

**REPORT FROM GENEVA:  
THE BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS  
CONVENTION MEETING OF  
EXPERTS AUGUST 2013**

Graham S. Pearson in association with Nicholas A. Sims

November 2013

## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	3
Meeting of Experts, 12 to 16 August 2013: Opening Plenary Session.....	10
Introductory Statements.....	13
Side Events.....	26
Biennial Item: how to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-Building Measures.....	28
Standing Agenda item on Cooperation and Assistance .....	29
Standing Agenda Item on Science and Technology .....	32
Standing Agenda Item on Strengthening National Implementation.....	34
Biennial Item: how to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-Building Measures.....	36
Closing Session: Adoption of the factual report reflecting the deliberations of the meeting.....	36
Outcome of the Meeting of Experts .....	37

# Report from Geneva: The Biological Weapons Convention Meeting of Experts July 2012

**Graham S. Pearson<sup>†</sup> in association with Nicholas A. Sims<sup>††</sup>**

## Introduction

As recorded in *Report 35* (March 2012), the Seventh Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC) held in Geneva from Monday 5 December to Thursday 22 December 2011 agreed an Intersessional Programme for 2012-2015. *Part III: Decisions and Recommendations* of the *Final Document* of the Seventh Review Conference stated that:

*The Conference decides that the following topics shall be Standing Agenda Items,*

*which will be addressed at meetings of both the Meeting of Experts and Meeting of States Parties in every year from 2012–2015:*

*(a) Cooperation and assistance, with a particular focus on strengthening cooperation and assistance under Article X;*

*(b) Review of developments in the field of science and technology related to the Convention;*

*(c) Strengthening national implementation.*

*9. The Conference decides that the following other items will be discussed during the intersessional programme in the years indicated:*

*(a) How to enable fuller participation in the CBMs (2012 and 2013);*

At the Meeting of States Parties in December 2012, as reported in *Report 37* (March 2013), the Arrangements for the Meeting of Experts and Meeting of States Parties in 2013 were considered. The United States on behalf of the Depositaries proposed 12 to 16 August 2013 for the Meeting of Experts, and 9 to 13 December 2013 for the Meeting of States Parties. These dates were agreed. Estonia on behalf of the East European Group then nominated Judit Koromi of Hungary as the Chairman for 2013. Iran on behalf of the NAM proposed Ambassador Mazlan Muhammad of Malaysia as one of the Vice-chairs and Australia on behalf of the Western Group nominated Ambassador Urs Schmid of Switzerland as the other Vice-chair. These nominations were agreed.

---

<sup>†</sup> HSP Advisory Board and University of Bradford

<sup>††</sup> London School of Economics

**Ms. Judit Koromi of Hungary wrote to the States Parties on 18 February 2013** to outline her plans for the Meeting of Experts and the Meeting of States Parties in 2013 saying that “*I intend to maintain the tried and tested working practices of the intersessional programme, and to continue along the lines established by the previous Chairman, Ambassador Delmi, in 2012. I believe it is important to build upon the sense of trust and common purpose we have developed, and to maintain the constructive atmosphere of our work. So I will not be proposing changes to the overall structure of our programme.*” She went on to add that “*Within our existing mandate and structure, however, I believe we can improve the process of preparing for our meetings, make more efficient and productive use of our precious meeting time, and enhance the practical value of the programme to States Parties. I believe the key to improving our process is to **bring in more voices.***” [Emphasis in original]. She then specified what she meant by more voices as follows:

- *Increasing the number of States Parties participating actively in our meetings. We need to hear more, from a wider range of States Parties, about their needs, concerns, interests, experiences and ideas with respect to our agenda items. This is especially the case for smaller states, which have the most to gain from the meetings of the intersessional programme.*
- *Broadening the range of participation within national delegations. Many countries may have activities and expertise at a national level which are relevant to our work, but which have not been brought into our meetings. This may be due to lack of awareness, or to financial constraints, or to other reasons. Where barriers to wider participation exist, we should work in partnership to identify and overcome them.*
- *Extending engagement with states not party. In many ways, the utility of the intersessional programme is the best advertisement for membership of the BWC. Encouraging participation in our meetings by states not party will be a key aspect of my efforts on universalization.*
- *Continuing our efforts to engage the scientific community, academia, industry and relevant NGOs. As recognized by States Parties, the input of these actors is important to our work. We should continue to identify relevant experts from outside of government and include them in our meetings through the established procedures.*

She then said that her hope is that *by bringing in more voices we will be able to develop a detailed schedule for the Meeting of Experts that supports an efficient, focused and structured discussion on the aspects of our agenda that are of most interest to States Parties. Rather than try to specify in advance which sub-items of our extensive agenda to focus on this year, my approach is rather to consult widely and to shape the schedule around the areas of greatest interest, where particular experts have been identified, and where we can construct an ordered, coherent discussion that leads toward the development of common understanding and effective action. I am therefore requesting your specific input and suggestions on:*

- *What your government is most interested in discussing: in what areas of the three standing agenda items and the biennial item would you most like to see focused discussion and action? What can be built on from 2012? What needs new attention? (It may be helpful in this regard to look over the outcome of the 2012 Meeting of States Parties, BWC/MSP/2012/5.)*
- *Who your government considers could most usefully contribute to this discussion: which are the national or international, government or non-government experts who could best support our goals? Can you propose a specific expert from within your government to speak on a particular sub-item? Could you join with other States Parties to make a group presentation on an item of common interest?*

In regard to side events, she said that *Many States Parties find the side events at BWC meetings to be highly relevant and useful, and there have been suggestions that the side events could better complement the formal meetings. In view of this, and the growing demand for limited time slots, I propose to institute a more coordinated system of scheduling side events. Instead of a simple first-come-first-served allocation of slots, requests to hold side events will now be collected by the ISU until **14 June**. The Vice-chairs, ISU and I will then consider the requests, identify any common themes and potential synergies with the official programme and, in full consultation with the organisers of the proposed events, develop a schedule that best complements and supports our work.* The letter concluded by providing information on the sponsorship programme, universality and CBMs.

**Ms. Judit Koromi of Hungary briefed the regional groups on 17 April 2013** when she said that:

- *The mandate for our work was set by the Seventh Review Conference and I intend to stick to that mandate.*
- *I will keep the overall allocation of time across each of our agenda items the same as it was last year - i.e. each item will have an equal allocation of time.*
- *I would like to reassure you that my efforts to develop a more detailed and structured schedule are not intended, in any way, to keep any issue out of our discussions.*
- *A more detailed and structured schedule is a tool we can use to ensure that we have allocated sufficient time to discuss any, and all, issues that States Parties indicate are of particular interest to them.*

She also sought their views on which relevant international organizations should be invited and in identifying individual experts to be invited as guests of the meeting. In regard to universalization she said that:

- *I intend to continue to work on universalization throughout the year and request your support to help expand the membership of the Convention.*

- *I hope that those States Parties undertaking universalization activities will provide the Chair and the ISU with details of their efforts, any results achieved, or information gathered.*

In regard to background information papers she said that she had identified a need to cover:

- *Any advances since our work last year in enabling technology, covering both potential risks and benefits;*
- *Advances in technologies for dealing with disease, again covering both risks and benefits; as well as*
- *Developments relevant to national oversight of advances that have potential for uses contrary to the Convention, including dual use research of concern.*

**Ms. Judit Koromi of Hungary then wrote again to the States Parties on 28 June 2013** saying that *I have been consulting extensively with States Parties in a range of settings: through the regional groups, bilaterally, and in various informal gatherings. I am most grateful for the constructive and practical feedback I have received from many delegations, and for the support and advice of the two Vice-chairs, Ambassador Mazlan Muhammad of Malaysia and Ambassador Urs Schmid of Switzerland. She went on to say that I am particularly pleased with the positive response to my proposal to "bring in more voices" to our intersessional programme. I thank all those delegations which have provided useful ideas to broaden awareness of and active participation in our work.*

She added that based on her consultation and written responses that she had received she had prepared an informal indicative schedule for the Meeting of Experts, as well as a draft provisional programme of work. She said that *The informal indicative schedule provides an overview of the Meeting of Experts, including the side events. A more detailed version of this indicative schedule, showing individual presentations and statements that delegations have so far indicated they plan to make under each agenda item, is available on the ISU website ([www.unog.ch/bwc/meeting](http://www.unog.ch/bwc/meeting)). This will be updated continually as more delegations provide input.*

In regard to the provisional programme she said that *The provisional programme of work is closely based on that of 2012, and will be proposed for adoption in the usual manner at the opening session of the meeting. It lists the sub-items of the respective Standing Agenda Items, indicating both those which were originally proposed for consideration in 2013 according to the division helpfully put forward in 2012 by my distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Delmi, and those which one or more delegations have specifically indicated they will wish to address in August.*

A list was attached to her letter of the relevant international organizations, professional and academic associations, and other NGOs and experts who might usefully contribute to our work by sharing their experience and

expertise at the Meeting of Experts. This list consisted of the following:

**I. Observers – Intergovernmental Organizations**

World Health Organization (WHO)  
World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE)  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)  
Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW)  
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)  
INTERPOL  
UNSCR 1540 Committee

**II. Guests of the Meeting**

**A. International professional and scientific organizations**

International Federation of Biosafety Associations (IFBA)  
IAP: the Global Network of Science Academies  
International Union of Microbiological Societies (IUMS)  
International Union of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (IUBMB)  
Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO)  
International Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Associations (IFPMA)

**B. Other organizations and individual experts**

**Cooperation & Assistance**

- *Nathan Wolfe* (Global Viral Forecasting initiative) – a leading virus hunter who has done a number of recent high-profile interviews.
- *Association of University Technology Managers*: a professional body directly involved in technology transfer.
- *Developing Countries Vaccine Manufacturers Network*: an industry body representing vaccine manufacturing capacity in emerging economies
- *Mike Short* (Institution of Engineering and Technology & Telefonica Europe): an expert on the use of information and communications technologies for disease reporting and surveillance, particularly in Africa.
- *Shanshan Zhang* (Peking University): runs a joint Ph.D.

programme with Emory University in the United States; will discuss how the programme deals with differences in national approaches to biorisk management, especially in the context of building human capacity.

### **Science & Technology**

- *Muhammad Abbas* (Veterinary Research Institute, Lahore, Pakistan): an expert on advances in understanding of influenza viruses.
- *Prof. Peter Piot* (Director, School of Global Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine)
- *Eri Gentry* (Scanadu): co-founder of a company producing a hand held scanner for home use capable of performing many routine diagnostic tasks.
- *Sanofi Aventis*: will update States Parties on the industrial production of an Artemisinin precursor created using synthetic biology. The 2009 Meeting of Experts was briefed by the biotechnology company doing the scale up work.
- *Simon Hay* (University of Oxford): an expert on the global mapping of infectious disease.
- *Sung-Woo Kim* (Nanobiosys): founder of a company producing state of the art PCR diagnostic equipment.
- *Simon Wain-Hobson* (Foundation for Vaccine Research): a leading scientist who has expressed strong moral and ethical objections to gain-of-function research.
- *Frida Kuhlau* (Uppsala University): an expert on the ethics of disseminating dual-use knowledge.

