openhouse
choose to be better

Model United Nations 2020

UNGA Study Guide

Agenda: Combating the threat of bioterrorism by non-state actors

Co-Chairperson: Zain Ahmed

Co-Chairperson: Rushil Khajanchi

Vice Chairperson: Aaryan Magan

Address by Executive Board

Greetings Delegates,

Welcome to the 7th Committee of OHMUN 2020- The General Assembly Committee for Disarmament and International Security- aka the DISEC.

We at Openhouse have it as our utmost prerogative to revolutionize the concept of MUN, and at the GA-DISEC, you as delegates will get the firsthand experience of what it is like to be in a fresh and dynamic committee. The GA-DISEC offers a little something for everyone. If you are a newcomer, looking to learn, I take it upon myself to make this committee a truly educational experience for you. If you are a seasoned MUNner and are looking to win, I can assure you will find yourself amidst competent delegates and sheer debating talent, and I shall do my best to facilitate pure competition to make this a cherished winning experience for you.

I have been on the executive board and organizing committees of MUNs since 2018, and kicked off this year being appointed to Chair at my school's premier MUN in Calcutta. As for delegate experiences, I have seen a myriad of committees, from conventional GA-SOCHUMs and traditional Security Councils to Chinese Foreign Affairs Cabinets and Ministerradets of Swedish Kings from the 1700s. I promise that I will, to the best of my ability, facilitate good and inclusive debate, where all aspects of you as a MUNner are tested- your research, logic, paperwork, lobbing foreign policy and so on and so forth.

All and all, MUNs are about learning while having fun. With me as Captain of your ship, I assure you that our journey will be legendary.

Regards,

Zain Ahmed.

what's inside

Meaning and Mandate

The General Assembly's First Committee tackles Disarmament and International Security, hence the name DISEC.

In more detail, The First Committee deals with disarmament, global challenges and threats to peace that affect the international community and seeks out solutions to the challenges in the international security regime.

It considers all disarmament and international security matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any other organ of the United Nations; the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, as well as principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments; promotion of cooperative arrangements and measures aimed at strengthening stability through lower levels of armaments.

The committee works in close cooperation with the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament.

The mandate of the Committee falls under seven thematic clusters:

1. Nuclear weapons
2. Other weapons of mass destruction
3. Outer space. (disarmament aspects)
4. Conventional weapons
5. Regional disarmament and security
6. Other disarmament measures and international security
7. Disarmament machinery

Introduction to Bioterrorism

Biological terrorism is a threat that is hard to comprehend, let alone prepare to defend against. During the Twentieth Century, many countries maintained biological warfare (BW) programs. Most of these were eliminated after the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (the BWC), although a few continued, including the Soviet Union. A few other countries including the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) are suspected of maintaining programs today. The risk of Non-State Armed Groups (NSAGs) acquiring BW is not high but sufficiently alarming to warrant strong international action. A few NSAGs tried to acquire BW in the 1990s and early 2000s, and some tried to sue them in terror attacks. While no successes have been reported so far, the prospect has galvanized global attention.

Although claims of massive risks are often repeated, the actual danger is not clearly understood. Many observers refuse to categorize BW ass weapon of mass destruction (WMD), noting that with BW, mass casualties probably require massive quantities. A successful BW attack is a technical difficulty, but could kill hundreds of people and endanger the lives of a thousand more. The United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) defines bioterrorism as a deliberate release of an agent (virus or bacteria) used to cause illness or death. Agents are found naturally, such as smallpox, but can be manipulated by terrorists in order to strengthen the potency of an agent. A biological attack is especially dangerous because, unlike a bomb or other weapon, biological agents are miniscule, and can be transferred through water, food, a handshake, or any other small form of contact. Because of the imminent and extreme danger any biological attack can cause to large amounts of people, bioterrorism has maintained a constant presence in international peace and defence discussions. The United Nations' Disarmament and Security Committee (DISEC) is no different.

Historical Bioterrorism

Research on biological warfare (BW) as we know it today began around World War I, with anthrax and smallpox being the first and most common agents.

