

**REPORT FROM GENEVA:  
THE BTWC EIGHTH REVIEW  
CONFERENCE:  
A DISAPPOINTING OUTCOME**

Graham S. Pearson in association with Nicholas A. Sims

April 2017

**CONTENTS**

Introduction ..... 3

    Financial Contributions by States Parties ..... 3

    Actions taken by States Parties on Compliance..... 6

    Actions taken by States Parties on the implementation of Article VII .. 8

    Actions taken by States Parties on the implementation of Article X .... 8

Analysis of the Working Papers submitted to the Eighth Review  
Conference ..... 10

    PrepCom Analysis of submitting States Parties and international  
    organisations..... 10

    PrepCom Analysis by relevant Articles of the Convention ..... 11

    Review Conference Analysis of submitting States Parties and  
    international organisations..... 12

    Review Conference Analysis by relevant Articles of the Convention . 14

Concluding Remarks..... 16

# Report from Geneva: The BTWC Eighth Review Conference: A Disappointing Outcome

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

## Introduction

1. Review no. 46 was published in February 2017 and is available on the ISU website ([http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/\(httpAssets\)/96E73A407E36F9D0C12580E000354AB3/\\$file/REPORT\\_FROM\\_GENEVA\\_46+E.pdf](http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/(httpAssets)/96E73A407E36F9D0C12580E000354AB3/$file/REPORT_FROM_GENEVA_46+E.pdf)). We have subsequently become aware of some additional information that adds to our appreciation of the disappointing outcome of the Eighth Review Conference. In this addendum we first provide some additional information on the financial contributions made by States Parties, then some additional information on the actions taken by States Parties on compliance, on the implementation of Article VII and on the implementation of Article X and finally we add a short analysis of the 44 Working Papers submitted to the Eighth Review Conference.

2. In our report Review No. 46 we provided information in square brackets after each statement made by a State Party in the General Debate to indicate whether:

- a. According to PC/3, the State Party has submitted its CBM
- b. According to the Background Information Papers, the State Party made a contribution in regard to compliance [INF.2], Article VII [INF.3] or Article X [INF.4]
- c. According to INF.1 on financial contributions, the State Party is shown as being in arrears, owes nothing or is in credit.

## Financial Contributions by States Parties

3. The document BWC/CONF.VIII/INF.1 dated 24 October 2016 provided the status of assessed contributions to the Biological Weapons Convention as of 21 October 2016 and was the most up to date published document on the status of financial contributions throughout the Review Conference itself. It was for this reason that we used its figures for the information in square brackets after each State Party that spoke in the General Debate in our report.

4. Updated information was subsequently made available on the ISU website which shows as of 30 November 2016, five days after the end of the Review Conference on 25 November 2016, that the financial contributions made by nine of those States Parties

---

<sup>\*</sup> Graham S. Pearson is a Visiting Professor of International Security in the Division of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford, Bradford, West Yorkshire BD7 1DP, UK.

<sup>†</sup> Nicholas A. Sims is an Emeritus Reader in International Relations in the Department of International Relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science, University of London, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK.

who made statements in the General Debate had changed. These changes are shown in **bold** in the table shown below.

Please note that the figures in the Table below in parentheses show amounts **owed** by the State Party, whilst figures **not** in parentheses show amounts already paid by the State Party which was thus **in credit**, the first column as at 21 October 2016 and the second column as at 30 November 2016.

[In addition, the opportunity has been taken to correct the incorrect figures shown in square brackets in our original report. These are that the figure for Indonesia shown in paragraph 72 should have indicated (\$6,905.42) and the figure for Burkina Faso shown in paragraph 113 should have indicated (\$137.87).]

