

**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**

7 June 2016

Original: English

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

**Financial implications of proposals for follow-on action after
the Eighth Review Conference**

**Background information document submitted by the Implementation
Support Unit**

Summary

The Preparatory Committee decided to request the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) to prepare a background information document on the financial implications of proposals for follow-on action after the Eighth Review Conference (see BWC/CONF.VIII/PC/2 paragraph 25). The ISU has duly prepared this document which outlines the financial implications of several different options for follow-on action after the Eighth Review Conference. The information presented here is not intended to prejudice any decisions of the Preparatory Committee or Review Conference, it is purely intended to aid States Parties' preparations for the Review Conference. The ISU can, upon request, prepare additional information prior to the Eighth Review Conference.

I. Introduction

1. This document is intended to facilitate States Parties' preparations for the Eighth Review Conference by presenting a range of different options for follow-on action after the Review Conference. States Parties have yet to agree on such follow-on action, including its possible form and structure, so this paper only provides factual information to aid discussions, it does not prejudice the outcome of future discussions and decisions yet to be taken. Financial information is provided on conference-servicing costs as well as on non-conference servicing costs.
2. Several proposals for follow-on action have already been made in working papers submitted to earlier meetings. Some of these proposals are detailed, while others are of a more general nature. This background document does not refer to specific proposals

GE.16-09238(E)



* 1 6 0 9 2 3 8 *

Please recycle



submitted by States Parties. Instead it provides general financial information which should be of use to States Parties when considering possible follow-on action. The information presented in this paper should also allow States Parties to extrapolate costs for various options for future follow-on action. If requested, the ISU can prepare an addendum to this document providing costs estimates for additional options.

3. The cost estimates presented are provisional and actual costs of any agreed future work programme after the Eighth Review Conference will depend on a variety of factors which cannot be predicted at this stage.

II. Cost estimates for options for possible follow-on action

4. Costs estimates approved by previous review conferences have included both conference-servicing and non-conference servicing costs.¹ The former include all costs associated with the meetings (*inter alia*, interpretation during the meetings, processing, reproduction and translation of documentation, and conference room support), while since the Sixth Review Conference the latter has included the costs of the Implementation Support Unit (*inter alia*, staff costs, equipment and travel). This section follows the same structure.

A. Conference-servicing costs

5. This section provides provisional financial information on a series of different options for follow-on action, particularly in terms of meetings which the Eighth Review Conference could decide to establish in the period before the Ninth Review Conference. The options are not presented in any particular order of preference or priority. The options are based on previous practice under the Convention, or on proposals made by States Parties in the context of preparations for the Eighth Review Conference.

6. As with all previous meetings, the meetings for which financial information is presented below are all assumed to take place at the United Nations Office at Geneva. The provisional cost estimates, based on information provided by the Financial Resources Management Service of the United Nations Office at Geneva, are as follows:

¹ For example, see BWC/CONF.VII/4/Rev.1.

Conference-servicing item	Cost estimates						
	(1) 5 days (full services)	(2) 3 days (full services)	(3) 2 days (full services)	(4) 10 days (full services)	(5) 5 days (no translation)	(6) 5 days (no interpretation or translation)	(7) 5 days (small meeting, full services)
Interpretation and meeting servicing	95,000	57,000	27,000	190,000	95,000	3,600	95,000
Documentation (e.g. translation, reproduction and distribution)	255,900	218,500	183,600	255,900	22,600	22,600	146,200
Support service requirements ^a	3,900	2,400	1,600	7,800	3,900	3,900	3,900
Other requirements ^b	26,700	19,500	14,500	98,400	13,700	8,500	20,600
Total (inclusive of 13% programme support costs)	381,500	297,400	226,700	552,100	135,200	38,600	265,700

^a Sound technician/recording.

^b Documents control officer, documents distribution officer, rental of computer, printer and flash recorder, general temporary assistance and dedicated assistance provided for accounting services and administration of financial resources.