The letter of 28 June 2013 proposed the following sub-items for each of Standing Agenda Items as follows – some had been proposed for consideration in 2013 by the **Chairman for 2012** in his letter of 2012 (indicated below by 2012 in parentheses) whilst others had been specifically indicated by one or more States Parties as a topic that they wished to address in 2013 (indicated below by 2013 in parentheses):

#### ***Cooperation and assistance, with a particular focus on strengthening cooperation and assistance under Article X (agenda item 5)***

- *Reports by States Parties on their implementation of Article X, and reports by the ISU on the operation of the database system to facilitate assistance requests and offers; (2012)*
- *Challenges and obstacles to developing international cooperation, assistance and exchange in the biological sciences and technology, including equipment and material, for peaceful purposes to their full potential, and possible means of overcoming these; (2013)*
- *A range of specific measures for the full and comprehensive implementation of Article X taking into account all of its provisions, including facilitation of cooperation and assistance, including in terms*



*of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for peaceful purposes, and identification of critical gaps and needs in these areas; (2012)*

- *Ways and means to target and mobilize resources, including financial resources, to address gaps and needs for assistance and cooperation, in particular from developed to developing States Parties, and from international and regional organizations and other relevant stakeholders. (2012)*
- *Education, training, exchange and twinning programmes and other means of developing human resources in the biological sciences and technology relevant to the implementation of the Convention, particularly in developing countries; (2012)*
- *Capacity-building, through international cooperation, in biosafety and biosecurity, and for detecting, reporting, and responding to outbreaks of infectious disease or biological weapons attacks, including in the areas of preparedness, response, and crisis management and mitigation;(2013)*
- *Coordination of cooperation with other relevant international and regional organizations, and other relevant stakeholders. (2012)*

***Review of developments in the field of science and technology related to the Convention (agenda item 6) focusing on advances in technologies for surveillance, detection, diagnosis and mitigation of infectious diseases, and similar occurrences caused by toxins in humans, animals and plants:***

- *New science and technology developments that have potential for uses contrary to the provisions of the Convention; (2012)*
- *New science and technology developments that have potential benefits for the Convention, including those of special relevance to disease surveillance, diagnosis and mitigation; (2012)*
- *Possible measures for strengthening national biological risk management, as appropriate, in research and development involving new science and technology developments of relevance to the Convention. (2013)*
- *Voluntary codes of conduct and other measures to encourage responsible conduct by scientists, academia and industry; (2012)*
- *Education and awareness-raising about risks and benefits of life sciences and biotechnology. (2012)*
- *Science- and technology-related developments relevant to the activities of multilateral organizations such as the WHO, OIE, FAO, IPPC and OPCW; (2012)*
- *Any other science and technology developments of relevance to the Convention. (2012)*

***Strengthening national implementation***

- *A range of specific measures for the full and comprehensive implementation of the Convention, especially Articles III and IV; (2013)*
- *Ways and means to enhance national implementation, sharing best practices and experiences, including the voluntary exchange of*

*information among States Parties on their national implementation, enforcement of national legislation, strengthening of national institutions and coordination among national law enforcement institutions;* (2012)

- *Regional and sub-regional cooperation that can assist national implementation of the Convention;* (2013)
- *National, regional and international measures to improve laboratory biosafety and security of pathogens and toxins;* (2012) *Any potential further measures, as appropriate, relevant for implementation of the Convention.* (2012)

### ***Commentary***

Judit Koromi, of Hungary, the Chair for the Meetings in 2013, in her preparations for the Meeting of Experts in August 2013 made it clear from the outset that she was keen to bring in more voices **by**:

- *Increasing the number of States Parties participating actively in our meetings.*
- *Broadening the range of participation within national delegations.*
- *Extending engagement with states not party. And*
- *Continuing our efforts to engage the scientific community, academia, industry and relevant NGOs.*

In addition, she noted that many States Parties find the side events at the BTWC meetings to be highly relevant and useful, and that there have been suggestions that the side events could better complement the formal meetings. She consequently decided to institute a system whereby she together with the vice-Chairmen would consider the requests to hold side events, identify any common themes and potential synergies with the official programme and, in full consultation with the organisers of the proposed side events, develop a schedule that best complements and supports our work. The side events were consequently included into the informal rolling detailed indicative schedule for the Meeting of Experts which was issued by the ISU, regularly updated and posted on the unog.ch website.

### **Meeting of Experts, 12 to 16 August 2013: Opening Plenary Session**

The Meeting of Experts began on Monday 12 August 2013 with Ms. Judit Koromi of Hungary in the Chair in a plenary session when she welcomed all those present. She noted that this was the second Meeting of Experts of the Intersessional Period between the Seventh Review Conference in 2011 and the Eighth Review Conference in 2016. She was continuing along the lines established at the meetings in 2012 and she would aim to make productive use of the precious meeting time and she asked States Parties for their understanding and cooperation in achieving this. She also noted that her proposal to bring in more voices had been taken to heart by many delegations.

Then turning to procedural matters, she noted, in regard to the adoption of the Agenda (Agenda item 2) in BWC/MSP/2013/MX/1 (all official papers are available at <http://www.unog.ch/bwc>), that agenda items 5 to 8 had been taken from the text of the report of the Seventh Review Conference that provided the mandate for the Intersessional Period. The Agenda was adopted. Moving on to Agenda item 3 the consideration of the provisional programme of work (BWC/MSP/2013/MX/2) she noted that the rolling indicative schedule was on the unog.ch/bwc website. This schedule was by no means final and she encouraged States Parties to add to the schedule or to request the floor to make interventions regarding the schedule. She intended to maintain flexibility and adjust the programme as appropriate. She also noted that sessions would be open or closed; open sessions would open for guests and observers whilst closed sessions would be open to States Parties and Signatory States only. She said that she had received a request from NGO's to make statements and she proposed the inclusion of an informal session for such statements. The draft programme was adopted.

The Chair then noted that there were a number of side events and mentioned that there would be a poster session on Monday evening from 6.00 pm to 7.30pm following the afternoon session.

The Chair then said that the Implementation Support Unit had prepared two background papers, BWC/MSP/2013/MX/INF. 1 on advances in science and technology related to the Convention and BWC/MSP/2013/MX/INF. 2 on challenges and obstacles to developing international cooperation, assistance and exchange. She went on to say that because of the very limited translation budget all Working Papers would be reproduced in the language of submission. However, the report and any substantive documents would be produced in all languages.

The Chair then considered item 4 of the Agenda on adoption of rules of procedure. She proposed to continue as in 2012 when the rules of procedure of the Seventh Review Conference were adopted *mutatis mutanda*. Formal credentials would not be required as all that was required was a letter to the ISU. The deadline for this had been 6 August 2013 and the Chair asked that if any had not yet been sent then this should be done as soon as possible. The rules of procedure were adopted.

The Chair then went on to speak about participation at the Meeting of Experts. She said one State non-Party, Namibia, had requested observer status. This was agreed. She then went on to say that the Meeting of Experts would be addressing a wide range of topics with a broad range of actors. She said that a small number of guests of the meeting had been invited who would only participate in open sessions. In addition, a number of international organizations had requested observer status: European Union, FAO, ICRC, Interpol, OPCW, WHO and OIE. This was agreed.

She went on to say that she had had positive results from her request to States Parties to provide sponsorship as this had been provided by the

European Union, Australia, Germany and the Netherlands which had enabled representatives of seven States Parties – Benin, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras, Mongolia and Montenegro – and two Signatory States – Myanmar and Nepal – to participate.

The Chair said that this completed the formalities and she now proposed to move on to any introductory statements which would then be followed by the statements by NGOs. Following that she would then move on to the Agenda items. She said that she encouraged the asking of questions and comments after any presentations so as to promote a general exchange and discussion. She asked that any statements be limited to 5 minutes and any presentations to 15 minutes so as to ensure that there was time for discussion.

She noted that as in previous years any proposals would be extracted to form part of the Annex to the Report of the Meeting of Experts. As previously this would not be an agreed document but would serve as a handy reference for the Meeting of States Parties. She looked forward to productive and stimulating discussions.

Eighty-three States Parties to the Convention participated in the Meeting of Experts as follows: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). This was two more States Parties than the eighty-one States Parties who had participated at the Meeting of Experts in 2012: fourteen States Parties participated in 2013 which did not in 2012 – Albania, Azerbaijan, Benin, Burkino Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Holy See, Honduras, Malta, Mongolia, Montenegro, New Zealand, Panama and Venezuela – 12 who had participated in 2012 did not in 2013 – Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Nigeria, Qatar, Serbia, Singapore, Slovenia, Uganda and United Arab Emirates.

In addition, three states that had signed the Convention but had not yet ratified it participated in the Meeting of Experts: Myanmar, Nepal and the United Republic of Tanzania. Two states, Israel and Namibia, neither parties nor signatories to the Convention, participated in the Meeting of Experts as observers. Seven intergovernmental organizations also participated as observers: The European Union, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC),

the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL), the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). In addition, at the invitation of the Chairman, in recognition of the special nature of the topics under consideration at this Meeting and without creating a precedent, seven scientific, professional, and academic organizations and experts participated in informal exchanges in the open sessions as guests of the Meeting of Experts: the International Federation of Biosafety Associations (IFBA), the Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC), the Developing Countries Vaccines Manufacturers Network (DCVMN), Nanabiosys, Sanofi, Dr. Cheng Zhu and Dr. Simon Wain-Hobson. This was a similar arrangement to that which had applied at the Meeting of Experts in 2012.

It was also agreed that as at previous meetings, this meeting would be suspended on Monday 12 August at about midday and resume in informal session with the Chairman remaining in the Chair to hear statements from a number of NGOs. In the event, the NGO statements were postponed to the start of the afternoon session when seven NGOs made statements. Some twenty NGOs attended the meeting either as guests of the meeting or as NGO participants.

There were close to 400 participants at the Meeting of Experts of which over 320 came from States Parties including over 150 participants from capitals. Total numbers were closely similar to the participation at the Meeting of Experts in 2012 when there were close to 400 participants of which over 320 came from States Parties including over 150 participants from capitals.