**Table of financial contributions of States Parties who made statements in the General Debate as indicated in BWC/CONF.VIII/INF.1 and subsequent updated information of 30 Nov 2016**

State Party	INF.1	30 Nov 2016
Hungary	\$1,303	√
The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela on behalf of NAM and others	(\$30,051-14)	√
Iceland on behalf of the Nordic States	(\$1,531-56)	√
Japan on behalf of the member countries of the G7 Global Partnership	Nil	√
Belarus on behalf of the Collective Security Treaty Organization	(\$618-64)	√
Canada on behalf of Japan, Australia, Canada, Republic of Korea, Switzerland and Norway	\$26,506-77	√
United States of America	\$429,103-15	√
Sweden	\$4,704-00	√
Morocco	(\$513-39)	√
Iraq	\$330-00	√
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	\$25,378-00	√
Serbia	\$353-69	√
Japan	Nil	√
<b>United Arab Emirates</b>	<b>(\$17,238-78)</b>	<b>\$2,916-00</b>
Brazil	(\$267,248-34)	√
Spain	\$14,569-00	√
Nepal	Not listed	Nil
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<b>(\$99,991-09)</b>	<b>\$11,946-91</b>
Kuwait	\$2,420-51	√
Germany	\$34,991-00	√
Belarus	(\$618-64)	√
Cuba	(\$900-12)	√

China	\$25,194-00	√
<b>Holy See</b>	<b>(\$37-96)</b>	<b>Nil</b>
<b>Philippines</b>	<b>(\$786-56)</b>	<b>Nil</b>
Republic of Moldova	(\$41-74)	√
Australia	\$18,413-41	√
France	\$27,405-00	√
Bulgaria	\$230-00	√
Netherlands	\$2,502-72	√
Mexico	(\$12,067-36)	√
Pakistan	\$747-71	√
Belgium	\$8,791-53	√
Malaysia	(\$3,889-15)	√
India	(\$2,040-92)	√
Lao Peoples' Democratic Republic on behalf of ASEAN	\$1,176-37	√
Indonesia	(\$6,905-42)	√
New Zealand	\$2,241-67	√
Republic of Korea	\$9,771-00	√
Turkey	\$6,508-00	√
Latvia	\$230-00	√
Kazakhstan	(\$2,315-20)	√
Slovakia	\$838-00	√
<b>Estonia</b>	<b>\$192-00</b>	<b>\$180-83</b>
Montenegro	(\$36-79)	√
Peru	\$1,034-78	√
<b>Thailand</b>	<b>(\$1,407-34)</b>	<b>Nil</b>
<b>Guatemala</b>	<b>(\$358-13)</b>	<b>\$137-02</b>
Panama	(\$1,070-40)	√
Colombia	(\$6,182-05)	√
Italy	\$21,796-00	√
Myanmar	\$49-00	√
Ukraine	\$485-00	√
Ireland	£2,048-00	√
<b>Algeria</b>	<b>(\$3,453-83)</b>	<b>(\$0-60)</b>
Venezuela	(\$30,051-14)	√
<b>Islamic Republic of Iran</b>	<b>(\$27,251-34)</b>	<b>Nil</b>
Argentina	(\$13,839-99)	√
South Africa	(\$2,204-56)	√
Ecuador	\$216-00	√
Switzerland	\$9,300-13	√
Georgia	(\$34-71)	√
Kenya	(\$605-45)	√
Chile	\$6,465-69	√
Qatar	(\$660-91)	√
Mali	(\$135-83)	√
Cote d'Ivoire	Nil	√

Poland	(\$8,471-18)	√
Zambia	(\$252-74)	√
Armenia	\$63-08	√
Bosnia and Herzegovina	\$118-57	√
Portugal	\$4,188-98	√
Ethiopia	\$365-93	√
Jordan	(\$204-08)	√
Austria	\$7,090-63	√
Burkina Faso	(\$137-87)	√
Senegal	(\$26-87)	√
Zimbabwe	(\$117-91)	√
Ghana	(\$361-99)	√
Liberia	Not listed	Nil
Libya	(\$10,748-96)	√

### **Actions taken by States Parties on Compliance**

5. The Implementation Support Unit prepared a background information paper BWC/CONF.VIII/INF.2 which stated:

*The Preparatory Committee decided to request the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) to prepare a background information document on compliance by States Parties with all their obligations under the Convention, to be compiled from information submitted by States Parties (see BWC/CONF.VIII/PC/9, paragraph 26(f)). The ISU duly requested submissions from States Parties, and all submissions provided to the ISU by 27 September 2016 are included in this document. Any further submissions from States Parties will be included in an addendum to this document.*

Subsequently, three Addenda were issued as Add.1, Add. 2 and Add.3 on 4 November 2016, 18 November 2016 and 18 December 2016 with further submissions. The information in INF.2 and its Addenda were used in our report to provide the information in square brackets indicating whether the State Party that had made a statement in the general debate had contributed to INF.2.