7. From the information presented above, financial implications for various possible options for follow-on action after the Eighth Review Conference can be calculated. Some illustrative examples are provided below for information purposes only (these only include the conference-servicing costs, non-conference servicing costs (e.g. the staff costs of the ISU) are addressed in Section B below):

(a) Two five day meetings per year with full services (translation and interpretation) (estimate 1 above), identical to the 2012-2015 intersessional programme. The cost per year of the conference-servicing element would therefore be USD 763,000;

(b) One ten-day meeting (estimate 4 above) and one five-day meeting (estimate 1 above) per year, both with full services (translation and interpretation), identical to the 2003-2005 intersessional programme. The cost per year of the conference-servicing element would therefore be USD 933,600;

(c) Five ten-day meetings (estimate 4 above) per year with full services (translation and interpretation), similar to the Ad Hoc Group meetings during the 1990s and early 2000s. The cost per year of the conference-servicing element would therefore be USD 2,760,500;

(d) Four ten-day meetings (estimate 4 above), five small five-day meetings (estimate 7 above) and one three-day meeting (estimate 2 above), all with full services. The cost per year of the conference-servicing element would therefore be USD 3,834,300;

(e) Two five-day meetings (estimate 1 above) and one three-day meeting (estimate 2 above), both with full services. The cost per year of the conference-servicing element would therefore be USD 1,060,400;

(f) Two five-day meetings with interpretation but without translation of documents (estimate 5 above) and one three-day meeting with full services (estimate 2 above). The cost per year of the conference-servicing element would therefore be USD 567,800.

8. Smaller meetings of shorter duration and of an informal nature with no interpretation or documentation can also be arranged on a case-by-case basis. As such, they are not included in the above options.

B. Non-conference servicing costs

9. This section provides financial information on the non-conference servicing costs which could be considered for follow-on action in the period after the Eighth Review Conference.

Implementation Support Unit

10. The Sixth Review Conference decided to establish an Implementation Support Unit (ISU) funded by States Parties with three fixed-term staff members, a decision that was renewed by the Seventh Review Conference.² The posts were at the P2, P3 and P5 levels. During 2014, following a review of the P2 and P3 posts, States Parties agreed to upgrade them to P3 and P4 posts respectively. Therefore, the current composition of the ISU is one P5 Chief of Unit, one P4 Political Affairs Officer and one P3 Political Affairs Officer. To facilitate States Parties' consideration of any further renewal of the mandate of the ISU, or of any expansion of its staff as a result of possible additional tasks mandated to the ISU by the Eighth Review Conference, the following information is provided (these are standard costs which can vary depending on several factors):

	USD ³
P5 Senior Political Affairs Officer	279,336
P4 Political Affairs Officer	240,125
P3 Political Affairs Officer	198,654
P2 Associate Political Affairs Officer	162,494
G5 Administrative Assistant	156,279

11. The costs of the ISU also include small annual budget lines for travel and equipment. During the 2012-15 intersessional programme these amounts were USD 20,000 and USD 5,000 respectively per annum. As described in the report submitted by the ISU on the performance of its activities,⁴ the small size of the travel budget has implications for the regional distribution of ISU activities. In addition, the current financial arrangements present challenges when staff members are temporarily absent for long periods, as it is not possible to recruit temporary replacements, or to carry over unspent funds from one year to the next. States Parties may wish to consider such issues at the Eighth Review Conference.

² See BWC/CONF.VI/6, Part III, paragraph 5 and BWC/CONF.VII/7, Part III, paragraph 31.

³ The costs provided for each post include programme support costs at the standard UN rate of 13%.

⁴ BWC/CONF.VIII/PC/6.

12. The annual costs of the ISU are included in the assessed contributions sent to States Parties on an annual basis. In the cost estimate document on which the assessed contributions are based, the costs of the ISU are traditionally included under the costs of the first meeting of a particular year. In addition, the United Nations applies a flat rate of 13% to cover programme support costs.