### **Introductory Statements**

**Iran** spoke first on behalf of the Group of the **Non-Aligned Movement and Other States Parties** saying that the Group would like to re-emphasise its position as reflected in the final document of the NAM Summit held in Tehran on 16 – 25 August 2012:

*199. The Heads of State or Government of the NAM States Parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC) reaffirmed that the possibility of any use of bacteriological (biological) agents and toxins as weapons should be completely excluded, and the conviction that such use would be repugnant to the conscience of humankind. They recognized the particular importance of strengthening the Convention through multilateral negotiations for a legally binding Protocol and universal adherence to the Convention. They reiterated their call to promote international cooperation for peaceful purposes, including scientific-technical exchange. They underlined the importance to maintain close coordination among the NAM States Parties to the Convention and highlighted that the Convention on Biological and Toxin Weapons forms a whole and that, although it is possible to consider certain aspects separately, it is critical to deal with all of the issues interrelated to this Convention*

*in a balanced and comprehensive manner.*

*200. The Heads of State or Government of the NAM States Parties to the BTWC welcomed the active participation by NAM States Parties in the Seventh BTWC Review Conference held in Switzerland from 5-22 December 2011, to advance their positions on this Convention, particularly their key role in the adoption of the important decisions related to the implementation of Article X of the BTWC, especially by emphasizing the need for enhancing international cooperation, assistance and exchanges in toxins, biological agents equipment and technology for peaceful purposes, bearing in mind the Action Plan on the implementation of Article X submitted by the NAM States Parties at the Sixth Review Conference, and the additional NAM States Parties' proposal on a mechanism for the full implementation of Article X of the Convention presented more recently. They further encouraged the BTWC States Parties to implement the Article X, as set forth in paragraphs 50-61 of the Final Document of the seventh BTWC Review Conference. They also welcomed the outcome of the Seventh Review Conference and in particular its decision to include cooperation and assistance as one of the Standing Agenda Items, with a particular focus on strengthening cooperation and assistance under Article X, as well as the Conference's decision to establish a database system to facilitate requests for and offers of exchange of assistance and cooperation among States Parties, and the establishment of a Sponsorship Programme, funded by voluntary contributions from States Parties in order to support and increase the participation of developing States Parties in the meetings of the intersessional programme in the framework of the BTWC.*

The statement went on to note that States Parties had agreed at the Seventh Review Conference on the continuation of the past inter-sessional structure *pursuing the same objective of the past inter-sessional program which is to discuss, and promote common understanding and effective action on the pre-defined issues without any decision making power as any decisions for further action on the outcome of the meetings in the inter-sessional program will be taken by the next Review Conference.* It also noted that the Group attached great importance to *cooperation and assistance as one of the standing agenda items, with a particular focus on strengthening Article X implementation. We continue to believe that that there is need for an effective mechanism to ensure the full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of the Article X. In this regard the Group will be submitting a Working Paper on measures for full, effective and non-discriminatory Implementation of the Article X. We hope that this Working Paper and its proposals contribute to the promotion of common understandings and effective actions by the inter-sessional Program in 2013.*

In addition the statement added that *The Group re-emphasizes that multilateral negotiations aimed at concluding a non-discriminatory, legally binding agreement, dealing with all Articles of the Convention in a balanced and comprehensive manner would sustainably strengthen the Convention. In*

*this context we believe that the respective mandates of this Convention and other international organizations should be respected, while utilizing the experiences of the relevant multilateral organizations dealing with human and animal health on issues that are of direct relevance to the Convention. The statement concluded by saying I would like to emphasize that maintaining the delicate balance reached in the Review Conference outcome by organization of work is of utmost importance for this Group. We hope that this delicate balance will be preserved through the entire inter-sessional program.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Iran has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**Pakistan** then spoke saying that Pakistan fully associates itself with the statement delivered by Iran on behalf of the NAM and Other States Parties. The statement noted that *Pakistan believes the outcome of the Seventh Review Conference as contained in its final document embodies a delicate balance that should be preserved during the current inter-sessional period from 2012-2015. We value the efforts that you and your delegation have undertaken in order to maintain the balance in the work program of the 2013 BWC meetings.* The statement concluded by saying that *Pakistan believes that the only sustainable method of strengthening the Convention is through multilateral negotiations aimed at concluding a non-discriminatory legally binding agreement, including on verification provisions, dealing with all Articles of the Convention in a balanced and comprehensive manner.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Pakistan has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**Brazil** then spoke saying that on *Agenda item 5, regarding cooperation and assistance, we hold the view that full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of Article X is essential for the realization of the objective and purpose of the Convention. .... We emphasize that technology transfer and international cooperation serve as an incentive for more States to adhere to the BWC and to guarantee biological substances will be exclusively used for peaceful purposes.* The statement went on to say that *on Agenda item 6, regarding developments in Science and Technology, Brazil shares the concern about possible misuse of biological research.* Then in regard to Agenda item 7, the statement said *we acknowledge that national measures are an essential path for implementation, given the ample scope of the BWC and its impact on numerous areas from research to industry.* The statement concluded by saying in regard to the biennial item of how to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-building Measures (CBMs), *Brazil supports reviewing and enhancing confidence-building measures (CBMs) in the BWC. Despite their importance, we continue to believe that the strengthening of CBMs cannot replace the existence of an effective verification regime based on a Protocol to the BWC, to be negotiated by States Parties.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Brazil has submitted its CBM in 2013 although this is not available on the public section of the website]

**The Russian Federation** then spoke recalling the consensus decision of the Seventh Review Conference as to which topics should be addressed this year. In regard to Confidence Building Measures, the statement said that *Some people see confidence-building measures (CBMs) as an alternative to the verification mechanism. We do not think this is an adequate option. Let us remember that CBMs were first discussed at the Second Review Conference of the BWC back in 1986, but it was only 10 years later that the negotiations on a verification mechanism were launched within the Ad Hoc Group of the States Parties. A draft verification mechanism required that, by way of a transparency measure, States Parties should provide notification of their biological activities and BWC-related facilities. Further steps towards developing a verification mechanism were aimed at eliminating the deficiencies and ambiguities of the information provided, as well as dispelling doubts and suspicions. Unfortunately, universal ways to information provision are yet to be found. We therefore, continue to believe that the absence of a Convention verification mechanism undermines confidence in the ability of the Convention to ensure complete biological disarmament.* The statement went on to add that *As for CBMs themselves, it should be noted that despite concerted efforts and goodwill demonstrated by the States in their determination to improve CBMs (including at the Seventh Review conference), this mechanism is still not very effectively used and not by all the States Parties. We speak for universalization of CBMs and stand ready to jointly work on this important track.*

In regard to scientific and technological developments, the statement said that *We have already proposed to consider the elaboration of common principles on the basis of which risk assessment and oversight of scientific research activities that have a dual-use potential should be carried out during all phases from planning through funding-related decision making to achieving concrete results. The issue could be considered in the context of experiment exchange in updating national risk management approaches and standards. This is a contribution that we could make to strengthening the work of the Convention during the intersession meetings and the arrangements could be formalized at the next Review Conference. ... We are ready for this kind of work.* In regard to national implementation the statement said *Some might say that the suggestion made just now is linked to national implementation issues as well. There is no argument about it. However, neither CBMs, risk management, standards of safe work with pathogens, nor verification mechanism can be separated from proper national implementation of the Convention.* The statement concluded by noting in regard to cooperation and assistance that *We believe, nevertheless, that cooperation and assistance under Article X of the BWC have their specifics as compared to such related international organizations as the WHO or FAO.*

[The [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc) website shows that the Russian Federation has submitted its CBM in 2013 although this is not available on the public section of the website]



**Malaysia** then spoke saying that it would like to associate itself with the statement made by Iran on behalf of the NAM and Other States Parties. The statement said that *There has been tremendous progress in the bio-sciences. While having much benefit for mankind, bio-sciences is burdened by the dual-use dilemma. .... We must develop oversight frameworks for bio-safety and bio-security. We must also develop preparedness efforts to detect and respond to potential bio-threats.* The statement went on to say that *in line with the decision of the Seventh Review Conference, Malaysia supports the call to enhance wider participation in the Confidence Building Measures (CBMs). ... In this context, Malaysia is of the view that further steps should be implemented to ensure universal participation in the CBMs, create greater awareness on the CBM requirements, and also to conduct regular training sessions to assist relevant parties in demonstrating their compliance in an open, systematic and continuous manner.*

The statement concluded by saying *Malaysia firmly believes that cooperation and assistance continue to be the most significant pillars of the BWC and that States Parties should develop an effective mechanism to successfully implement Article X of the Convention so as to ensure effective mobilization and maximum utilization of resources.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Malaysia has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**India** then spoke saying that India associates itself with the statement made by Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. The statement said that *India is committed to improving the effectiveness of this Convention and to the strengthening of its implementation.* In regard to advances in science and technology, the statement said that *It is important that these discussions cover all ongoing high-risk dual use research. For example, it is important to review all ramifications of the recent advancements in scientific understanding related to H5N1, H7N1, H7N9, MERS-Cov as well as other BSL 3&4 pathogens. An important aspect of these discussions is how to balance risks and benefits of biological sciences and technology given their dual use nature. The measures taken to mitigate biological risks should be proportional to the assessed risk and not hamper legitimate peaceful activities including international cooperation. India looks forward to continuing discussions on Codes of Conduct and education and awareness raising to explore ways to achieve further progress under the Convention.* In regard to cooperation and assistance, the statement said that *India continues to attach high importance to the full and effective implementation of Article X of the Convention. We believe that the measures suggested by the Non-Aligned Movement in this regard should be given due consideration. We believe that strengthened implementation of Article III would ensure that the cooperation envisaged under Article X is not abused.*

On national implementation, the statement said that *We have always emphasized the responsibility of States Parties to fully implement their*

*obligations under the Convention and adopt requisite national measures to this end. India has a broad based regulatory framework to prevent the misuse of biological science and technology, including effective export controls matching the highest international standards. We also support assistance to States Parties for strengthening their national systems for bio-safety and bio-security. The statement concluded by noting in regard to CBMs that we wish to underline that our effort should be to look at ways and means to increase the number of States Parties making CBMs submissions. It went on to add that CBMs are an important transparency measures to enhance trust in implementation of the Convention. However, they are not an alternative to an effective multilaterally agreed mechanism for verification of compliance. Only such a mechanism can provide the assurance of observance of compliance obligations by States Parties and act as a deterrence against non-compliance.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that India has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**Mexico** then spoke saying that the changes in the area of the economy, investment, trade, agriculture and human safety, as well as the food crisis and the crisis of science and technology, means that today we need to update the way in which we meet the risks attached to international security and human safety in the area of global security, biosecurity and biocustody. The statement went on to say that it is imperative that, as the States Parties to the Convention, we have legal and political certainty with regards to the enforcement of the BWC provisions and to ensure that we, the States Parties, reject the effects of the use of biological weapons. In regard to the Confidence-Building measures (CBMs), Mexico said that we must review the way in which we submit reports to ensure that the information provided is useful and does generate confidence between States Parties. In this respect, Mexico would like to urge all States Parties that still have not done so to submit a confidence-building measure and to promote dialogue between the parties to identify possible reluctances and obstacles and objections as a result of which States do not submit CBMs. On the basis of our experience, each State needs to have an authority that looks at this and it would be very useful to raise awareness for the various sectors and governmental and non-governmental institutions that are involved in the implementation of the BWC, on its provisions, implications and content, as well as to create a contact base with regards to national networks on the areas that are of competence to the Convention. The statement went on to stress the importance of national implementation and the importance of cooperation and assistance with the purpose of strengthening the capability of responding to and managing crises. The statement concluded by saying that Mexico seeks joint solutions to shared problems and believes that we need to find solutions that contribute towards making progress for the 2016 Review Conference. Furthermore, Mexico urged the States Parties and international organizations and civil society to think carefully about whether the Convention's procedures promote the decision-making process or hamper the decision-making process. The widespread consensus should be seen as an ideal to

which we must aspire. It should not be a rule that is applied as a veto which prevents the effectiveness of multilateral activity.