6. Whilst the Implementation Support Unit requests that States Parties provide contributions to such Background Information Papers it is a prerogative of the State Party to decide whether it wishes to submit a Working Paper as well or instead of providing a contribution to the INF. document. Such a Working Paper may be identical to the submission sent to the ISU for the INF. document or it may be a quite different document that is submitted as a Working Paper with no contribution being sent to the ISU for the INF. document.

7. At the Eighth Review Conference, there were Working Papers with relevance to compliance submitted by various States Parties:

- a. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.11 and BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.11/Corr.1** - *Confidence in Compliance - Peer Review Visit Exercise at the Bundeswehr Institute of Microbiology in Munich, Germany* - Submitted by Germany, Co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, France, Georgia, Jordan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Yemen
- b. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.29** - *Peer review visit exercise at the Bundeswehr Institute of Microbiology in Munich, Germany: Civil society observer report* - Submitted by Germany
- c. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.16** - *Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Consultative Provisions of Article V of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention* - Submitted by the European Union
- d. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.22** - *BWC Implementation Review Initiative* - Submitted by Canada, Chile, Ghana, Mexico, and the United States of America
- e. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.18** - *BWC Implementation Review Initiative: Report by the United States of America on the Visit to Washington, DC* - Submitted by the United States of America
- f. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.27** - *BWC Implementation Review Initiative – Canada’s report of the visit to Ottawa* - Submitted by Canada
- g. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.28** – [Mexican participation in the BWC Implementation Review Initiative] - Submitted by Mexico
- h. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.33** - *Ghana's Report on the BWC Implementation Review Exercise held in Accra, 19-20 October 2016* - Submitted by Ghana
- i. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.41** - [BWC Implementation Review Exercise Report of Visit to Santiago de Chile] - Submitted by Chile
- j. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.35** - *Building Confidence Through Voluntary Transparency Exercises* - Submitted by Belgium, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Ghana, Germany, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland and the United States of America

## **Actions taken by States Parties on the implementation of Article VII**

8. The Implementation Support Unit prepared a background information paper BWC/CONF.VIII/INF.3 which stated:

*The Preparatory Committee decided to request the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) to prepare a background information document on the implementation of Article VII, to be compiled from information submitted by States Parties, (see BWC/CONF.VIII/PC/9, paragraph 26(g)). The ISU duly requested submissions from States Parties, and all submissions provided to the ISU by 27 September 2016 are included in this document*

Subsequently, one Addendum was issued Add.1 on 1 November 2016 with a further submission. The information in INF.3 and its Addendum were used in our report to provide the information in square brackets indicating whether the State Party that had made a statement in the general debate had contributed to INF.3.

9. Whilst the Implementation Support Unit requests that States Parties provide contributions to such Background Information Papers it is a prerogative of the State Party to decide whether it wishes to submit a Working Paper as well or instead of providing a contribution to the INF. document. Such a Working Paper may be identical to the submission sent to the ISU for the INF. document or it may be a quite different document that is submitted as a Working Paper with no contribution being sent to the ISU for the INF. document.

10. At the Eighth Review Conference, there were Working Papers on the implementation of Article VII submitted by various States Parties:

- a. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.34** - *Implementation of Article VII* - Submitted by South Africa [No submission by South Africa to INF.3]
- b. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.38** - *Preparing for and Responding to Deliberate Events: Specific Proposals for Work Under Article VII Based on Examining Lessons Learned from the International Response to the Ebola Outbreak in West Africa* - Submitted by the United States of America [No submission by USA to INF.3]
- c. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.39** - *Select International developments Relevant to Article VII of the BWC* - Submitted by the United States of America [No submission by USA to INF.3]