Research has led to extraordinary advances, but actual use has been very limited. Small scale use, often by individuals, is most common. The only large-scale use came during World War II, when the Japanese Army experimented and used biological agent on Chinese prisoners and cities. After World War II, the Soviet Union (USSR) and the United States and USSR had competing biological weapons programs during the Cold War. While research produced extremely lethal agents, weaponization—especially effective dispersal from artillery or aerial dispensers—and progress on militarily useful effects was difficult. With their armed forces ambivalent or opposed, and strong public dismay at the prospect of BW warfare, in 1972 the Cold War superpowers completed a treaty to prohibit most possessions and use of BW, the Convention of the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction in 1972 (also known as the BWC)

Non-State Actors

Non-state actors include organizations and individuals that are not affiliated with, directed by, or funded through the government. These include corporations, private financial institutions, and NGOs, as well as paramilitary and armed resistance groups. In the context of bioterrorism, we herein refer predominantly to the latter definitions, I.e. paramilitary and armed forces. The world has seen chemical warfare and bioterrorism conducted innumerable times and hence there is a need to combat the rising threat faced by all member nations of the UN, but first we task ourselves with the elimination of usage of such bioweapons by those not present in United Nations conferences, by those not represented in government- Non State Actors. In international relations, violent non-state actors (VNSA), also known as non-state armed actors or non-state armed groups (NSAGs), are individuals and groups that are wholly or partly independent of state governments and which threaten or use violence to achieve their goals.

YSNAs vary widely in their goals, size, and methods. They may include narcotics cartels, popular liberation movements, religious and ideological organizations (e.g. private military contractors), self-defense militia, and paramilitary groups established by state governments to further their interests.

While some VNSAs oppose governments, others are allied to them. Some VNSAs are organized as paramilitary groups, adopting methods and structure similar to those of state armed forces. Others may be informally structured and use violence in other ways, such as kidnapping, using improvised explosive devices, or hacking into computer systems, or using bioweapons.

Multiple states in the region do not have a monopoly on the use of force within their borders, and that means, for the time being at least, VNSAs hold vital and decisive power over the course of political events in the region. The current level and nature of conflict in the region, in fact, seems to be degrading the power of the state even further. This allows not only the major VNSAs to influence the politics of the region but also the ‘industry’ of

hundreds of other groups who also act as critical factors in the course and speed of political change. Paraphrasing Hobbes, life in the Middle East seems to be even shorter, even more brutish and seemingly more hopeless.

There are a variety of groups that operate in the shadows of the larger Islamic mass movements and serve as strategic paramilitary partners for more established VNSAs such as Hamas or Hezbollah. The nature of their affiliation is generally intentionally obscured to grant some level of political immunity to the political wing of its parent group. Groups such as the Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) (Fletcher 2008) and Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade (AAMB) (Fletcher 2005) have persisted for decades but remain clandestine and maintain very limited and exclusive membership. In addition to violent actions taken by the group on its own, it often functions as a strategic partner to other larger groups who are designed as mass movements (PIJ and Hamas and AAMB with Fatah and Hamas. There are also several groups that act as local agents of foreign governments such as Iran or transnational actors such as Al Qaeda. Ansar al Islam (AI) (Stanford University n.d.) and Kata'ib Hizballah (KH) (Stanford University n.d.) have been listed by the US State Department as foreign terrorist organizations for at least 10 years. AI is a Sunni group based on Salafi Jihadi principles whose primary mission has been to resist the Kurdish regional government in Iraq and advance the potential for Sunni Islamic rule in that region of Iraq. Its founders were trained in the AQ camps during and following the Afghan war and currently affiliate with Al Qaeda groups in the region. It has at times cooperated with and fought with ISIS as well. KH is a relatively large Shia paramilitary group that is reportedly backed by Iran and seeks to strengthen the ability of Iran to influence Iraqi politics in favour of the majority Shia community in Iraq. It has played a prominent role in the Popular Mobilization Units in Iraq (Toumaj 2016).KH troop strength, noted to be as high as 30,000 civilian fighters, was called to action to defend Iraq against the invasion by ISIS in 2014 in Iraq. There are hundreds of other VNSAs that arose – or became prominent – in the wake of the wars in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, and Libya. A few of the prominent groups that rose up in the last 5 to 10 years include Jaysh