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Mexico has submitted its CBM in 2013 although this is not available on the public section of the website]

**Switzerland** then spoke saying that *we welcome the efforts of the Presidency to bring more voices to the intersessional process. We also strongly welcome efforts to maximize the efficiency of our work while following the mandate of the Seventh Review Conference.* In regard to CBMs the statement said that *Switzerland attaches particular importance to the Confidence-Building Measures (CBMs) as they represent the essential tool to foster transparency and trust among States Parties to the BWC. The current mechanism is still marked by a number of shortcomings and participation remains low, despite a number of important initiatives during the last five years. Additional measures must be taken to ensure fuller participation and ensure that this mechanism matches expectations. Switzerland is of the view that the number of CBM returns is inextricably linked to the relevance of the information provided in the CBMs. In order to enable fuller participation, we need to address the CBM forms themselves. .... The ultimate goal, in our view, must be to increase the political relevance of the CBM process, which in turn will turn increase participation. We also need to achieve common understanding on how we intend to handle and process the wealth of information submitted by States Parties in a systematic way and how we are going to address any ambiguities, doubts and suspicions in light of Article V's aim towards increased transparency.*

The statement went on to address cooperation and assistance saying that *In our view, strengthening cooperation and assistance is necessary to address the transnational challenges of modern biology.* However, for successful cooperation, *the basic provisions of the Convention have to be implemented at the national level before further cooperation and assistance can be envisaged. Accordingly, the provision of assistance in the area of national implementation may in many instances represent an initial priority.* In regard to advances in science and technology, the statement said that *The dual-use nature of life science research requires thoughtful approaches to maximize benefits and minimize risks of accidents or misuse. In our view, the responsible conduct of research by life scientists sensitized to potential dangers and the dual-use problem will continue to constitute an important implementation measure of the BWC and a crucial element of any way forward to the issue at hand. States Parties to the BWC should do their part to support the promotion of a culture of responsibility and security among life scientists.* The statement concluded by saying that *it is both important and timely to review the fundamental issue of BWC compliance .... We need to address both what constitutes compliance as well as how States Parties can better demonstrate compliance.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Switzerland has submitted its CBM in 2013 and that this is available on the public section of the website]

**Kenya** then spoke saying that they associated themselves fully with the statement made by Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States. The statement went on to outline various steps that Kenya had put in place to strengthen national implementation of the Convention. This included a *Revised Biotechnology Awareness (BioAware) strategy to inform stakeholders of its uses and continuing to train the staffs involved on biosafety and biosecurity issues*. The statement then highlighted some issues that Kenya believes needs to be addressed by developing countries. These include *Improvement on inventories and safe custodies of valuable biological materials; Introduction of curriculum at secondary and institutions of higher learning on biosafety and biosecurity; Establishment of rapid response systems on biosafety and biosecurity issues; Continuous improvement of confidence building measures forms to ensure transparency*.

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Kenya has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**Algeria** then spoke saying they supported the statement made by Iran on behalf of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement. The statement went on to say that Algeria, like many countries, continues to emphasize the importance of promoting the transfer of biotechnologies required for the socio-economic development of developing countries. It noted that at the national level, although Algeria has not yet adopted specific legislation for the implementation of the Convention, the monitoring of the use, exploitation and movement of biological agents are covered by national regulations in force relating to dangerous goods and also through a strict legislative framework for border monitoring. The statement went on to note that Algeria considers the BTWC is an important element in international security. This Convention calls upon States Parties to take necessary measures in order to prevent the use of biology for prohibited purposes. In this connection, a credible verification regime is necessary in order to ensure compliance with commitments undertaken. In addition, the statement noted that the Convention calls for sharing the benefits of progress of biological scientists for all of mankind. In this connection, it is important that the provisions of the Convention relating to the promotion of cooperation and international assistance should be fully implemented. The statement concluded by saying that Algeria hoped that this meeting will reaffirm the value of the Convention as an instrument for international cooperation, for promoting security and socio-economic development.

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Algeria has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**Indonesia** then spoke saying that they associated themselves with the statement made by Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States. The statement went on to note that *a series of BWC awareness workshops and regional events socialization have been and will be conducted in several regions which shows a strong commitment in*

*universalizing the BWC. With 170 states already ratifying this convention, BWC has been acknowledged as a strengthened treaty regime and considered to be one of the most important conventions on disarmament and non-proliferation. Nevertheless, the implementation of the BWC should be an ongoing process for each State Party in order to achieve complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. The statement went on to say that it has become a priority for Indonesia to formulate the draft law on bio-security which does not only emphasize on the implementation of the Convention itself but also on the implementation of World Health Organization based regulations. Noting the importance of complementing the WHO based provisions with BWC provisions, Indonesia sees the merit in enhancing partnership between experts in bio-security/nonproliferation and public health. A closer cooperation between WHO and BWC in order to build an integrated approach on bio-security and bio-safety needs to be undertaken. The statement concluded by saying that Last but not least, the most appropriate method in strengthening the Convention is indeed through multilateral negotiation aimed at concluding a non discriminatory, legally binding agreement, including on verification, dealing with all Articles of the Convention in a balanced and comprehensive manner.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Indonesia has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**Lithuania** then spoke saying that they associated themselves with the statement made by the European Union. The statement went on to say that *We actively support the universalization and national implementation of and full compliance with the Treaty. It then said that It is therefore very timely that we gather here to discuss the themes for this year's Meeting of Experts. Particularly – to focus on international cooperation and support to strengthen national structures and capabilities for preventing, detecting and treatment of infectious human, animal and plant diseases. The statement went on to add that Recognizing the serious threat of bio-terrorism, Lithuania reaffirms her commitment in strengthening bio-security, including by fully implementing relevant international requirements. Lithuania fully adheres to the principle that safety is a precondition for responsible use of bio-technology and stands ready to share our experience in the field.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Lithuania has submitted its CBM in 2013 and that this is available on the public section of the website]

**Madagascar** then spoke saying that they supported the statement made by Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. The statement went on to say that in regard to national implementation, in 2010 Madagascar began the process of drawing up a bill on the implementation of the Convention with the technical support of the NGO VERTIC and joint action of the European Union. However, this process has not been completed because of the crisis persisting in Madagascar preventing it from adopting that legislation to date. The statement went on to add that in regard to confidence-building

measures, Madagascar in 2012 had participated in the confidence-building measures through the submission of its annual report to the ISU. The statement concluded by saying that Madagascar supports the view that the full and effective implementation of the provisions of Article X of the Convention is likely to promote exchanges and interaction among countries.

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Madagascar has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**China** then spoke saying that *With the rapid development of bioscience and biotechnology, non traditional security threats such as bioterrorism and pandemic infectious diseases are increasingly prominent, which brings notable threat to human society. To continue improving the universality and effectiveness of the Convention, promoting the objectives of the Convention in a balanced manner, strengthening the role of the Convention in eliminating threats and preventing proliferation of biological weapons, as well as facilitating the peaceful uses of biotechnology are consistent with the common interests of States Parties.* The statement went on to say that *International cooperation remains one of the prominent pillars of the Convention. It helps enhance the implementation capability of States Parties, and promote healthy and sustainable development of the Convention.* It then added that *Comprehensive grasp of the new trend and tendency of development in bioscience and biosecurity, timely assessment of their impacts on the Convention, as well as sharing experience and practices on biosafety and biosecurity management, are beneficial to the promotion of the effective implementation of the Convention. They also guarantee that bioscience and biotechnology could better benefit mankind, and all kinds of biosafety and biosecurity risks and threats could be effectively responded to.*

The statement continued by saying that *States Parties should continue to be encouraged to strengthen national implementation on a voluntary basis, and in a progressive manner. Meanwhile, it should be noted that the best compliance mechanism under the Convention is to conclude a protocol with a verification regime to enhance the effectiveness of the Convention comprehensively.* In regard to CBMs the statement said that they *are an important means for States Parties to enhance mutual trust. China attaches importance to the CBMs, and has submitted annual CBMs data in a timely manner. The Chinese delegation considers that the low rate of submission is the main challenge to the CBMs mechanism. More States Parties should be encouraged to submit CBMs data.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that China has submitted its CBM in 2013 although this is not available on the public section of the website]

**Cuba** then spoke saying that they fully endorsed the statement made by NAM and other States Parties. The statement went on to say that Cuba attaches great importance to the implementation of the BWC. As a result of this, Cuba has enacted a set of legal instruments whose purpose is to

guarantee the protection of men and women and the environment in the peaceful use of biological agents and toxins. The statement went on to say that Cuba considers that much remains to be done to make progress towards the full effective and non-discriminatory implementation of Article X of the Convention. It then noted that Cuba, like the other members of the NAM and other States Parties to the Convention, is in favour of the resumption of negotiations on a legally binding protocol which would be resting on the basic pillars of the Convention, and that includes assistance and cooperation. The statement went on to say that Cuba reiterated their readiness to cooperate to promote scientific exchange of ideas in the area of biological science and technology, in the area of bio-safety and bio-security, in surveillance and detection of infectious diseases that affect men, women, animals and plants, pursuant to our regional and international development of the peaceful use of biological science and technology.

[The [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc) website shows that Cuba has submitted its CBM in 2013 although this is not available on the public section of the website]

**The Philippines** then spoke saying that they would like to acknowledge the efforts of the Non-Aligned Movement under the chairmanship of Iran to promote wider support and adherence to the BWC. The statement said that *The potential misuse of biological, chemical and nuclear assets, continue to pose a grave threat to international peace and security thus the need for a harmonized response by the international community.* It went on to add that *most recently, the country was accepted to the Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and other Material of Mass Destruction (GP) and had begun participating in its activities. The Philippines is in fact the first Southeast Asia country to join the GP and hopes others will follow suit.* It then went on to note that *To advance the implementation of the BWC at the regional level the Philippines spearheaded, in partnership with Australia and United States, the organization of a series of workshops within the framework of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) on the themes of Biological Threat Reduction, Biorisk Management, Disease Surveillance and Detection, Preparedness and response from 2009 to 2012.* A number of other international meetings and initiatives are also mentioned. The statement goes on to say that *The Philippines supports developing closer synergies of effort between the BWC and WHO communities, and appreciated the WHO's invitation to participate in the WHO Informal Consultation on Dual Use Research of Concern in Geneva on 26 – 29 February 2013. The Philippines Department of Foreign Affairs is consulting with the WHO's regional office for the Western Pacific in Manila along with our other BWC stakeholders in advancing this effort.* The statement then goes on to set out a list of initiatives and projects that the Department of Health has launched in advancing the thrust of the BWC. It then concludes by saying that *the Philippines is of the view that it is of utmost importance to foster closer collaboration and synergy between states and international organizations such as INTERPOL, World Customs Organization, World Health Organization, World Organization for Animal Health and Food and Agriculture Organization as biosecurity and biosafety are cross-cutting issues that*

*necessitate a holistic response through the strengthening of international linkages.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that the Philippines has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**Benin** then spoke saying that they associated themselves with the statement made by Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. The statement went on to say that Benin would like to reaffirm the importance of promoting technical assistance activities and also the importance of international cooperation activities. They also wanted to emphasize the importance of strengthening institutional and human capacity for the implementation of the Convention. The statement went on to add that it is particularly important to promote information activities and initiatives, education and communication activities together with scientific and technical research and the development of regulations and legislation for the surveillance, monitoring and implementation of measures and also the need for measures to apply sanctions for any failings. The statement concluded by saying that Benin would ask for technical assistance and cooperation from international and regional institutions and from countries involved in the follow-up and implementation activities under this Convention.

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Benin has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**Ecuador** then spoke saying that they would also like to endorse what was said by Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. The statement went on to say that their political constitution prohibits the development, production, possession, trade, importation, transport, stockpiling and the use of the following: chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, highly toxic persistent organic pollutants, internationally prohibited agrochemicals, harmful experimental biological agents and technologies, as well as genetically modified organisms that are harmful to human health or that infringe upon food security or the security of ecosystems. The statement also noted that Ecuador has strict biosecurity standards for modern biotechnology and for the use and testing and trading of its products. The statement went on to say that Ecuador had recently appointed a national implementation authority for the BWC and that they had recently submitted their confidence building measures report for 2012.