## **Actions taken by States Parties on the implementation of Article X**

11. The Implementation Support Unit prepared a background information paper BWC/CONF.VIII/INF.4 which stated:



*The Preparatory Committee decided to request the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) to prepare a background information document on the implementation of Article X, to be compiled from information submitted by States Parties, including information submitted pursuant to paragraph 61 of the Final Declaration of the Seventh Review Conference (see BWC/CONF.VIII/PC/9, paragraph 26(h)). The ISU duly requested submissions from States Parties, and all submissions provided to the ISU by 27 September 2016 are included in this document. Any further submissions from States Parties will be included in an addendum to this document.*

Subsequently, three Addenda were issued Add.1, Add. 2 and Add. 3 with submissions received up to 8 November 2016. The information in INF.4 and its Addenda were used in our report to provide the information in square brackets indicating whether the State Party that had made a statement in the general debate had contributed to INF.4.

12. Whilst the Implementation Support Unit requests that States Parties provide contributions to such Background Information Papers it is a prerogative of the State Party to decide whether it wishes to submit a Working Paper as well or instead of providing a contribution to the INF. document. Such a Working Paper may be identical to the submission sent to the ISU for the INF. document or it may be a quite different document that is submitted as a Working Paper with no contribution being sent to the ISU for the INF. document.

13. At the Eighth Review Conference, there were Working Papers on the implementation of Article X submitted by various States Parties:

- a. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.4** - *Difficulties and obstacles for the full implementation by Cuba of Article X of the BWC* - Submitted by Cuba
- b. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.5** - *Cuban offers and requests to the International Cooperation database under Article X of the BTWC* - Submitted by Cuba
- c. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.6** - *Implementation of the Article X of the Biological Weapons Convention* - Submitted by Cuba. [Identical to submission by Cuba in INF.4/Add.3]
- d. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.7** - *Report on Implementation of Article X of the Convention* - Submitted by India [No submission by India to INF.4]
- e. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.21 and Add. 1** - *International Activities of Global Partnership Member Countries related to Article X of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention* - Submitted by Canada, Denmark, European Union,

Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom and the United States of America [Additional to any submissions made individually to INF.4]

- f. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.23** - BTWC Article X Compliance Mechanism for the 8th Review Conference - Submitted by Venezuela on behalf of the NAM and Other States
- g. **BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.37** - *Russia's Implementation of Article X of the Biological Weapons Convention* - Submitted by the Russian Federation [No submission by Russian Federation to INF.4]

## **Analysis of the Working Papers submitted to the Eighth Review Conference**

14. 39 Working Papers were submitted to the Preparatory Committee meetings and 44 Working Papers were submitted to the Review Conference itself. In this analysis here, for completeness, we first reproduce our analysis of the 39 Working Papers submitted to the PrepCom and then in a similar way we analyse the 44 Working Papers submitted to the Review Conference. In our Report from Geneva No. 45 on the Preparatory Committee meetings in April and August 2016 we provided an analysis of the 39 Working Papers submitted then. In our PrepCom Report we first analysed the States Parties and international organisations that had submitted Working Papers:

### **PrepCom Analysis of submitting States Parties and international organisations**

15. The benefits of a substantive Preparatory Committee Meeting were evident in that a total of 39 Working Papers were submitted – 13 being submitted for the two day April session and the remaining 26 for the week long August session – and 5 background information papers prepared by the ISU for the August session.

16. The three Co-Depositaries led the way in submitting eleven of the Working Papers – five by the USA (WP. 3 on S & T review, WP.6 on confidence building mechanism, WP. 9 on taking action, WP.10 on alleged use and WP.18 on new S & T developments), three by Russia (WP.1 on biomedical units, WP.2 on S & T review and WP.19 on the BTWC and Geneva Protocol) and three by the United Kingdom (WP.4 on S & T review, WP. 14 on Article VII and Article X, and WP.15 on a new Intersessional Process).

17. Three Working Papers were also submitted by South Africa (WP.21 on functional structures, WP.22 on Article VII and WP.23 on future planning for the ISU). Two Working Papers were submitted by Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands (WP.13 on peer review, together with France, and WP.26 on peer review), Canada (WP.24 on the Intersessional Process and WP.25 on oversight of research and dual-use risks), China and Pakistan (WP. 31 on Code of Conduct and WP.32 on export controls & international

cooperation), France (WP.11 on the Geneva Protocol and WP.12 on response to disease outbreaks), Iran (WP. 17 on investigation of use and WP.33 on transfers), Spain (WP.27 on S & T review and WP.28 on voluntary visits), Switzerland (WP.8 on S & T review and WP.16 on S & T review) and by the EU (WP.5 on the Eighth Review Conference and WP.20 on implementation of Article X by the EU). Single Working Papers were submitted by Germany (WP.35 on CBMs for dual-use materials) and by Japan (WP.29 on cooperation with International Organisations).