13. Based on the figures provided above, the estimated cost for a continuation of the ISU with the current level of staffing and travel and equipment budgets (one P5, one P4, one P3 and USD 25,000 for travel and equipment) plus the 13% programme support costs would amount to USD 746,365. For information purposes only, adding two additional staff members (e.g. one at the P4 level and one at the G5 level) would increase the cost per annum of the ISU to USD 1,142,800.

Participation of national experts in BWC meetings

14. Some proposals for follow-on action after the Eighth Review Conference involve the participation of national experts in meetings in Geneva with the costs of their participation covered from the annual budget of the Convention. Based on its experience administering the sponsorship programme that was established by the Seventh Review Conference, the ISU can provide the following financial information:

- (a) Average cost of return economy flights to Geneva (outside of Europe) – USD 1,500;
- (b) Average cost of return economy flights to Geneva (within Europe) – USD 500;
- (c) Daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rate for Geneva – USD 401 per day.

15. These figures can be used to establish an approximate cost of USD 68,000 for bringing national experts from 20 States Parties to Geneva for a five-day meeting.⁵ While the costs of flights could be much less than the averages given above, the DSA rate for Geneva is set by the United Nations and is not subject to much variation.

Outreach and capacity development events

16. The budget for the Convention currently does not make provision for outreach events to raise awareness about the Convention or to conduct capacity development activities. Such events have been conducted using voluntary contributions provided by States Parties in a position to do so. For example, in 2013 the ISU received a contribution from the United States of America to organize an event in Santiago, Chile. Furthermore, UNODA, as the host entity of the ISU, has received three large contributions from the European Union, under which the ISU has been involved in the conduct of several regional workshops and national assistance programmes. Based on this extensive experience, the average cost of a regional workshop amounts to approximately USD 60,000.

III. Scale of assessments

17. Once approved by the States Parties, the cost estimates prepared by the Secretariat are used to calculate the scale of assessments. Since the Seventh Review Conference, the costs of the intersessional programme have been shared by all States Parties to the

⁵ Based on average costs for 10 experts travelling from outside Europe and 10 experts travelling from within Eastern and Western Europe and with DSA paid for six nights to allow participants to arrive one day prior to the meeting.

Convention, based on the United Nations scale of assessments pro-rated to take into account differences in membership between the Convention and the United Nations.⁶

18. For illustrative purposes, the scale of assessments for the Eighth Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee in 2016 is included in the Annex to this document. The document shows the individual assessment for each State Party towards the total cost of the meetings in 2016 which is USD 1,966,700.

IV. Conclusions

19. The information provided in this document is intended to provide States Parties with data in order that they can consider the financial implications of proposals for follow-on action after the Eighth Review Conference. If requested, the ISU can prepare an addendum to this paper with additional financial data for the information of States Parties to be circulated in advance of the Review Conference.

⁶ BWC/CONF.VII/7, Part III, paragraph 37.

Annex

[English only]

Scale of assessments for the Biological Weapons Convention in 2016

		<i>Percentage of UN 2016 assessment</i>	<i>Prorated % of contributions</i>	<i>Assessed contributions US\$</i>
		<i>(1)</i>	<i>(2)</i>	<i>(3)</i>
<i>A. States Parties</i>				
1	Afghanistan	0.006	0.006	118
2	Albania	0.008	0.008	159
3	Algeria	0.161	0.162	3,188
4	Andorra	0.006	0.006	118
5	Antigua and Barbuda	0.002	0.002	39
6	Argentina	0.892	0.898	17,661
7	Armenia	0.006	0.006	118
8	Australia	2.337	2.353	46,275
9	Austria	0.720	0.725	14,256
10	Azerbaijan	0.060	0.060	1,188
11	Bahamas	0.014	0.014	277
12	Bahrain	0.044	0.044	872
13	Bangladesh	0.010	0.010	198
14	Barbados	0.007	0.007	139
15	Belarus	0.056	0.056	1,108
16	Belgium	0.885	0.891	17,526
17	Belize	0.001	0.001	19
18	Benin	0.003	0.003	60
19	Bhutan	0.001	0.001	19
20	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0.012	0.012	238
21	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.013	0.013	258
22	Botswana	0.014	0.014	277
23	Brazil	3.823	3.849	75,695
24	Brunei Darussalam	0.029	0.029	574
25	Bulgaria	0.045	0.045	891
26	Burkina Faso	0.004	0.004	80
27	Burundi	0.001	0.001	19
28	Cabo Verde	0.001	0.001	19
29	Cambodia	0.004	0.004	80
30	Cameroon	0.010	0.010	198