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Ecuador has submitted its CBM in 2013 although this is not available on the public section of the website]

**Ghana** then spoke saying that Ghana aligns itself with the statement made by Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. The statement went on to say that *Over the years, our bio-science community has benefited from the support extended to them by some States Parties to the Convention including the provision of infrastructure such as state of the art laboratories and training in advanced bio-science. Indeed, we have received some offers*



*of support from the European Union and other States Parties and they are being considered positively. We have also received a copy of a survey report compiled by VERTIC, the United Kingdom not-for-profit NGO. This important document contains a very detailed examination of the laws of Ghana that relate to the Convention and indicates the shortfalls, drawing our attention to which legal provisions are lacking in our legislature. The statement went on to say that Ghana remains convinced of the importance of Article X. and added that Ghana recommends a continuous dialogue and collaborative initiatives between developed and developing States Parties and regions to assist the latter in improving their national and regional capabilities to detect, diagnose and combat infectious diseases as well as other possible biological threats and integrate these into national and/or regional emergency and disaster management plans.*

[The unog.ch/bwc website shows that Ghana has not submitted a CBM in 2013]

**The European Union** then spoke saying that the following countries align themselves with this statement: Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Iceland, Serbia, Albania, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia and Georgia. The statement went on to say that *The EU actively promotes the universality, national implementation and full compliance with the Convention. While recognizing that there is currently no consensus on verification – which remains a central element of a complete and effective disarmament and non-proliferation regime - the EU is willing to work towards identifying options that could achieve similar goals. For us, national implementation is also an issue of great importance. This new intersessional process offers the opportunity to consider ways and means, including innovative approaches, to enhance national implementation through voluntary exchanges of information and the sharing of best practices among State parties.* The statement went on to say in regard to CBMs that *We noted that the discussion on CBMs last year was not as far reaching as it could have been. CBMs remain an important instrument to promote the purpose of the BTWC. We hope that this year, we will have more substantive discussions on some more fundamental questions on the purpose of CBMs, as these too have a bearing on the level and nature of annual participation.* The statement also said that *The European Union through its WMD Strategy, its previous Joint Actions and the new Council Decision of July 2012, currently under implementation, ensures continued support and financial contribution to increase adherence to and promotion of the implementation of the BTWC. A new Council decision to further support WHO activities in the areas of laboratory biosafety and biosecurity is in progress. The EU has also launched the CBRN Centres of Excellence initiative which aims at enhancing the institutional capacity of partner countries to mitigate CBRN risks, whether they are criminal, accidental or natural in origin.* The statement concluded by saying that *We believe that the Meetings of Experts offer the opportunity for in-depth technical discussions and that we should make good use of them. We would like therefore to support your approach to maximize efficiency and provide for one day discussions to address the standing agenda items,*

*linking them also more to the side events which can ensure high quality expertise on important scientific issues.*

This completed the morning session with the Chair saying that she would not rush to take the NGO statements before lunch and that these would be taken at the start of the afternoon session before moving to the formal session on Agenda item

After the statement by the European Union the formal meeting was suspended and resumed with the Chairman remaining in the chair to hear statements – which are available at [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc) – from seven NGOs. The first NGO statement was made at 12.50 pm and then the Chair said that she would not rush to take the remaining NGO statements before lunch but would taken them at the start of the afternoon session. The formal session was then resumed to enable the Secretary, Richard Lennane, to announce that there would be a side event by King’s College, London, entitled *Hard to Prove* in Salle XXIII. The first statement was taken before lunch and the remainder were taken at the start of the afternoon session before moving to the formal session on Agenda item 8 on *How to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-Building Measures (CBMs)*.

The afternoon session opened with the Chair saying that a request had been received from Israel for observer status. This was agreed. The Chair then resumed the informal session to hear the remaining six NGO statements. In total, the following NGOs spoke

- a. **The University of Bradford.** Graham S Pearson.
- b. **The University of London.** Filippa Lentzos
- c. **International Network of Engineers and Scientists.** Kathryn Nixdorff.
- d. **[Landau Network Centro Volta & Bradford Disarmament Research Centre.](#)** Tatyana Novossiolo
- e. **VERTIC.** Bilqees Esmail.
- f. **Pax Christi International.** Trevor Griffiths.
- g. **Biosecurity Working Group of the InterAcademy Panel on International Issues.** Ryszard Słomski

The Chairman then thanked the NGOs who had made statements for their constructive comments and thanked the NGOs for their support. The meeting then went on to consider Agenda item 8 the *Biennial Item: how to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-Building Measures*.

**In addition, it should be noted that, as at the Sixth and Seventh Review Conferences in 2006 and 2011 respectively and at the Meeting of Experts 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 and the Meeting of States Parties 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, Richard Guthrie in association with the BioWeapons**

**Prevention Project provided daily reports on the Meeting of Experts that were made available in hard copy to the delegations as well as electronically. These reports are available at [http:// www.bwpp.org/reports.html](http://www.bwpp.org/reports.html). Side Events**

During the Meeting of Experts there were side events at lunchtime each day from Monday to Wednesday, an evening event on Monday 12 August 2013 as well as breakfast events at 09.00 am each day from Tuesday 13 to Thursday 15 August.

The first lunchtime event on **Monday 12 August** was organized by King's College London entitled *Hard to Prove: Compliance with the Biological Weapons Convention*. The presentations made are available at [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc) and were the following:

- Dr. Filippa Lentzos, King's College London: [\*Policy Brief: Hard to prove\*](#)
- Dr. Susan Martin, King's College London: [\*Compliance from the bottom up: Building compliance capacity\*](#)
- Professor Wyn Bowen, King's College London: [\*The BWC and compliance: Reading across from nuclear\*](#)
- Emeritus Reader Nicholas Sims, London School of Economics: [\*A new forum for sharing implementation experience and enhancing compliance assurance\*](#)

The second side event was a Poster Session held outside the MX/2013 Conference Room (Salle XIX) following the afternoon session on Monday 12 August. Posters were exhibited by the following:

- UNODA *27 - 29 May 2013 Kyiv Regional Workshop of National Implementation for Eastern Europe*
- Ukrainian Biosafety Association
- University of Bradford *Biosecurity Education: Active Learning*
- University of Bradford *Biosecurity Education: Student Poster 1: Dual Use*
- University of Bradford *Biosecurity Education: Student Poster 1: Dual Use*
- FBI/CDC *Key Biosecurity Related Changes made to US Select Agent Regulations*
- US DOD *The Suite for Automated Global Electronic Biosurveillance (SAGEB)*
- Korean Biotech Industry *National Implementation of the BWC in the Republic of Korea*
- Research Group for Biological Arms Control at the University of Hamburg

The third side event on the morning of **Tuesday 13 August** from 9.00 to 10.00 am was entitled [\*Dual Use Education\*](#) and organized by the University of Bradford, US National Academies of Science, and the Landau Network –

Centro Volta. The presentations made are available at [un.org.ch/bwc](http://un.org.ch/bwc) and were the following:

- Ambassador Urs Schmid of Switzerland, Chairman, [Remarks](#)
- [Effective and Sustainable Biosecurity Education for those in the Life Sciences: The Benefits of Active Learning](#), Tatyana Novossiolova, University of Bradford
- [Neuroscience Dual-Use Education Network](#), Gerald Walther, University of Bradford,
- [Recent Activities by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences](#), Jo Husbands, U.S. National Academy of Sciences
- [UNSC Resolution 1540 and Biosecurity Education for Life Scientists](#), Dana Perkins, Group of Experts, UN Security Council 1540 Committee

The fourth side event was at lunchtime on Tuesday 13 August and was entitled *Mini-university* and presented by the Geneva Forum.

The fifth side event on the morning of **Wednesday 14 August** from 9.00 to 10.00 am was entitled *Dealing with Dual Use Research of Concern* and presented by the Indonesian Academy of Sciences & Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences

The sixth side event was at lunchtime on Wednesday 14 August and was entitled *Convergence of biology and chemistry and opportunities for outreach and education* and presented by the OPCW and BWC ISU. The presentations made are available at [un.org.ch/bwc](http://un.org.ch/bwc) and were the following:

- [Convergence of biology and chemistry and opportunities for outreach and education](#) - Piers Millett, BWC ISU
- [On the convergence of chemistry and biology](#) - Stephan Mogl, OPCW SAB TWG on Convergence of biology and chemistry
- [Project in education and outreach relevant to the CWC: Pilot project in Argentina](#) - Alejandra G. Suárez, OPCW SAB TWG on Education and Outreach

The seventh and final side event on the morning of **Thursday 15 August** from 9.00 to 10.00 am was entitled *International Assistance for Public Health Emergencies* and presented by the United States of America.

### **Biennial Item: how to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-Building Measures**

This item was first addressed on the Monday afternoon 12 August 2013. Statements or interventions were made by Iran (on behalf of the Non-aligned Movement), United Kingdom, Canada, South Africa, United States, ISU, Brazil, Germany, India, Mexico, Kenya, Netherlands, Cuba, Pakistan, Switzerland, Belarus and Australia, with some States Parties taking the floor more than once. The United Kingdom in its statement introduced Working Paper No. 3 entitled *Confidence-building Measures: next steps to enable*

*fuller participation*, Canada introduced its Working Paper No. 7 entitled *Improving participation in the Confidence-Building Measure system*, South Africa introduced its Working Paper No. 10 entitled *Implementation of the BTWC in South Africa* containing a section on CBMs, Switzerland introduced its Working Paper No. 13 entitled *Confidence-Building Measures: enabling fuller participation* and the United States its Working Paper No. 9 entitled *Making the most of the Confidence-building Measures*. Only the statement made by Iran on behalf of the NAM is available at [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc)

The Chair closed the session thanking participants for the honest and straightforward points that they had made and noted that they would return to consider this topic further on Thursday evening/Friday morning. She said that this concluded the formal work for Monday 12 August and that there would now be a poster session and the formal session would resume on Tuesday morning at 10.00 am with consideration of Agenda item 5 on *Cooperation and assistance*. The Secretary then noted that there was a poster session immediately after this meeting and that there would be a side event at 9.00 am on Tuesday entitled *Dual-use Education* in Salle XXIII.

### **Standing Agenda item on Cooperation and Assistance**

Consideration of this Standing Agenda item commenced on the Tuesday morning with some general statements on the overall topic by Iran on behalf of the NAM, Brazil, France, Cuba, United States, the European Union, India and Australia. Only the statement made by Iran on behalf of the NAM is available at [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc) although the statement made by the European Union is available at [http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/un\\_geneva/documents/eu\\_statments/conference\\_disarmament/20130813\\_eu\\_stmt\\_article\\_x\\_final.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/un_geneva/documents/eu_statments/conference_disarmament/20130813_eu_stmt_article_x_final.pdf).

The meeting then moved on to consider the first sub-topic on *Reports by States Parties on their implementation of Article X, and reports by the ISU on the operation of the database system to facilitate assistance requests and offers* with statements and interventions being made by the ISU, United States, Georgia, Germany, Russia, Mongolia, United Kingdom, South Africa, Malaysia, India, Iran on behalf of the NAM and Pakistan. The ISU reported on the operation of the Article X database that was established following the decision at the Seventh Review Conference. The database currently contains 23 offers of various types of assistance from 5 States Parties, but only 2 requests for assistance from 2 States Parties, one of which has now been partially fulfilled. It was reported that the offers of assistance cover a wide range of issues and it was rather disappointing that there had been a small number of requests for assistance. It was recognised that now the database exists, it is possible that States Parties contact each other directly in which case the ISU would be unaware of any such approaches or cooperation. It was also noted that the database is located in the restricted area of the ISU website. One State Party suggested that the database should be moved to the public area of the ISU website as the Review Conference had not decided that it should be posted in the restricted area. The point was made that the establishment of this database was one of the more significant

outcomes of the Seventh Review Conference and it would be good to see this working well.