18. Single Working Papers were also submitted by groups of two or more States Parties – those submitted by groups of States Parties from more than one of the Groups of States Parties are particularly welcome as these demonstrate trans-Group support. Single Working Papers were submitted by Australia and Japan (WP.37 on the Intersessional Process), by Australia, Canada, Japan, Malaysia, Republic of Korea, and Switzerland (WP.36 on step by step participation in CBMs), by Australia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ghana, Japan, Malaysia, Norway, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Switzerland and Thailand (WP.34 on reassurance), by Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Montenegro, Philippines and Uganda (WP.30 on national CBRN action plans), by Finland, Norway and Sweden (WP.7 on S & T review), and by France and India and cosponsored by Belgium, Canada, Finland, Germany, Jordan, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru and the United Kingdom (WP.38 on a database for Article VII).

19. In addition, a Working Paper was submitted by ICRC (WP.39 on humanitarian response to use of biological weapons).

### **PrepCom Analysis by relevant Articles of the Convention**

20. In this second analysis, the Working Papers were analysed by their relevance to particular Articles of the Convention.

21. **Article I.** Seven Working Papers were submitted in regard to S & T review which is considered here as being of particular relevance to Article I and the scope of the Convention although the implications of S & T developments are relevant for many Articles of the Convention. Papers on S & T review were submitted as follows: two by Switzerland (WP.8 and WP.16) and one each by Finland, Norway and Sweden (WP.7), Russia (WP.2), Spain (WP.27), United Kingdom (WP.4) and USA (WP.3). In addition the USA submitted a Working Paper on new S & T developments (WP.18).

22. **Article III.** Two Working Papers were submitted in regard to Article III – one by China and Pakistan on export controls (WP.32) and one by Iran on transfer-related issues (WP.33).

23. **Article IV.** Seven Working Papers were submitted in regard to various aspects of national implementation – one by Australia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ghana, Japan, Malaysia, Norway, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Switzerland

and Thailand on reassurance (WP.34), two by Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands on peer review (WP.13 and WP.26), one by Canada on oversight of research and dual-risk materials (WP.25), one by China and Pakistan on codes of conduct (WP.31), one by Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Montenegro, Philippines and Uganda on national CBRN action plans (WP.30), and one by Spain on voluntary visits (WP.28).

24. **Article V.** Three Working Papers were submitted in regard to Article V – one by Australia, Canada, Japan, Malaysia, Republic of Korea, and Switzerland on step by step participation in CBMs (WP.36), one by Germany on CBMs for dual-use materials (WP.35) and one by the USA on confidence-building mechanisms (WP.6).

25. **Article VI.** Four Working Papers were submitted on Article VI investigation of alleged use – one by France on response to natural and deliberate outbreaks (WP.12), one by Iran on investigation of use (WP.17), one by Russia on mobile biomedical units (WP.1) and one by USA on alleged use (WP.10).

26. **Article VII.** Four Working Papers were submitted on Article VII – one by France and India and co-sponsored by Belgium, Canada, Finland, Germany, Jordan, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru and the United Kingdom on a database for Article VII (WP.38), one by South Africa on Article VII (WP.22), one by the United Kingdom on Article VII and Article X: the importance of synergy (WP.14) and one by the ICRC on humanitarian response to use of biological weapons (WP.39).

27. **Article VIII.** Two Working Papers were submitted on Article VIII – one by France on the Geneva Protocol (WP.11) and one by Russia on the BTWC and the Geneva Protocol (WP.19).

28. **Article X.** Three Working Papers were submitted on Article X – one by Japan on cooperation with International Organizations (WP.29), one by the United Kingdom on Article VII and Article X: the importance of synergy (WP.14) and one by the EU on implementation of Article X by the EU (WP.20) [This was essentially an information paper].

