



BWPP experiences in the field

**Dr Jean Pascal Zanders
BioWeapons Prevention Project**

**Practical Contributions of Civil Society to
National Implementation and Regional Cooperation
Meeting of States Parties to the BTWC
Geneva, 10 December 2007**



BWPP observations

- Limited interpenetration in interface between government and civil society
 - Low awareness of issues involved => no stakeholdership
 - Often lack of knowledge about who the interlocutors on other side of interface might be
 - No emergence of dynamic in favour of treaty implementation

- BWPP seminar experiment (Kenya, November 2007)
 - Civil society **and** government explicitly targeted
 - Active interaction by all participants
 - even in session exclusively set up for civil society on 2nd day
 - Government officials suggested other departments / agencies to participate (which they did without formal invitation and at very short notice)
 - Government officials and civil society representatives became requesting parties for more interaction
 - **Interaction across interface may be the source of 'claiming ownership'**
 - Interaction appears to give focus and purpose (concrete action vs. action in support of abstract goals)
 - was missing in early BWPP outreach & capacity building activities
 - Probably 2-3 meetings in total required to set sustainable dynamic off (broadening of base and building up capacity)

- Promoting stakeholdership in government, parliament and civil society should be primary goal on way to implementing the BTWC
 - Raising political profile to overcome obstacles (in some cases, these were 'declaratory')
 - Identification of each constituency's role under the treaty
 - Dynamic interaction defines relevancy of the BTWC



Side note: Article X and the implementation of the BTWC

- General observation: surprising lack of saliency of issue in regional outreach seminars
- Is saliency a function of the discussion forum?
 - Very strong issue in Geneva
 - Was prominent in discussions at preparatory meetings of EU Joint Action (Brussels, Geneva, New York)
 - Hardly any in-depth debates in regional outreach seminars
 - Topic nonetheless introduced by speakers
- Possible reasons for lack of saliency of Article X in regional debates
 - No or limited knowledge about the BTWC and its different components
 - Tendency to emphasize regulatory, rather than promotional component; as well as linkage to Article III (non-proliferation component)
 - Lack of concrete—in particular region or country specific—illustrations of the promotional component
 - Immediate needs identified by local participants differ considerably from promise of international cooperation, exchanges, technology transfers, etc.
 - Need for basic information; concrete indicators of legal, economic, financial and human resource implications of joining treaty
 - Biology and biotechnology may not play that significant role in national economy
 - Need for general capacity-building of government agencies
 - Border controls and monitoring of transfers: training and equipment
 - Information, training and equipment relating to monitoring and regulating activities on territory
 - General wariness of promises in treaties that are subsequently not implemented



BioWeapons Prevention Project



#On the web

www.bwpp.org

#E-mail

bwpp@bwpp.org