Rijal al-Tariqa al-Naqshbandia in Iraq (Iraqi Sunni nationalist) (Stanford University n.d), Ahrar al Sham in Syria (Syrian Salafi Jihadi nationalists) (Stanford University n.d.), the Houthis in Yemen (Yemeni Shia nationalists) (International Crisis Group 2014), and the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group in Libya (Libyan Salafi Jihadi nationalist) (Witter 2011). These groups vary in size, ability, and political ideology, but all play/have played important roles in their respective political/military areas of operation. In addition, there are new VNSA groups emerging in Egypt in reaction to the authoritarian regime of the current President, Abdel Fattah al Sisi (BBC News 2014). Groups such as Hasm and Liwa al Thawra in Egypt (El-Gundy 2017) are still small, less than 18 months old, but increasingly active with attacks on government officials and military targets. Though rumored, it is not clear what, if any, links they may have to more long-standing activist groups in Egypt such as the Muslim Brotherhood or potentially ISIS. They seek to overthrow the sitting President of Egypt, Al Sisi, through violence and to establish an Egyptian society based on Islam.

Bioterrorism Attacks

While the BWC transformed the threats of biological warfare, it did not eliminate them. The Soviet Union—suspicious of American secrecy on these issues— continued its research and expanded its weaponization of BW agents. It never used them, but did experience major accidental exposure, such as the 1979 Sverdlovsk incident which caused several dozen deaths. Other countries are widely believed to have devolved BW capabilities, especially North Korea, but these allegations are hard to prove. Iraq and Libya—suspected by the American intelligence of community of developing BW—were shown to have none, after the 2003 American-led invasion of Iraq and Libya's decision that year to end all its work on weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Today, most concern about BW focuses on terrorist acquisition and use. This is technically difficult. Easy methods of for non-experts are suspect. Terrorists have tried chemical weapons (CW), which are easier to make and handle, but generally been unsuccessful. Using BW is harder. Releasing BW into water supplies cannot work in regions that practice chlorination, for example. But the risks of BW attack are sufficiently dangerous they require international attention. The most successful attack probably was the work of an American military BW expert.

Shortly after 11 September 2001, letters were sent to news agencies and politicians in the United States that contained anthrax over a five- week period. Five people died and dozens were infected, as no one recognized the dangerous substance until it was often too late. To this day, the actual perpetrator, supplier, and other vital questions remain questionable, although it widely believed the attack was undertaken by Dr. Bruce Ivins, American military anthrax expert at the United States Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases in Fort Detrick, Maryland. Ivins committed suicide in 2008, shortly before he could be arrested by the FBI. The attack widely associated with Ivins remains one of the more deadly terrorists uses of BW.

Bioweaponry and Agents

Anthrax

Experts believe that today, the most likely organism to be used in a bioterrorism attack would be *Bacillus anthracis*, the bacteria that causes anthrax.

It is widely found in nature, easily produced in the laboratory, and survives for a long time in the environment. Also, it is versatile and can be released in powders, sprays, water, or food.

Anthrax has been used before. In 2001, anthrax spores were sent through the United States postal system. In all, 22 people contracted anthrax – five of whom died. And, the guilty party was never caught.

Smallpox

Another potential agent of bioterrorism is smallpox, which, unlike anthrax, can spread from person to person. Smallpox is no longer a disease of concern in the natural world – because concerted vaccination efforts stamped it out – and the last naturally spread case occurred in 1977.

However, if someone were to gain access to the smallpox virus (it is still kept in two laboratories – one in the U.S. and one in Russia), it could be an effective weapon, spreading quickly and easily between people.

Plague

The Plague originates from Yersinia pestis, which is passed to humans through the bite of a flea that has fed on infected rodents.

Once a human is infected, the resulting disease can either develop into bubonic plague, which is difficult to transmit among humans and fairly easy to treat with antibiotics, or – if the infection

spreads to the lungs – it becomes pneumonic plague, which develops rapidly and does not respond well to antibiotics.

Given the presence and availability of plague around the world, the capacity for mass production and aerosol dissemination, the high fatality rate of pneumonic plague, and the potential for rapid secondary spread, the potential use of plague as a biological weapon is of great concern."

Cholera

As a potentially severe and sometimes deadly gastrointestinal disease, cholera has the potential to be used in bioterrorism. It does not spread easily from person to person, so for it to be effective, it would need to be liberally added to a major water source.

In the past, the bacteria responsible for cholera, Vibrio cholerae, has been weaponized by the U.S., Japan, South Africa, and Iraq, among others.