		<i>Percentage of UN 2016 assessment</i>	<i>Prorated % of contributions</i>	<i>Assessed contributions US\$</i>
		<i>(1)</i>	<i>(2)</i>	<i>(3)</i>
<i>A. States Parties</i>				
31	Canada	2.921	2.941	57,835
32	Chile	0.399	0.402	7,901
33	China	7.921	7.975	156,836
34	Colombia	0.322	0.324	6,376
35	Congo	0.006	0.006	118
36	Cook Islands	0.001	0.001	19
37	Costa Rica	0.047	0.047	930
38	Croatia	0.099	0.100	1,960
39	Cuba	0.065	0.065	1,286
40	Cyprus	0.043	0.043	852
41	Czech Republic	0.344	0.346	6,810
42	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.005	0.005	99
43	Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.008	0.008	159
44	Denmark	0.584	0.588	11,564
45	Dominica	0.001	0.001	19
46	Dominican Republic	0.046	0.046	910
47	Ecuador	0.067	0.067	1,327
48	El Salvador	0.014	0.014	277
49	Equatorial Guinea	0.010	0.010	198
50	Estonia	0.038	0.038	752
51	Ethiopia	0.010	0.010	198
52	Fiji	0.003	0.003	60
53	Finland	0.456	0.459	9,028
54	France	4.859	4.892	96,210
55	Gabon	0.017	0.017	336
56	Gambia	0.001	0.001	19
57	Georgia	0.008	0.008	159
58	Germany	6.389	6.432	126,502
59	Ghana	0.016	0.016	317
60	Greece	0.471	0.474	9,326
61	Grenada	0.001	0.001	19
62	Guatemala	0.028	0.028	555
63	Guinea-Bissau	0.001	0.001	19
64	Guyana	0.002	0.002	39
65	Holy See	0.001	0.001	19
66	Honduras	0.008	0.008	159
67	Hungary	0.161	0.162	3,188

		<i>Percentage of UN 2016 assessment</i>	<i>Prorated % of contributions</i>	<i>Assessed contributions US\$</i>
		(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>A. States Parties</i>				
68	Iceland	0.023	0.023	456
69	India	0.737	0.742	14,593
70	Indonesia	0.504	0.507	9,980
71	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.471	0.474	9,326
72	Iraq	0.129	0.130	2,555
73	Ireland	0.335	0.337	6,633
74	Italy	3.748	3.773	74,210
75	Jamaica	0.009	0.009	178
76	Japan	9.680	9.745	191,664
77	Jordan	0.020	0.020	396
78	Kazakhstan	0.191	0.192	3,782
79	Kenya	0.018	0.018	357
80	Kuwait	0.285	0.287	5,643
81	Kyrgyzstan	0.002	0.002	39
82	Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.003	0.003	60
83	Latvia	0.050	0.050	990
84	Lebanon	0.046	0.046	910
85	Lesotho	0.001	0.001	19
86	Libya	0.125	0.126	2,475
87	Liechtenstein	0.007	0.007	139
88	Lithuania	0.072	0.072	1,426
89	Luxembourg	0.064	0.064	1,267
90	Madagascar	0.003	0.003	60
91	Malawi	0.002	0.002	39
92	Malaysia	0.322	0.324	6,376
93	Maldives	0.002	0.002	39
94	Mali	0.003	0.003	60
95	Malta	0.016	0.016	317
96	Marshall Islands	0.001	0.001	19
97	Mauritania	0.002	0.002	39
98	Mauritius	0.012	0.012	238
99	Mexico	1.435	1.445	28,416
100	Monaco	0.010	0.010	198
101	Mongolia	0.005	0.005	99
102	Montenegro	0.004	0.004	80
103	Morocco	0.054	0.054	1,069
104	Mozambique	0.004	0.004	80
105	Myanmar	0.010	0.010	198