29. **Intersessional Process and the Implementation Support Unit.** Five Working Papers were submitted on the Intersessional Process and one on the Implementation Support Unit – one by Australia and Japan on the Intersessional Process (WP.37), one by Canada on the Intersessional Process (WP.24), one by South Africa on functional structures (WP.21), one by the United Kingdom on a new Intersessional Process (WP.15) and one by the USA on taking action (WP.9) – and the one on the ISU being submitted by South Africa on future planning for the ISU (WP.23).

## **Review Conference Analysis of submitting States Parties and international organisations**

30. Expectations for the Eighth Review Conference were raised when a further 44

Working Papers were submitted which could be expected to build on what had already be done by the 39 Working Papers submitted for the two day April session and for the week long August session Of the Preparatory Committee.

31. At the Eighth Review Conference itself the three Co-Depositaries led the way in submitting ten of the Working Papers – six by the USA (WP.14 on Article I, WP.15 on facilitating S & T exchange under Article X, WP.18 on the BWC Implementation Review visit to USA, WP.19 on acquisition and use, WP.38 on proposals under Article VII and WP.39 on international developments relevant to Article VII), three by Russia (WP.8 on biomedical units, WP.9 on confidence-building measure formats and WP.37 on implementation of Article X) and one by the United Kingdom (WP.17 on developments in S & T).

32. Five Working Papers were also submitted by Cuba (WP.2 on a code of professional ethics, WP.3 on a new Intersessional Programme, WP.4 on difficulties in implementing Article X, WP. 5 on Cuban offers under Article X and WP.6 on implementation of Article X). Three Working Papers were submitted by NAM and Other States (WP.23 on BTWC Article X Compliance Mechanism for the 8th Review Conference, WP.24 on proposals for the Article by Article Final Document, WP.25 on proposals for the Final Declaration and WP. 26 on proposals for the Intersessional Programme, ISU and on S & T). Two Working Papers were submitted jointly by China and Pakistan (WP.30 on a code of conduct for biological scientists and WP.31 on an export control and international cooperation regime), two by Iran (WP.12 on the review of S & T and WP.13 on amending the Convention to specifically exclude use) and two by Mexico (WP.28 on Implementation Review visit to Mexico and WP.40 on a Multisectoral National Workshop on CBMs: Filling in the Report).

33. Single Working Papers were submitted by Canada (WP. 27 on Implementation Review visit to Canada), Chile (WP. 41 on Implementation Review visit to Chile), the European Union (WP. 16 on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Consultative Provisions of Article V, Germany (WP.29 on peer review visit to Munich), Ghana (W.P.33 on Implementation Review visit to Ghana), India (WP.7 on implementation of Article X), and by South Africa (WP.34 on Implementation of Article VII).

34. Single Working Papers were also submitted by groups of two or more States Parties – those submitted by groups of States Parties from more than one of the Groups of States Parties are particularly welcome as these demonstrate trans-Group support. Single Working Papers were submitted by Argentina, Australia, Canada, France, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine and the United Kingdom (WP. 42 on proposal on Article IV for COW), by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, and Peru (WP.43 on Universalization), by Belgium, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Ghana, Germany, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland

and USA (WP.35 on building confidence through voluntary transparency exercises), by Canada and China (WP.44 on workshop promoting BWC implementation and biosecurity governance), by Canada, Chile, Ghana, Mexico, and USA (WP.22 on BWC Implementation Review Initiative), by Canada, Denmark, European Union, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, UK and USA (WP.21 on international activities of Global Partnership Member Countries related to Article X), by Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Georgia, Kenya, Montenegro, Morocco, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Senegal and Uganda (WP.32 on a coordinated approach to enhancing bio-risk mitigation: National CBRN Action Plans), by Finland, Norway and Sweden (WP.20 on technological developments for the decoding of new, old and ancient infectious disease outbreaks and incidents), by Germany, Austria, Belgium, France, Georgia, Jordan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Switzerland, UK, and Yemen (WP.11 on Confidence in Compliance - Peer Review Visit Exercise at the Bundeswehr Institute of Microbiology in Munich, Germany), by India and USA (WP.1 on strengthening implementation of Article III), by Japan, Australia, Netherlands and UK (WP.36 on proposals for Final Document on strengthening cooperation with International Organizations), and by the UK and Ukraine (WP.10 on awareness-raising, education, outreach).