Tularemia

Some consider tularemia, an infection caused by the Francisella tularensis bacterium, as a potential bioweapon. It causes fever, ulcerations, swelling of lymph glands, and, sometimes, pneumonia.

The bacterium can cause infection by entering through breaks in the skin or by being breathed into the lungs. It is particularly infectious, and only a very small number of organisms (as few as 10) need to enter the body to set off a serious bout of tularemia.

Studied by the Japanese during World War II and stockpiled by the U.S. in the 1960s, F. tularensis is hardy, capable of withstanding low temperatures in water, hay, decaying carcasses, and moist soil for many weeks.

According to the Johns Hopkins Center for Public Health Preparedness, "Aerosol dissemination of F. tularensis in a populated area would be expected to result in the abrupt onset of large numbers of cases of acute, non-specific, febrile illness beginning 3 to 5 days later […], with pleuropneumonitis developing in a significant proportion of cases."

"Without antibiotic treatment, the clinical course could progress to respiratory failure, shock, and death."

The pathogens listed above are an abbreviated selection. Others considered to have potential as biological weapons include brucellosis, Q fever, monkeypox, arboviral encephalitides, viral hemorrhagic fevers, and staphylococcal enterotoxin B.

Ebola

Since the February 2014, the deadly Ebola virus has ravaged much of West Africa. After a thorough investigation, the source of the latest outbreak can be traced back to a two-year-old child from Guinea. As of September, there have been more than 2,800 deaths and 5,800 confirmed cases of Ebola within Liberia and Sierra Leone. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the projected estimates for January 2015 could be anywhere from 550,000 to 1.4 million if there are no "additional interventions or changes in community behavior." Another factor that has been taken into more consideration is the ability for the disease to spread. As of October 2014, the United States has increased its effort to screen passengers on incoming planes from West Africa, or have been to the region in the past few months, in order to limit the spread of the Ebola virus. Also, as of October 2014, the Ebola virus has been seen in Germany, which was the only other country besides the United States at that to have the Ebola virus patients outside of West Africa. Ebola is one of the many bio-chemical agents that do not have a proven vaccine that can combat the virus. With this in mind, it is crucial to note two important thoughts. If an organization, or organizations, were to weaponize the Ebola strain, or any other strain of virus without a cure, it would be detrimental to human society. The very risk or thought of this coming into a reality is one that all countries and nations cannot prepare for, but is also one that is not totally impossible. If this were to happen, would country policy break in the sense that governments would negotiate with terrorist cells? Another train of thought is also this: what happens if a virus is weaponized and is released into an already unstable country? What would the United Nations do in this situation versus what the host country would do? Realizing that the country might already be unstable due to a lack

of infrastructure, lack of definite government or leader, or is a war-torn and poverty-stricken country, it might be difficult to send aid and relief if a virus were to break out.

One last thought

that should be kept in mind is the fact that there are many different ideologies when it comes to how a virus should be approached. It is less so about the traditional vaccination and humanistic beliefs as much as it is about the lack of education most persons receive when it comes to the symptoms of certain diseases (yellow eyes, clamminess, vomiting, etc.) as well as protection, quarantine and sterilization procedures if one person is infected. One case that was highly publicized was that many West African children were playing with diseased corpses of people that had died of Ebola. In 2012, scientists admitted to have made a virus that could kill millions if it was released in sufficient quantities. The World Health Organization immediately disallowed the publication of more research on the subject, but deadly weapons could be available for terrorists if they could somehow retrieve it. These two events further suggest that more must be done by the international community to stop the possibility of mass murder through biological terrorism.

Table 2-9. Types and Characteristics of Some Biological Agents

TYPE OF AGENT	STABILITY	INCUBATION TIME	ENTRANCE	
			AEROSOL	NONAEROSOL
Anthrax	High	1 to 6 days	Inhalation	Skin, Mouth
Botulinum toxin	High	24 to 36 hours	Inhalation	Mouth, Wound
Brucellosis	High in wet environment	1 to 4 weeks	Inhalation	Mouth, Skin, Eyes
Cholera	Moderate	Hours to 5 days		Mouth
Plague (Pneumonic)	Low	2 to 3 weeks	Inhalation	
Plague (Bubonic)	Moderate	2 to 10 days		Bite of Vector
Ricin	High	<36 hours	Inhalation	Mouth
Staphylococcal Enterotoxin B	High	1 to 6 hours	Inhalation	Mouth
Trichothecene Mycotoxin	High	Minutes to hours	Inhalation	Mouth, Skin
Tularemia	Low	2 to 10 days	Inhalation	Mouth, Skin