The meeting then moved on to consider the second sub-topic on *Challenges and obstacles in developing international cooperation, assistance and exchange in the biological sciences and technology, including equipment and material, for peaceful purposes to their full potential, and possible means of overcoming these* with statements and interventions being made by the ISU, World Health Organization (WHO), United States, India and Canada. The ISU introduced their background information paper, BWC/MSP/2013/MX/INF. 2 entitled *Challenges and obstacles to developing international cooperation, assistance and exchange*. This paper provides an overview of some of the specific challenges and obstacles to developing international cooperation, assistance and exchange that have been identified by States Parties and international organizations in the course of meetings of the Convention and in other relevant settings. One section of INF. 2 sets out *Challenges and obstacles identified in synthesis papers* prepared in 2009 and 2010.

**[Comment:** It seems strange that INF. 2 for completeness does not include the section in the synthesis paper for 2012 (MSP/2012/L.1) which is entitled *C. Challenges and obstacles to developing international cooperation, assistance and exchange in the biological sciences and technology*]

The meeting then moved on to consider the third sub-topic on *A range of specific measures for the full and comprehensive implementation of Article X taking into account all of its provisions, including facilitation of cooperation and assistance, including in terms of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for peaceful purposes, and identification of critical gaps and needs in these areas* with statements and interventions being made by WHO, China, United States, Iraq and United Kingdom. Much attention was given to the outbreaks of MERS (Middle East Respiratory Syndrome) and H7N9 influenza.

The meeting then moved on to consider the fourth sub-topic on *Ways and means to target and mobilize resources, including financial resources, to address gaps and needs for assistance and cooperation, in particular from developed to developing States Parties*. However, no delegations asked to speak on this.

The meeting then considered the fifth sub-topic on *Education, training, exchange and twinning programmes and other means of developing human resources in the biological sciences and technology relevant to the implementation of the Convention, particularly in developing countries* with a presentation being given on a laboratory twinning between the United Kingdom and Turkey and a statement was made by Germany.

The meeting then considered the sixth sub-topic on *Capacity-building, through international cooperation, in biosafety and biosecurity, and for*

*detecting, reporting, and responding to outbreaks of infectious disease or biological weapons attacks, including in the areas of preparedness, response, and crisis management and mitigation* with statements and interventions being made by Mongolia, WHO, Lithuania, United States and World Organization for Animal Health/OIE. The WHO made a statement about a 6-year plan to promote biosafety and the OIE about the elimination of the animal disease rinderpest.

The following statements and presentations made on Tuesday 13 August 2013 relating to this Standing Agenda Item are available on the [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc) website:

- [Iran \(Islamic Republic of\) on behalf of the Group of NAM and Other States](#)
- [World Health Organization](#) (Promoting Access to Medical Innovation: Intersections between Public Health, Intellectual Property and Trade)
- World Health Organization ([MERS](#) and [Avian Influenza](#))
- [China](#) (Response to Human Infection with Avian Influenza A(H7N9) Virus)
- [China](#) (Emergency Response to the Animal H7N9 in China)
- [United States of America](#) (Influenza Diagnostics Development and Distribution: Responding to Emerging Threats)
- [United Kingdom](#) (OIE Laboratory Twinning on Brucellosis)
- [World Organization for Animal Health](#) (Rinderpest)

As the consideration of this Standing Agenda Item was incomplete at the end of Tuesday, the Chair said that consideration would continue on Wednesday morning. On the Wednesday morning consideration was given to the seventh topic on *Coordination of cooperation with other relevant international and regional organizations and other relevant stakeholders* with statements and interventions by the International Federation of Biosafety Associations (which participated as a guest of the meeting), United Kingdom, United States of America, Switzerland & Iraq, Kenya, Iran, Belgium and Germany. The following statements and presentations made on Wednesday 14 August 2013 relating to this Standing Agenda Item are available on the [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc) website:

- [International Federation of Biosafety Associations](#) (Supporting Implementation of the Biological Weapons Convention)
- [Iraq](#) (Experience Exchange Between Switzerland and Iraq)
- Kenya (Capacity building through international cooperation in biosafety and biosecurity)

During the consideration of this Standing Agenda Item, three Working Papers were introduced: WP. 6 entitled *Identifying and addressing barriers to the emergency sharing of international public health and medical assistance* by the United States, WP. 8 entitled *Advances in science and technology: Vaccine development* by the United Kingdom, WP. 14 entitled *Efforts of China in response to the epidemic of H7N9 avian influenza* by China, WP. 15

entitled *International assistance and cooperation and its role in the implementation of the Convention* by Iraq, and WP. 17 entitled *Measures for full, effective and non-discriminatory Implementation of the Article X* by Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

### **Standing Agenda Item on Science and Technology**

The Chair then moved on to consideration of the Standing Agenda Item on *Developments in the field of science and technology related to the Convention* with some general statements on the overall topic by Iran (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Brazil, Cuba, Pakistan, India and China. The statement made by Iran on behalf of the NAM is available at [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc)

The meeting then moved on to consideration of the first – *New science and technology developments that have potential for uses contrary to the provisions of the Convention* – and second sub-topics – *New science and technology developments that have potential benefits for the Convention, including those of special relevance to disease surveillance, diagnosis and mitigation* – together. Statements and interventions were made by the ISU, Ukraine, Australia, India, Sanofi (which participated as a guest of the meeting), United Kingdom, Nanbiosys (which participated as a guest of the meeting), Spain, South Africa, Hungary, Republic of Korea and the United States. The ISU introduced the background paper, BWC/MSP/2013/MX/INF. 1 entitled *Advances in science and technology related to the Convention*. This paper expanded upon and updated the background information document on scientific and technology that have potential benefits for the Convention prepared for the 2012 Meeting of Experts (BWC/MSP/2012/MX/INF.3), and updates the overview of advances in enabling technologies provided to the 2012 Meeting of Experts (BWC/MSP/2012/MX/INF.1). The paper also outlines the arrangements made by the Implementation Support Unit to make available to States Parties as much information as possible on relevant advances in science and technology. These arrangements are that:

*The ISU has updated the relevant section of the BWC website to accommodate information on relevant advances in science and technology ([www.unog.ch/bwc/science](http://www.unog.ch/bwc/science)). These pages have been structured to present relevant advances in a similar format to this paper, background information provided to the 2012 Meeting of Experts and the Seventh Review Conference.*

During this session, the United Kingdom introduced its Working Paper WP. 8 entitled *Advances in science and technology: Vaccine development*, South Africa its Working Paper WP.11 entitled *Advances in laboratory diagnostics, point of care detection, pathogen characterisation and potential benefits to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention* and the United States its Working Papers WP.5 entitled *Developments in science and technology – diagnostics* and WP. 6 entitled *Identifying and addressing barriers to the emergency sharing of international public health and medical assistance*.



The meeting then moved on to consideration of the third – *Possible measures for strengthening national biological risk management, as appropriate, in research and development involving new science and technology developments of relevance to the Convention* – and fourth sub-topics – *Voluntary codes of conduct and other measures to encourage responsible conduct by scientists, academia and industry* – together. Statements and interventions were made by WHO, Netherlands, Iran (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), United States, Simon Wain-Hobson (who participated as a guest of the meeting), United Kingdom, France, Japan, Australia, Spain and Indonesia.

The following statements and presentations made on Wednesday 14 August 2013 relating to this Standing Agenda Item are available on the [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc) website:

- [Iran \(Islamic Republic of\) on behalf of the Group of NAM and Other States](#)
- [Sanofi](#) (The Semi-Synthetic Artemisinin Project\_Industrialization of a Synthetic Biology derived product)
- Nanobiosys (Application of LabChip System for Quantitative Detection of Biological Pathogens)
- [Republic of Korea](#) (Biosecurity System for\_ Livestock Disease Control)
- [Poland](#) (Advances in technologies for detection of infectious diseases)
- [World Health Organization](#) (WHO 2013 Informal Consultation on Dual-Use Research of Concern)
- Prof. Wain-Hobson - [One Small Step for Science, One Giant Risk for Mankind](#)
- [France](#) (Synthetic Biology Observatory)
- [Japan](#) (Code of Conduct for Scientists – Recent Activities of Science Council of Japan)

As the consideration of this Standing Agenda Item was incomplete at the end of Wednesday, the Chair said that consideration would continue on Thursday morning. On the Thursday 15 August 2013 morning consideration was given to the remaining three topics:

- *Education and awareness-raising about risks and benefits of life sciences and biotechnology*
- *Science- and technology-related developments relevant to the activities of multilateral organizations such as the WHO, OIE, FAO, IPPC and OPCW*
- *Any other science and technology developments of relevance to the Convention*

These were actually taken so that the second item was considered first, then the first item and finally the third item. Three connected presentations (available at [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc)) described the operation of the Scientific Advisory

Board (SAB) of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and of two of the Board's Temporary Working Groups on the subjects of Convergence of Chemistry and Biology and on Education and Outreach. Statements and interventions were made by Ukraine, United Kingdom, Australia, Switzerland, India and Germany.

### **Standing Agenda Item on Strengthening National Implementation**

The Chair then moved on to consideration of the Standing Agenda Item on *Strengthening national implementation* with some general statements on the overall topic by Iran (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), France, Germany, Mexico, Cuba, Colombia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Benin, Switzerland, Spain, India, Netherlands, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Russia, the United States and the Republic of Korea. The statement made by Iran on behalf of the NAM and that made by Switzerland are available at [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc). In this session, France introduced its WP. 16 entitled *National implementation assessment report of the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC)* and the United States its WP. 4 entitled *Key biosecurity-related changes made to the USA select agent regulations*.

The meeting then moved on to consideration of the first sub-topic *A range of specific measures for the full and comprehensive implementation of the Convention, especially Articles III and IV*. Statements and interventions were made by the ISU, Sweden, Chile and Japan. The ISU noted that the European Union Joint Action is funding the preparation of a comprehensive guidance brochure providing:

- An overview of the obligations of the States Parties of the BWC;
- A coverage of national measures for full and comprehensive implementation of the BWC;
- A toolkit of implementation measures and examples of best practices.

Consideration was then given to the second sub-topic *Ways and means to enhance national implementation, sharing best practices and experiences, including the voluntary exchange of information among States Parties on their national implementation, enforcement of national legislation, strengthening of national institutions and coordination among national law enforcement institutions*. Statements and interventions were made by the 1540 Committee, Iraq, Mongolia, VERTIC (who participated as a guest of the meeting), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Interpol, United Kingdom and South Africa.

The meeting then moved on to consider the third sub-topic *Regional and sub-regional cooperation that can assist national implementation of the Convention*. However, no delegations asked to speak on this.

The meeting then moved on to consider the fourth sub-topic *National, regional and international measures to improve laboratory biosafety and security of pathogens and toxins* when a presentation was made by Canada.

The meeting then moved on to consider the fifth and final sub-topic *Any potential further measures, as appropriate, relevant for implementation of the Convention* when statements and interventions were made by Australia, Iran, King's College London, Canada, United States, Germany and Japan. The intervention by King's College, London was notable as it was the first made by someone speaking as an NGO, rather than as a guest of the meeting, during a formal working session. It arose as Australia had made a specific reference to the side event on Monday 12 August 2013 at lunchtime organised by King's College, London entitled *Hard to Prove: Compliance with the Biological Weapons Convention* making it entirely logical for the representative from KCL to provide further detail. Before giving the floor to the NGO, the Chair asked the meeting whether there was any objection to this and there was none.