### **Review Conference Analysis by relevant Articles of the Convention**

35. In this analysis, the Working Papers submitted to the Review Conference are analysed by their relevance to particular Articles of the Convention.

36. **Article I.** One working paper was submitted in regard to the key prohibition of article I by USA on reinforcing the core prohibition of Article I (WP.14). Three working papers were submitted in regard to S & T and its review which is considered here as being of particular relevance to Article I and the scope of the Convention although the implications of S & T developments are relevant for many Articles of the Convention. Papers on S & T review were submitted as follows: one by Finland, Norway and Sweden on technological developments for the decoding of new, old and ancient infectious disease outbreaks and incidents (WP.20), one by Iran on S & T review (WP.12), and one by UK on developments in S & T: key points from the 2012-2015 BTWC Intersessional Programme (WP.17).

37. **Article III.** Two Working Papers were submitted in regard to Article III – one by China and Pakistan on establishing a Non-Proliferation Export Control and International Cooperation Regime (WP.31), and one by India and USA (WP.1) on strengthening implementation of Article III).

38. **Article IV.** Nine Working Papers were submitted in regard to various aspects of national implementation – one by Belgium, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Ghana, Germany, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland and USA on building confidence through voluntary transparency exercises (WP.35), one by

Canada and China on an International Workshop promoting BWC implementation and enhancing global biosecurity governance (WP.44), one by China and Pakistan on Proposal for the Development of a Model Code of Conduct for Biological Scientists (WP.30), one by Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Georgia, Kenya, Montenegro, Morocco, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Senegal and Uganda on a coordinated approach to enhancing bio-risk mitigation: National CBRN Action Plans (WP.32), one by Cuba on a code of professional ethics (WP.2), one by Germany, Austria, Belgium, France, Georgia, Jordan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Switzerland, UK, and Yemen on Confidence in Compliance - Peer Review Visit Exercise at the Bundeswehr Institute of Microbiology in Munich, Germany (WP.11), one by Germany on Peer review visit exercise at the Bundeswehr Institute of Microbiology in Munich, Germany: Civil society observer report (WP.29), one by UK and Ukraine on awareness-raising, education, outreach (WP.10) and one by USA on Acquisition and Use of Biological and Toxin Weapons: Addressing the Threat (WP.19). A further six working papers were submitted on an implementation review exercise (WP.22) held in Canada (WP.27), Chile (WP.41), Ghana (WP.33), Mexico (WP.28) and USA (WP.18).

39. **Article V.** Three Working Papers were submitted in regard to Article V – one by the EU on enhancing the effectiveness of the consultative provisions of Article V (WP.16), one by Mexico on a national workshop on Confidence-Building Measures (WP.40) and one by Russia on enhancing the format of confidence-building measures (WP.9).

40. **Article VI.** One Working Paper was submitted by Russia on a temporary working group on mobile biomedical units (WP.8).

41. **Article VII.** Three Working Papers were submitted on Article VII – one by South Africa on implementation of Article VII (WP.34), and two by USA on preparing for and responding to deliberate events: specific proposals for work under Article VII based on examining lessons learned from the international response to the Ebola outbreak in West Africa (WP.38) and on select international developments relevant to Article VII (WP.39).

42. **Article X.** Eight Working Papers were submitted on Article X – three by Cuba on difficulties and obstacles for the full implementation of Article X (WP.4), Cuban offers and requests to the International Cooperation database under Article X (WP.5), Implementation of the Article X of the Biological Weapons Convention (WP.6), one by Canada, Denmark, European Union, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, UK and USA on international activities of Global Partnership Member Countries related to Article X (WP.21), one by India on implementation of Article X (WP.7), one by the NAM and Other States on an Article X compliance mechanism (WP.23), one by Russia on implementation of Article X (WP.37) and one by USA on facilitating the fullest possible exchange of S & T under Article X (WP.15).