Source: GlobalSecurity.com

United Nations Action

PAST ACTION

In 1972, the Convention of the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (BWC) was completed. In the United States, President Richard Nixon made an executive order destroying all biological weapons and ending further creation of them prior to this agreement. The BWC lacks mandatory verification; it relies on self-interest and reciprocity among signatories for enforcement. Efforts to create a verification regime have been blocked by states suspicious it will be misused for espionage, especially the United States. Since the first conference, there have been seven official Review Conferences and an Ad Hoc Group that came together over a dozen times since the 1980s, primarily to develop an acceptable mandatory verification system, with the latest meeting occurring in 2011. While this agreement focuses on keeping State-level biological proliferation at bay, the threat of individual or small group biological terrorism can't be prevented as easily. In the United States in 1984, followers of a spiritual leader wanted to ensure he won a local election, taking political power in the town of Antler, Oregon. To do this, they sprinkled Salmonella on salad bars in local restaurants, hoping to make local citizens too sick to vote. They caused a reported 751 individuals to get sick, but no deaths, and they lost the election. The weaknesses in their attack laid in the lack of access to deadly bacteria strains and lack of an effective delivery mechanism.

The United Nations has been at the forefront of international efforts to fight all forms of WMD terrorism, passing a series of resolutions calling on states to sign relevant treaties, to accelerate negotiations to strengthen those treaties, and prevent trade in relevant materials. Member states are generally agreed on the importance of stopping on-state actors from developing BW capabilities. But many states refuse to support strong limits on their own freedom of action, and oppose measures to penalize particular states they consider friends or allies. Although the United Nations have banned the use of chemical and biological weapons as well as the ability to store them within any one nation, two distinct cases of this rule being broken are prevalent in the United States

as well as Russia. Both of these countries have samples of smallpox and other assorted bio-chemical agents.

Some United Nation resolutions to combat the storage and production of other countries chemical weapons have been the Security Council Resolution 2118, which proposed the removal and destruction of Syria's stockpile of illegal chemical agents (CW). Two other groundbreaking resolutions that were passed by the Security Council were resolutions 1540 and 2118. One notable idea is that, in both of these resolutions, they recognize that biological and chemical agents can, and are, used as weapons of mass destruction and could be used to coerce leaders of other nation as well as deliver a threat to international peace and security." All of these resolutions oblige to the inter alia rule, stating that these resolutions support by any means non-State actors (an individual or organization that has significant political influence but is not allied to any particular country or state) from "developing, acquiring, manufacturing, possessing, transporting, transferring or using nuclear, chemical or biological agents and their delivery systems." Others are concerned about the dilemma of how to balance the need to control BW, versus the need to support legitimate research to combat infectious disease. Measures that would combat BW research and weaponization to completely also can stop necessary research on defensive measures, such as prevention, inoculation and treatment. Research on virulent disease, such as H1N1 bird flu, is accepted as essential, but such research also can be turned to destructive purposes. Balancing the demands of medical research and counterterrorism is a difficult job for the international community.

Role of the United Nations Today

Presently, the United Nations is being criticized by many for pushing bioterrorism, which many believe is one of the gravest dangers in the world today, to the backburner. One unresolved issue is ensuring all parties are compliant. A possible addition to the agreement that would create annual Confidence Building Measures used to verify the compliance was proposed for a decade. However, powerful countries like the United States did not favor tactics that would involve intrusion by outside verifiers. At the present time, the closest thing to this idea is the Australia Group, a

voluntary forum with the goal of uniting countries in ensuring biological weapons are removed or not created in the first place, under the efforts provided by the BTWC. Without the backing of the United Nations, this voluntary group only has less than 50 participants, as opposed to the 165 signees of the BTWC. The former Secretary-General of the U.N., Kofi Annan, stated "Bioterrorism is especially under-addressed and in acute need of new thinking" in 2006. Many new initiatives were proposed in his '06 report "Uniting Against Terrorism." This report shifted the focus away from concerns of state-funded biological and chemical attacks and towards rogue groups and elements. So far, none have been seriously enacted.

.