As discussion of this topic was not completed on the afternoon of Thursday 15 August 2013, the Chair said that discussion would continue on the morning of Friday 16 August 2013.

Consequently, on the morning of Friday 16 August 2013, discussion on the fifth and final sub-topic continued with statements and interventions made by France, Denmark, Switzerland, United Kingdom and Sweden.

During the sessions on this Standing Agenda Item, Australia introduced WP. 2 entitled *BWC compliance – a conceptual discussion: preliminary views by Australia*, Japan introduced WP. 18 entitled *Preliminary views on the paper entitled "We need to talk about compliance"*, Switzerland introduced WP. 12 entitled *Compliance with the BWC: preliminary considerations by Switzerland*, and the United Kingdom introduced WP. 1 entitled *We need to talk about compliance: A response to BWC/MSP/2012/WP.11*.

The following statements and presentations made relating to this Standing Agenda Item on strengthening national implementation are available on the [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc) website:

- Chile (Implementation of the Biological Weapons Convention through Phito - Zoosanitary Control)
- UNSCR 1540 (synergy in the area of non-proliferation and international cooperation for peaceful purposes)
- VERTIC (Strengthening National Implementation of the BWC)
- INTERPOL (BioTerrorism Prevention Unit)
- Australia (Demonstrating Compliance with National Implementation Obligations)
- Japan (Strengthening National Implementation)
- Switzerland (Strengthening national implementation: Compliance)

## **Biennial Item: how to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-Building Measures**

The meeting then returned to the consideration of the biennial item *how to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-Building Measures* which had first been considered on the afternoon of Monday 12 August 2013. Statements and interventions were made by Japan, United States, Malaysia, United Kingdom and Ecuador. The statement made by Japan is available at [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc).

## **Closing Session: Adoption of the factual report reflecting the deliberations of the meeting**

The Chair invited any delegations that wished to do so make concluding remarks. Russia, India, United States, Australia, Iran (on behalf of the NAM), United Kingdom and Ghana made such remarks. The meeting was then adjourned briefly for some final items for incorporation in Annex I to the report of the meeting listing *considerations, lessons, perspectives, recommendations, conclusions and proposals drawn from the presentations, statements, working papers and interventions on the topics under discussion at the Meeting* to be prepared.

The meeting then considered the following material:

- a. BWC/MSP/2013/MX/CRP.1 *Draft elements for the compilation of the considerations, lessons, perspectives, recommendations, conclusions and proposals drawn from the presentations, statements, working papers and interventions on the topics under discussion at the Meeting* [This covers material presented until 18.00 on Wednesday 14 August 2013]
- b. BWC/MSP/2013/MX/CRP.2 *Draft report of the Meeting of Experts*
- c. BWC/MSP/2013/MX/CRP. 3 *Draft elements for the compilation of the considerations, lessons, perspectives, recommendations, conclusions and proposals drawn from the presentations, statements, working papers and interventions on the topics under discussion at the Meeting* [This covers material presented until 18.00 on Thursday 15 August 2013]
- d. Advance Friday-AM.pdf *Draft elements for the compilation of the considerations, lessons, perspectives, recommendations, conclusions and proposals drawn from the presentations, statements, working papers and interventions on the topics under discussion at the Meeting* [This covers material presented up until the close of the meeting on Friday 16 August 2013]

[It should be noted that whilst all four of these documents appeared on the [unog.ch/bwc](http://unog.ch/bwc) website prior to the final report BWC/MSP/2013/MX/3 becoming available, only the first two are listed in Annex II to the Report of

the Meeting of Experts and only the first two are now available on the unog.ch/bwc website]

The report of the meeting was quickly adopted as it is a factual report of the meeting and Annex I to the report is a paper prepared by the Chair, under her own responsibility and initiative, which lists considerations, lessons, perspectives, recommendations, conclusions and proposals drawn from the presentations, statements, working papers and interventions on the agenda items under discussion at the Meeting. This paper is not agreed and has no status. It was the Chair's view that the paper could assist delegations in their preparations for the Meeting of States Parties in December 2013 and in its consideration of how best to *discuss, and promote common understanding and effective action* on the topics in accordance with the decision of the Seventh Review Conference.

The Chair then closed the meeting noting that the meeting had been *focused, positive and constructive*. She recalled that her aim had been to 'bring in more voices' and she welcomed the broader participation during the Meeting of Experts. The Meeting of Experts was closed at about 12.30 at the end of the morning session.

## **Outcome of the Meeting of Experts**

During the Meeting of Experts, 18 Working Papers (1 more than at MX/2012) were submitted by 10 States Parties and 1 on behalf of a group of States Parties (NAM) with the numbers submitted by individual States Parties ranging from one to four: Australia (2), Canada (7), China (14), France (16), Iran (NAM) (17), Iraq (15), Japan (18), South Africa (10, 11), Switzerland (12, 13), United Kingdom (1, 3, 8) and United States (4, 5, 6, 9). These papers related to the Standing Agenda item on cooperation and assistance - WP. 15 (Iraq), WP. 17 (Iran(NAM)) - to the Standing Agenda item on developments in science and technology - WP. 5 (USA), WP. 6 (USA), WP. 8 (UK), WP. 11 (South Africa), WP. 14 (China) - to the Standing Agenda item on strengthening national implementation - WP. 1 (UK), WP. 2 (Australia), WP.4 (USA), WP. 10 (South Africa), WP. 12 (Switzerland), WP.16 (France), WP.18 (Japan) - and to the biennial item on how to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-Building measures - WP. 3 (UK), Canada (WP. 7), WP. 9 (USA), WP. 13 (Switzerland). As at MX/2012 there were Working Papers submitted by 10 States Parties and one on behalf of a group of States Parties. A notable difference was that, unlike MX/2012 when the Russian Federation, one of the three co-Depositaries along with the United Kingdom and the United States, submitted 4 Working Papers, none were submitted by the Russian Federation at MX/2013.

As noted above, on the Thursday morning and on Friday morning and again towards the close of the meeting, preliminary compilations (CRP.1, CRP. 3 and Advance Fri-AM) of the proposals made at the Meeting of Experts was circulated. An updated version was subsequently issued as Annex 1 to the report of the meeting (MX.3). These were helpfully grouped under subheadings.

These subheadings essentially follow the proposals made in the Chair's letter of 28 June and promulgated as the provisional programme of work in MSP/2013/MX/2. There are two variations to the subheadings in Annex I. First, in regard to the Standing Agenda Item on Cooperation and Assistance, there is no section with the subheading of the first sub-topic discussed under this Standing Agenda Item:

*Reports by States Parties on their implementation of Article X, and reports by the ISU on the operation of the database system to facilitate assistance requests and offers;*

This followed the practice that appears to have been followed at MX/2012 when the same divergence from the sub-topics listed in the provisional programme of work in MSP/2012/MX/2/Rev. 1 occurred. The second variation was in regard to the Standing Agenda Item on National Implementation where there is no section with the subheading of the third sub-topic discussed under this Standing Agenda item:

*Regional and sub-regional cooperation that can assist national implementation of the Convention;*

This variation is due to the fact that no States Parties wished to speak to this sub-topic during the Meeting of Experts.

An analysis of the proposals in the tabulation below shows that they came from 33 States Parties, 4 international organizations and 3 guests of the meeting (this is an improvement compared to MX/2012 when proposals were recorded from 30 States Parties, 2 international organizations and 2 guests of the meeting). The largest number of proposals came from the United States (88 proposals). Other major contributors were the United Kingdom (58), Iran (on behalf of the NAM) (45), Switzerland (37), India (23), Germany (16), Canada (14), Australia (12), Japan (12), Russia (11) and South Africa (10). From the eight intergovernmental organizations, proposals came from four: WHO (5), SCR 1540 Committee (2), ICRC (1) and EU (1) – none came from the FAO, INTERPOL, OPCW, or the OIE. From the seven guests of the meeting, proposals came from three: VERTIC (3), SANOFI (2) and Wain Hobson (1) – none came from the International Federation of Biosafety Associations (IFBA), the Developing Countries Vaccines Manufacturers Network (DCVMN), Nanabiosys, or Dr. Cheng Zhu. In the tabulation below the numbers of proposals made by each State Party are shown for each of the six subheadings for cooperation and analysis (C &A), of the seven subheadings for science and technology (S & T), of the four subheadings for national implementation (NI) and for the biennial topic on Confidence Building Measures (CBMs).

It is to be regretted that despite the Chair's request for more voices, there are **no** proposals recorded for four guests of the meeting or for four of the international organizations present.

State Party	C&A	C&A	C&A	C&A	C&A	C&A	S & T	S & T	S & T	S & T	S & T	S & T	S & T	S & T	NI	NI	NI	NI	CBM	Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	4	5			
Algeria	2																			2
Australia			1				2					2					6		1	12
Belarus																			2	2
Belgium																			1	1
Benin															2				2	4
Brazil	1						1		1	1	1								4	9
Canada	5		1														1		7	14
China	2		1		1										2			1	1	8
Cuba	3																		1	4
Denmark																		1		1
Ecuador																			1	1
France			1						1							4				6
Germany																4			12	16
India	5	4					2			3		1		1				2	5	23
Indonesia						1				4						2		1		8
Iran																			1	1
Iran (NAM)	9		3	5	6	1	6	2		2					7				4	45

Iraq					1														1
Japan										1	1		1				7	2	12
Kenya		1																1	2
Malaysia		2			1	2			1					1				1	8
Mexico			2											1				3	6
Mongolia															1	1			2
Pakistan					1		1											1	3
Philippines					1	1													2
Poland								4											4
Russian Fedn		3			3	2			1					1	1				11
South Africa								9										2	11
Sweden															1				1
Switzerland		1							1			3	1	1	4		6	20	37
Ukraine												1	1						2
UK	2	1		2	5		3	15	1			2		1			4	22	58
USA	8	1	2	1	4	1	2	19						3	7	10	2	28	88
Total (No. of States P)	37 (9)	14 (7)	10 (7)	8 (3)	23 (9)	8 (6)	17 (7)	49 (5)	6 (6)	11 (5)	2 (2)	9 (5)	3 (3)	10 (7)	34 (11)	12 (3)	30 (9)	123 (22)	406 (33)



EU		1																	1	
1540 Committee						2														2
ICRC														1						1
WHO					4				1											5
																				415
Sanofi								2												2
VERTIC														2	1					3
Wain Hobson									1											1
																				421

A comparison of the proposals that appeared in Annex I to BWC/MSP/2013/MX/3 and those included in CRP. 1, CRP. 3 and Advance Friday-AM.pdf shows which States Parties took advantage of the opportunity provided between the end of the Meeting of Experts on Friday 16 August 2013 and the completion a few days later of BWC/MSP/2013/MX/3, which has a date of 11 September 2013, to make modifications to the proposals attributed to them. These were Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, Germany, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iran (on behalf of the NAM), Japan, Pakistan, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, and the United States – some 15 of the 33 States Parties making proposals.