43. **Article XII.** One Working Paper was submitted by Iran on a proposal for amending the Convention to incorporate an explicit "*Prohibition of the Use of Biological Weapons*" (WP.13).

44. **Proposals for the COW.** One Working Paper was submitted by Argentina, Australia, Canada, France, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine and UK on a proposal for Article IV (WP.42).

45. **Proposals for the Final Document.** Six Working Papers were submitted – one by Cuba on a new work programme for the intersessional period (WP.3), four by the NAM and Other States on an Article X compliance mechanism (WP.23), on proposals for the Article by Article Final Document (WP.24), on proposals for the Final Declaration (WP.25) and on proposals for the Intersessional Programme, ISU and on S & T (WP.26) and one by Japan, Australia, Netherlands and UK on proposals for Final Document on strengthening cooperation with International Organizations (WP.36).

## **Concluding Remarks**

46. The additional information included in the Addendum reinforces the conclusions that we had reached in our Report on the Eighth Review Conference that the Eighth Review Conference was undoubtedly the best prepared of all the Review Conferences with its enhanced and extended Preparatory Committee. States Parties had clearly shown their determination to strengthen the effectiveness of the Convention through the 14 Working Papers submitted to the Meeting of States Parties in December 2015, many of which were looking ahead to the Review Conference, the 39 Working Papers submitted to the Preparatory Committee and the 44 Working Papers submitted to the Review Conference itself. Particularly welcome was the fact that several of these Working Papers were co-authored by States Parties across Group boundaries. And the number of contributions made by States Parties both at the Preparatory Committee meetings and in the General Debate at the Review Conference itself quite rightly raised expectations that the Eighth Review Conference would conclude with a solemn declaration and Article by Article language with extended understandings that strengthened the effectiveness of the Convention together with Decisions and Recommendations that would have resulted in an intersessional programme with an effective science and technology review mechanism as well as working groups on reassurance in implementation and on cooperation and assistance.

47. The actual outcome was indeed disappointing. It is evident from the Eighth Review Conference that the vast majority of the States Parties are indeed keen to make the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention stronger and more effective to the benefit of international peace and security and thus to all of us. In order to demonstrate their commitment to this common goal, there are practical steps that States Parties can take. All can share in coordinating their preparations for the annual Meeting of States



Parties well in advance of 4 December 2017 and, in the immediate future, **ensuring that resources are found for it to take place**. In particular, those States Parties which are still in arrears should heed the Depositary Ambassadors' letter of 21 March 2017 (available on the ISU website at [http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/\(httpAssets\)/7701849D12F98541C12580ED00388CEA/\\$file/letter+depositories+240317.pdf](http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/(httpAssets)/7701849D12F98541C12580ED00388CEA/$file/letter+depositories+240317.pdf)) which explained the financial predicament of the Convention and its Implementation Support Unit in sombre tones and concluded:

*We, therefore, urge all States Parties to the Convention to pay their assessed contributions as soon as possible and to settle their arrears without delay. Without the prompt resolution of this issue, the structures and decisions agreed upon just a few months ago at the Eighth Review Conference will be in serious jeopardy.*

As the Depositary Ambassadors make clear in the same letter, **a decision will have to be taken in September 2017 on whether to go ahead** with the 4-8 December 2017 Meeting of States Parties, and this will depend upon the necessary funding having been secured. It is vitally important that the 4-8 December meeting should be held as scheduled if decisions, such as the Next Steps recommended in our Review No.46 (available on the ISU website at [http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/\(httpAssets\)/96E73A407E36F9D0C12580ED00354AB3/\\$file/REPORT\\_FROM\\_GENEVA\\_46+E.pdf](http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/(httpAssets)/96E73A407E36F9D0C12580ED00354AB3/$file/REPORT_FROM_GENEVA_46+E.pdf)), are to be taken and an intersessional work programme authorised. Only through positive decisions coming out of the December 2017 Meeting of States Parties can the disappointing outcome of the Eighth Review Conference be remedied and the Convention strengthened to the benefit of all.

The logo for HSPPOP, featuring the letters 'HSP' in white and 'POP' in blue on a brown background.

# HSPPOP

HARVARD SUSSEX  
PROGRAM  
OCCASIONAL  
PAPER

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 founding co-directors.

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