29. Mr. SARAN (India) pointed out that certain delegations had expressed the opinion that the Committee on Disarmament need not await the outcome of the bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States before holding negotiations on chemical weapons. To take account of that fact, a sentence on the following lines should be added after the seventh sentence of paragraph 20: "Other participants took the view that such multilateral negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament need not await the conclusion of the bilateral negotiations". As to the eighth sentence of paragraph 20, he was not sure that it was necessary.

30. Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom) requested that the eighth sentence should be retained because it embodied the essence of his delegation's statements.

31. Mr. SARAN (India) said that if the eighth sentence of paragraph 20 was retained, the seventh sentence should be replaced by the following text: "A number of participants considered that the ongoing bilateral negotiations between the USSR and the United States on chemical weapons should be intensified and thus contribute to the multilateral negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament." That sentence would be followed by the sentence he had proposed in his preceding statement.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the amendments proposed by the United States delegation to the first two sentences of paragraph 20.

33. It was so decided.

34. Mr. SARAN (India), at the invitation of the Chairman, read out the seventh sentence of paragraph 20, as amended in accordance with his proposal, and the sentence which he had proposed for inclusion before the existing eighth sentence of paragraph 20.

35. Mr. QUEIROZ DUARTE (Brazil) supported the amendments proposed by the Indian representative but pointed out that there were now two sentences starting with the words "A number of participants". That gave the impression that the number of participants which had supported those differing views was the same. The opening words of the existing eighth sentence should therefore be changed.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the two sentences proposed by the representative of India.

37. It was so decided.

38. Paragraph 20, as amended was adopted.

Paragraph 21

39. Paragraph 21 was adopted.

Paragraph 22

40. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that, in order to be consistent with the observations his delegation had made the previous day, the beginning of the penultimate sentence of paragraph 22 should read: "Another proposal, which was supported by a number of delegations ...".

41. Paragraph 22, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 23

42. Paragraph 23 was adopted.

Paragraph 24

43. Mr. LEGG (Canada) proposed that the words "in this context" should be replaced by the words "inter alia" in order to avoid giving the impression that the Conference was concerned solely with assessing rapid technical and scientific developments.

44. Paragraph 24, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 25

45. Paragraph 25 was adopted.

Paragraph 26

46. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) saw no point in the last sentence of the paragraph and proposed that it should be deleted.

47. It was so decided.

48. Mrs. FREYRE-PENABAD (Argentina) said that if the Mongolian delegation maintained its suggestion that the words "nuclear weapons States" should be replaced by "the permanent members of the Security Council", her delegation would support it.

49. Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) pointed out that he had made his suggestion merely in an effort to meet the wishes of the delegation of Pakistan. He himself preferred the words "nuclear weapons States".

50. Mrs. FREYRE-PENABAD (Argentina) proposed that the words "nuclear weapons States" should be replaced by the words "the permanent members of the Security Council", since all the permanent States members of the Security Council were nuclear-weapon States and, in their capacity as permanent members of the Security Council, they had a duty to become parties to a convention on disarmament.

51. Mr. MAINA (Kenya) considered that the term "nuclear weapons States" was preferable to the term "the permanent members of the Security Council" because it was less restrictive.

52. Mr. PISSAS (Cyprus) felt that it would be better to keep the existing wording since it concerned any State which might subsequently become a nuclear-weapon State, and not only the permanent members of the Security Council.

53. Mrs. FREYRE-PENABAD (Argentina) withdrew her proposal.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt paragraph 26 with the amendment proposed by the Soviet representative.

55. Paragraph 26, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 27

56. Paragraph 27 was adopted.

Paragraph 28

57. Mr. MIKULAK (United States of America) considered that the first sentence of the paragraph should be amended in order to reflect more accurately the discussion which had taken place in the Committee. He proposed that the words "a review procedure ensured an adequate mechanism for assessing the implementation" should be replaced by the words "a review procedure was an important mechanism for".

58. Mr. OLUMOKO (Nigeria) said the wording proposed did not take into account the opinions expressed by his delegation. He therefore proposed that the following two sentences should be added to paragraph 28: "The view was expressed that developments in science and technology make a future review of the Biological Weapons Convention necessary. The view was also expressed that parallel negotiations on chemical weapons should be borne in mind with a view to providing mechanisms for improving the implementation of the Biological Weapons Convention."

59. Mr. QUEIROZ DUARTE (Brazil) observed that the first sentence proposed by the Nigerian delegation corresponded to the proposals made by his own delegation the previous day.

60. Paragraph 28, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 29 and 30

61. Paragraphs 29 and 30 were adopted.

62. The draft report (BWC/CONF.I/CRP.1/Rev.1) as a whole, as amended, was adopted by consensus.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had made an effective contribution to the work of the Conference. The exchange of views had shown that there had been no violation of the Convention and that for most delegations it remained a viable international instrument with a special significance in the field of disarmament. It was to be hoped that the Conference would help to encourage all countries to become parties to the Convention. The discussions had helped to build up mutual confidence and would undoubtedly strengthen confidence in other disarmament agreements. It had been felt that future review conferences might be held on the initiative of the States parties to the Convention. Many delegations were anxious that other types of weapons of mass destruction should be effectively banned and placed under international control. The goodwill shown by delegations would have a positive effect on other disarmament problems. It was particularly gratifying to note that the needs and interests of the developing countries had received the necessary degree of understanding and that no one had opposed the peaceful use of microbiology. Co-operation in that field would contribute to collaboration and confidence among States and to international security.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that this is crucial for ensuring transparency and accountability in the organization's operations.

2. The second part outlines the various methods and tools used to collect and analyze data. This includes the use of surveys, interviews, and focus groups to gather insights from stakeholders and employees.

3. The third part details the process of identifying key performance indicators (KPIs) and how they are used to measure the organization's progress towards its strategic goals. It also discusses the challenges associated with selecting and tracking these indicators.

4. The fourth part explores the role of technology in data management and analysis. It highlights the benefits of using data analytics software to process large volumes of information and generate actionable insights.

5. The fifth part addresses the importance of data security and privacy. It provides guidelines for protecting sensitive information and ensuring compliance with relevant regulations and standards.

6. The sixth part discusses the need for a data-driven culture within the organization. It encourages leaders to promote a mindset where data is used to inform decision-making and drive continuous improvement.

7. The seventh part concludes by summarizing the key findings and recommendations. It stresses the importance of ongoing monitoring and evaluation to ensure that the organization remains agile and responsive to changing market conditions.