Country Roles

China, the European Union and Former Soviet republics led by Russia have taken the lead on international action, demanding reform starting with improvements to the 1972 BWC. They maintain that effective international action requires cooperation through the UN. Above all, they agree the BWC requires the addition of an effective verification regime, including on-sight inspections of research facilities and facilities that can be used for biological research.

The United States maintains its strong position against bioterrorism. However, the anthrax attacks in 2001 were traced to domestic sources, leading some to question whether or not the U.S. actually does still have some stockpile of biological weapons. American leaders have divided on the value of international agreements, which a substantial group in the American Congress insisting the treaties will hurt America's sovereign freedom and not slow its enemies. Other American leaders stress the need for international cooperation, since the country cannot defend itself alone. The U.S. maintains BW inventories, which it says are exclusively for research, not weaponization. Some American leaders also are suspicious of changes to the BWC that could require verification and inspection, possibly endangering military secrets.

From the Asian continent, only Myanmar and Nepal have not ratified the treaty. Neither is suspected of having offensive biological weapon facilities. According to the US Congress Office of Technology Assessment, China, North Korea, and Taiwan are all suspected to have undeclared biological weapons in 2008. Even though China has never violated the BWC, there is some evidence that the country may have some dual-use (both defensive and offensive) biological weapons currently.

India has strong biological defense operations, but it can safely be said that they have no biological weapons for offensive purposes. Pakistan has very similar infrastructure. Many states formerly controlled by the Soviet Union have biological weapon facilities left over from that time, with

Kazakhstan including some of the longest lasting ones. They have been somewhat cooperative with outside countries in ensuring no

The Middle East is one of the biggest areas of concern, especially with the great amount of governmental unrest. Presently, with the looming Civil War, Syria is of top concern in regards to biological weapons. As recently as 2008, reports state Syria possesses offensive biological weapons. The concern is so high that Western Powers have publicly discussed and warned the Syrian government against the use of biological weapons. Israel has not signed the BWC, and it is believed that they have developed offensive biological warfare capability, though their actual stockpile is completely unknown. Along with Israel, Iran and Iraq were considered to have biological weapons in their possession in 1995; however, Iraq's program was abandoned before the 2003 invasion.

Africa has a large number of non-signatories and countries that haven't ratified the treaty. African nations that have not signed the BWC include Andorra, Angola, Cameroon, Chad, Djibouti, Eritrea and South Sudan. The continued unrest in much of the region makes it one of the most dangerous in terms of possible availability and use of biological warfare against innocent victims. South Africa had an extensive program in the 80s and 90s, but has since claimed they have no offensive weapons.

Latin American countries generally are very supportive of efforts to strengthen the BWC. While nearly every country has ratified the agreement to disarm bioterrorism, there are still many countries that (unwillingly) house terrorist groups. If these groups can get close enough to the main cities around Central and South America, and even the United States and Canada, with a biological weapon such as anthrax, they could cause scores of fatalities. Some countries in the region— such as Brazil, Cuba, Equator, Nicaragua and Venezuela—are suspicious of changes in the treaty that could be used to force inspections in sensitive national security areas.

Bibliography

You are urged to go beyond the study guide for your research. The guide is present only to give you a rough idea of the past and present circumstances relating to the agenda. It is your job as a delegate to research the future, I.e. solutions to the crisis, your foreign policy and to read up on past UN documents concerning the same agenda.
Use the links provided below to get started!

1. www.medicalnewstoday.com

2. www.ibtimes.com

3. www.geneticsandsociety.org

4. www.e-ir.info

5. globalbiodefense.com

6. www.un.org

FAQs

1. What procedure will we be following?

- UNAUSA but procedure exists to facilitate debate so at times we might have to slightly deviate from it to best facilitate debate.

2. Will there be substantive chits in committee?

- No, unless there are extreme recognition issues but we assure you that such a scenario is very unlikely

3. Will there be updates?

- If the flow of committee is very good without them then no. Otherwise, we can have them to improve the flow of debate.

4. Will there be verbal Points of Information all the time?

- We will try our best to incorporate as many points as possible verbally but we'll have informal voting in committee for the specifics

5. Will communiques be allowed?

- No. However, several other forms of paperwork can be sent in when communication lines are opened. (Memorandums of understanding instead of joint public communiques, presidential statements, action orders, working papers, etc.) These can do the same thing as communiques but save time and be more realistic