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Concluding Remarks

- NO ACD AGREEMENT IS PERFECT
  EACH of the 3 CW-related ‘Agreements’ (Hague Declaration, Geneva Protocol, CWC) has weaknesses

- If you are not inside the tent trying to make things happen, you are out of the action

- Requirement for Scientific & Technical expertise

- Funding contributions not a substitute for Expertise

- ACD Mechanisms – Negotiation & Implementation:
  Mixed Bag: UN SecGen & CWC are Highpoints
CW Timeline

WWI
- Hague Declaration 1899
- WWI
- 1914-18 German & Allied use

WWII
- Geneva Protocol 1925
- 1935-36 Italian Use (Abyssinia)
- 1940
- 1950
- 1960
- 1970
- 1980
- 1990
- 2000
- 2010
- 2020

Vietnam
- 1965-1975 USA RCAs & Defoliants
- 1980s UN Sec Gen Resolution

Iraq-Iran
- 1983-89 Iraqi Use
  - 1987 Sardasht Iran
  - 1988 Halabja Iraq
- 1991-99 UNSCOM
- 1999-2007 UNMOVIC
- 1992 CD & CWC
- 1993 CWC Opens for Signature
- 1996 CD & CTBT
- 1997 CWC EIF

Syria
- 1991-99 UNSCOM
- 1999-2007 UNMOVIC
- Syria: UN/OPCW 2013-14
Reference Points

- Universality
- Comprehensiveness
- Clarity
- Resiliency
- Verification & Accountability
‘Agreements’

- **1899 Hague Declaration**: “The Contracting Powers agree to abstain from the use of all *projectiles*, the sole object of which is the diffusion of asphyxiating or deleterious gases”

- **1925 Geneva Protocol**: “Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare”

Reference Points vs. ‘Agreements’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universality</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>almost Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>tentative Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification &amp; Accountability</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no to tentative Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no to tentative Yes</td>
<td>tentative Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concluding Remarks

- NO ACD AGREEMENT IS PERFECT
  Each of the 3 CW-related ‘Agreements’ (Hague Declaration, Geneva Protocol, CWC) has weaknesses

- If you are not inside the tent trying to make things happen, you are out of the action

- Requirement for Scientific & Technical expertise

- Funding contributions not a substitute for Expertise

- ACD Mechanisms – Negotiation & Implementation:
  Mixed Bag: UN SecGen & CWC are Highpoints