A comparison of the proposals that appeared in Annex I of BWC/MSP/2013/MX/3 and the corresponding number that appeared in 2012 in Annex I to BWC/MSP/2012/MX/3 shows that the number of proposals made in 2013 of 406 from 33 States Parties is better than the 339 proposals made in 2012 from 30 States Parties so that the Chair's campaign to 'bring in more voices' succeeded at least in so far as the States Parties were concerned. In regard to the international organizations, the number of proposals recorded in Annex I in 2013 was 9 from four international organizations (EU, ICRC, WHO and the 1540 Committee) compared to 6 in 2012 from two international organizations (OIE, OPCW). And for guests of the meeting, 6 proposals were made in 2013 by three of the seven guests of the meeting compared to 9 from two of the six guests of the meeting in 2012.

As in previous years, the Chair has said that, for the Meeting of States Parties, she will create a synthesis paper that distills the essence of the many ideas and proposals contained in Annex I to the report of the Meeting of Experts. As the Meeting of Experts considered three Standing Agenda items and also a biennial topic (on CBMs) which will not be considered further in the formal Intersessional Process, attention needs to be given at the Meeting of States Parties as to what common understandings and effective action should be agreed in regard to the biennial topic on *how to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-Building Measures* so that an up-to-date well considered situation can be presented prior to the Eighth Review Conference in 2016. One possible approach that has been suggested already is that the Chair could ask one of the Vice Chairs to maintain a watching brief on the topic of Confidence-Building Measures and to provide an annual report on developments to the successive annual Meetings of States Parties. Such an approach would help to ensure that Confidence-Building Measures are not overlooked in the coming two years.

The substantive paragraphs to be adopted by the Meeting of States Parties for each of the Standing Agenda Item topics will need to be looking forward not only to what the States Parties may do as a cohesive entity but also to what direction the further consideration of these topics should take in 2014. Attention also needs to be given to the cross fertilization between the elements of the Standing Agenda items. For example, the Standing Agenda item on science and technology includes the sub-item:

*5. Education and awareness-raising about risks and benefits of life sciences and biotechnology*

which is closely related to the sub-item of the Standing Agenda item on national implementation which reads:

*1. A range of specific measures for the full and comprehensive implementation of the Convention, especially Articles III and IV*

Another example relates to the Standing Agenda item on cooperation and assistance which has a sub-item:

*5. Capacity-building, through international cooperation, in biosafety and biosecurity, and for detecting, reporting, and responding to outbreaks of infectious disease or biological weapons attacks, including in the areas of preparedness, response, and crisis management and mitigation*

which is closely related to the sub-item of the Standing Agenda item on national implementation which reads:

*4. National, regional and international measures to improve laboratory biosafety and security of pathogens and toxins;*

The solution is probably for the substantive paragraphs in the report of the Meeting of States Parties to avoid any reference to the sub-items and to focus on what is relevant to the totality of each of the Standing Agenda items as well as to how these inter-relate as an integrated approach is vital for maximizing and realizing the benefits in the strengthening of the Convention. Whilst the substantive paragraphs in the report of the Meeting of States Parties, as at MSP/2012, are likely to be listed under the individual Standing Agenda items, consideration could usefully be given to also having some substantive paragraphs that address material that relates to more than one Standing Agenda item thereby helping to promote an integrated and comprehensive approach.

## **Reflections**

The Meeting of Experts successfully brought in more voices from the States Parties in the second year of the Intersessional Process for the period between the Seventh Review Conference in December 2011 and the Eighth Review Conference in 2016. As at previous Meetings of Experts, the 2013 meeting included an informal session when seven NGOs made short statements of direct relevance to the Meeting of Experts. In addition, as at previous Meetings of Experts, the 2013 meeting was open throughout enabling NGOs to gain a better appreciation of the concerns expressed by States Parties. In addition, during a formal session an NGO representative was able to provide further information in regard to a point made by a State Party.

In 2013, for the first time the Chair paid particular attention to the side events during the Meeting of Experts and said in her letter of 18 February 2013 that:

*Many States Parties find the side events at BWC meetings to be highly relevant and useful, and there have been suggestions that the side events could better complement the formal meetings. In view of this, and the growing demand for limited time slots, I propose to institute a more coordinated system of scheduling side events. Instead of a simple first-come-first-served allocation of slots, requests to hold side events will now be collected by the ISU until **14 June**. The Vice-chairs, ISU and I will then consider the requests, identify any common themes and potential synergies with the official programme and, in full consultation with the organisers of the proposed events, develop a schedule that best complements and supports our work.*

Whilst this is a welcome step forward to making better use of the side-events, it is evident that a further step needs to be taken so as to provide a means whereby a short factual outcome of the side event can be provided to the formal sessions of the Meetings – this could readily be done by the chair of the side event if this is a member of a State Party’s delegation or by a member of the ISU. Such a further step would enable any significant points that arose at the side event to be captured as appropriate in the Annex I to the meeting.

One of the changes from the previous Intersessional Processes has been the appointment of two Vice-Chairs together with the Chair for the current Intersessional Process. However, little benefit is yet apparent from the creation of the two Vice-Chairs in that at the Meetings in 2012 the Vice-Chairs were called upon to chair some of the sessions in lieu of the Chairman, whilst at the 2013 Meeting of Experts neither of the Vice-Chairs was called upon in this way. There would have appeared to be an opportunity for the Chair to ask a Vice-Chair to take on particular responsibilities in regard to either one of the Standing Agenda Items or the Biennial item as there would be potential benefits from continuity between one year and the next.

It was noted that the problems which had affected the participation of the European Union at the Seventh Review Conference (see Review 35 (March 2012)) appeared to have been solved at the Meeting of Experts in 2012 with the EU making statements at the start of the consideration of various sub-items of the Agenda in a similar way to the NAM statements and statements made by individual States Parties. There was, however, in 2012 no general statement made by the EU in the opening session. In 2013, there was a statement made by the EU in the opening session but this was made after all the States Parties and was a statement made by an international organization. The contrast is marked to the situation in New York on 7 October 2013 when at the General Debate of the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly the statement by the European Union was one of the first five statements made on behalf of groups of States before the statements made by individual States Parties.

Although a number of specialized agencies and other international organizations were invited and participated, it is noted that proposals recorded in the Annex to the report of the Meeting of Experts were only made by the World Health Organization (5), the ICRC (1) and the 1540 Committee (2). No proposals were recorded as being made by

the FAO, Interpol, OPCW or OIE. This is especially unfortunate given the emphasis in the programme under the Standing Agenda item on cooperation and assistance to

*6. Coordination of cooperation with other relevant international and regional organizations, and other relevant stakeholders*

and under the Standing Agenda item on developments in science and technology to

*6. Science- and technology-related developments relevant to the activities of multilateral organizations such as the WHO, OIE, FAO, IPPC and OPCW*

It is not evident what is said in the invitations sent to these international organizations. It would, however, be beneficial if, especially prior to future Meetings of Experts, if the letters of invitation sent to these international organizations were to specifically encourage them to make contributions and any specific proposals that relate to the specific sub-topics of the Standing Agenda items mentioned above as well as to any of the other sub-topics.

A point that is evident is that it is important to enhance and maximize the efficacy of the Meetings of Experts and the Meetings of States Parties by all the participants - whether States Parties, International Organizations or 'Guests of the Chair' - considering how best to ensure that their contributions are recorded in the information relating to the Meeting. It is especially relevant at the Meeting of Experts for any of those making statements and presentations to include specific language regarding any considerations, lessons, perspectives, recommendations, conclusions and proposals as this would facilitate the capture of such proposals into Annex I to the report of the Meeting of Experts. It is also beneficial if all participants provide their statements and presentations to the Implementation Support Unit for posting on the unog.ch/bwc website.

The Implementation Support Unit has a mandate (set out in BWC/CONF.VI/6/Part III. Para 5 A (ii) and renewed in BWC/CONF.VII/7/Part III. Para 31) to provide administrative support, including facilitating communication between States Parties. In the weeks preceding the Meeting of Experts it could have carried out this mandate more effectively if more States Parties had taken up the invitation to offer their views on compliance so as to promote an initial conceptual discussion of this subject at the Meeting of Experts, within the Standing Agenda Item on Strengthening National Implementation. Specifically, in their working paper *We need to talk about compliance* (BWC/MSP/2012/WP.11) of 12 December 2012, Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand and Switzerland had posed six questions to facilitate and focus such a discussion. They had invited States Parties to provide their views to the ISU by 30 June 2013 and requested the ISU in accordance with its mandate to compile and circulate those views ahead of MX/2013. However, while a few considered responses did acknowledge the initiative launched by the five States Parties, the expected exchange of views through the ISU after 30 June 2013 in preparation for MX/2013 did not occur. It is regrettable that disappointingly few States Parties took up the invitation to contribute their views on the questions posed in BWC/MSP/2012/WP.11 and that

most instead failed to take advantage of this imaginative attempt to promote a structured discussion of compliance which could have added significant value to the Meeting of Experts.

Overall, a particular reflection is that, as might be expected, there is considerable scope for cross fertilization between the Standing Agenda items as any particular issue area such as biosafety and biosecurity is important in considering all three Standing Agenda items: cooperation and assistance, science and technology and national implementation. There are few if any issue areas that do not have relevance to one or more Standing Agenda items.

As in previous years, the Chair has said that, for the Meeting of States Parties, she will create a synthesis paper that distills the essence of the many ideas and proposals contained in Annex I to the report of the Meeting of Experts. As the Meeting of Experts considered three Standing Agenda items with considerable scope for cross-fertilization which will be considered again next year, attention needs to be given to how to maximize the benefits from the change in the Intersessional Process to this continued consideration of the topics. The substantive paragraphs to be adopted by the Meeting of States Parties for each of the topics will need to be looking forward not only to what the States Parties may do as a cohesive entity but also to what direction the further consideration of these topics should take in 2014.

The solution is probably for the synthesis paper - and hence the subsequent substantive paragraphs in the report of the Meeting of States Parties - to focus on what is relevant to the totality of each of the Standing Agenda items and to consideration of how their cross-fertilization leads to an integrated and consolidated approach that makes an effective contribution to strengthening of the Convention regime.

As the biennial topic for 2013 (on enhancing participation in the CBMs) which will not be considered further in the current formal Intersessional Process, attention needs to be given at the Meeting of States Parties as to what *common understandings and effective action* should be agreed in regard to the biennial topic on *how to enable fuller participation in the Confidence-Building Measures* so that an up-to-date well considered situation can be presented prior to the Eighth Review Conference in 2016. One possible approach is that the Chair could ask one of the Vice Chairs to maintain a watching brief on the topic of Confidence-Building Measures and to provide an annual report to the successive annual Meetings of States Parties on any developments regarding CBMs. Such an approach would help to ensure that Confidence-Building Measures are not overlooked in the coming two years.

It is hoped that the Chair, vice-Chairs and the Implementation Support Unit will be successful in enabling the benefits of the detailed discussions at the Meeting of Experts to be carried forward to further all of the Standing Agenda items in an integrated way at both the Meeting of States Parties in 2013 and at subsequent meetings throughout the Intersessional Period so as to effectively strengthen the Convention.

It is hoped that the Chairman, vice-Chairmen and the Implementation Support Unit will be successful in enabling the benefits of the detailed discussions at the Meeting of Experts to be carried forward to further **all** of the Standing Agenda items in an integrated way at **both** the Meeting of States Parties in 2012 **and** at subsequent meetings throughout the Intersessional Period so as to effectively strengthen the Convention.



HSP is an inter-university collaboration for research, communication and training in support of informed public policy towards chemical and biological weapons. The Program links research groups at Harvard University in the United States and the University of Sussex in the United Kingdom. It began formally in 1990, building on two decades of earlier collaboration between its co-directors.

**<http://hsp.sussex.ac.uk>**