

---

**Eighth 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**

9 August 2016

English only

---

**Preparatory Committee  
Geneva, 26-27 April and 8-12 August 2016  
Item 7 of the agenda  
Comprehensive consideration of all provisions of the Convention**

**Future planning for the Implementation Support Unit**

**Submitted by South Africa**

**Background**

1. The Implementation Support Unit (ISU) was established by the Sixth Review Conference in 2006 to provide administrative support to the BTWC Meetings and the Review Conference as well as the comprehensive implementation of the Convention and the exchange of Confidence Building Measures. Although the ISU is administratively based in ODA, its work is directed entirely by States Parties, through the Chairman of the intersessional process or the President of the Review Conference.
2. The ISU has undertaken a considerable amount of work over the previous intersessional periods despite limited capacity. Although more tasks could be provided to the ISU to strengthen the implementation of the Convention, that would be subject to a possible increase in human and financial resources. It is noted that such possibility may be limited due to financial constraints being experienced by States Parties. It is therefore necessary to consider how the ISU could be utilised more efficiently, if resources cannot be increased.
3. In order for the ISU to efficiently conduct its work, there needs to be proper management and planning that is undertaken particularly on its structure and size. Any decision on the future structure and size of the ISU will need to be closely linked to the tasks that States Parties decide should be carried out. Any tasks that States Parties decide on should therefore take into consideration the size and structure of the ISU. There are a number of proposals that States Parties have made that may impact on the functions of the ISU, should the proposals be adopted. There would therefore need to be agreement on the role and functions of the ISU.
4. It would not be appropriate to base the structure and budget for the ISU on assumptions. To ensure that there is no underestimation of costs, planning should be based on the actual work that would be undertaken by the ISU as mandated by States Parties. The ISU structure and budget should be based on proper planning once there is consensus on its

GE.16-13785(E)



\* 1 6 1 3 7 8 5 \*

Please recycle



role and functions for the next intersessional period. 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.

## **Proposal**

5. It is therefore proposed that the Review Conference:
- (a) determine the budget of the ISU until the end of 2017, once a decision has been made on the ISU functions;
  - (b) mandate the ISU and interested States Parties to do detailed planning with relation to the structure and budget for the period until the next Review Conference for consideration and approval by the Meeting of States Parties at the end of 2017.
-