		<i>Percentage of UN 2016 assessment</i>	<i>Prorated % of contributions</i>	<i>Assessed contributions US\$</i>
		(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>A. States Parties</i>				
106	Nauru	0.001	0.001	19
107	Netherlands	1.482	1.492	29,343
108	New Zealand	0.268	0.270	5,307
109	Nicaragua	0.004	0.004	80
110	Niger	0.002	0.002	39
111	Nigeria	0.209	0.210	4,138
112	Norway	0.849	0.855	16,810
113	Oman	0.113	0.114	2,237
114	Pakistan	0.093	0.094	1,842
115	Palau	0.001	0.001	19
116	Panama	0.034	0.034	674
117	Papua New Guinea	0.004	0.004	80
118	Paraguay	0.014	0.014	277
119	Peru	0.136	0.137	2,692
120	Philippines	0.165	0.166	3,267
121	Poland	0.841	0.847	16,652
122	Portugal	0.392	0.395	7,761
123	Qatar	0.269	0.271	5,326
124	Republic of Korea	2.039	2.053	40,372
125	Republic of Moldova	0.004	0.004	80
126	Romania	0.184	0.185	3,643
127	Russian Federation	3.088	3.109	61,142
128	Rwanda	0.002	0.002	39
129	Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.001	0.001	19
130	Saint Lucia	0.001	0.001	19
131	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.001	0.001	19
132	San Marino	0.003	0.003	60
133	Sao Tome and Principe	0.001	0.001	19
134	Saudi Arabia	1.146	1.154	22,691
135	Senegal	0.005	0.005	99
136	Serbia	0.032	0.032	633
137	Seychelles	0.001	0.001	19
138	Sierra Leone	0.001	0.001	19
139	Singapore	0.447	0.450	8,850
140	Slovakia	0.160	0.161	3,168
141	Slovenia	0.084	0.085	1,664
142	Solomon Islands	0.001	0.001	19
143	South Africa	0.364	0.366	7,207

		<i>Percentage of UN 2016 assessment</i>	<i>Prorated % of contributions</i>	<i>Assessed contributions US\$</i>
		(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>A. States Parties</i>				
144	Spain	2.443	2.460	48,374
145	Sri Lanka	0.031	0.031	614
146	Sudan	0.010	0.010	198
147	Suriname	0.006	0.006	118
148	Swaziland	0.002	0.002	39
149	Sweden	0.956	0.962	18,928
150	Switzerland	1.140	1.148	22,572
151	Tajikistan	0.004	0.004	80
152	Thailand	0.291	0.293	5,762
153	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.007	0.007	139
154	Timor-Leste	0.003	0.003	60
155	Togo	0.001	0.001	19
156	Tonga	0.001	0.001	19
157	Trinidad and Tobago	0.034	0.034	674
158	Tunisia	0.028	0.028	555
159	Turkey	1.018	1.025	20,157
160	Turkmenistan	0.026	0.026	515
161	Uganda	0.009	0.009	178
162	Ukraine	0.103	0.104	2,040
163	United Arab Emirates	0.604	0.608	11,959
164	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4.463	4.493	88,367
165	United States of America	22.000	22.149	435,604
166	Uruguay	0.079	0.080	1,565
167	Uzbekistan	0.023	0.023	456
168	Vanuatu	0.001	0.001	19
169	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	0.571	0.575	11,306
170	Viet Nam	0.058	0.058	1,149
171	Yemen	0.010	0.010	198
172	Zambia	0.007	0.007	139
173	Zimbabwe	0.004	0.004	80
GRAND TOTAL		99.328	100.000	1,966,700