
**Ninth Review Conference of the States Parties
to the Convention on the Prohibition of the
Development, Production and Stockpiling
of Bacteriological (Biological) and
Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction**

8 December 2023

Original: English

Geneva, 28 November–16 December 2022

Summary record of the 12th meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Thursday, 15 December 2022, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Bencini(Italy)

Contents

Credentials of representatives to the Conference:

(b) Report of the Credentials Committee (*continued*)

Preparation and adoption of the final document(s) (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of the present record to the Documents Management Section (DMS-DCM@un.org).

Any corrected records of the public meetings of this Conference will be reissued for technical reasons after the end of the Conference.



The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Credentials of representatives to the Conference:

(b) Report of the Credentials Committee *(continued)*

1. **Mr. September** (South Africa), speaking in his capacity as Chair of the Credentials Committee, said that the Credentials Committee had convened its third and final meeting the day before. The Committee's report, which it had adopted unanimously, would shortly be made available on the website of the Ninth Review Conference.

Preparation and adoption of the final document(s) *(continued)* ([BWC/CONF.IX/CRP.2](#), [BWC/CONF.IX/PC/4](#))

2. **Mr. Feakes** (Secretary-General of the Conference), accompanying his statement with a digital slide presentation, said that he wished to draw the attention of Conference participants to document [BWC/CONF.IX/PC/4](#), which had been issued in February 2022. He would draw heavily on that document for his brief presentation of the financial status of the Convention and the financial implications of the proposals for follow-on action after the Ninth Review Conference. There had been a number of changes since the issuance of the document, but the secretariat included updated financial information in the monthly reports it sent to States parties, the most recent of which had been produced in late November 2022. Those updates and other relevant information could also be consulted on a financial dashboard viewable on the website of the Office for Disarmament Affairs.

3. Nearly 98 per cent of the assessed contributions billed to States in 2021 had been received. The 2021 budget, in which there had been a shortfall of some \$40,000, was of interest because it was the yearly budget from which funds had been set aside for the Review Conference. For 2022, just less than 94 per cent of the assessed contributions, which would fund the activities of the Implementation Support Unit, had been received. There would again be a small shortfall. All States parties, as many delegations had noted, should make their assessed contributions in full and on time.

4. Although the Conference was drawing to a close, there was still considerably uncertainty as to the financial implications of the decisions it was considering. As Conference participants knew, the cost of activities under the Convention was composed of conference-servicing costs – for interpretation services, for example – and costs not related to conference services. Examples of cost estimates for possible follow-on action during the intersessional period could be found in the background information document he had mentioned earlier. Actual costs, of course, would depend on the specific proposals the Conference adopted.

5. The scale of assessments was adopted by the General Assembly every three years. A new scale of assessments would apply starting in 2025. Under that scale, some two thirds of States parties had been making Convention contributions of less than \$1,000 a year during the most recent intersessional period, the last full year of which had been 2021.

6. The establishment of a group of experts that met for 15 days a year and the recruitment of two additional staff members by the Implementation Support Unit, proposals that the Conference was considering adopting, would push the annual budget for activities under the Convention up to around \$2.4 million. In that scenario, more than half of all States parties would, as shown in one of the pie charts in the final slide of the presentation, still be assessed contributions of less than \$1,000 a year. The other pie charts made it possible to visualize the impact of other scenarios. Any delegations that wished to know what impact budget increases would have on the contributions the States they represented would be assessed could contact him for that information.

Chapter III. Decisions and recommendations

7. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that paragraph 5 of chapter III of the draft final document ([BWC/CONF.IX/CRP.2](#)) should be amended to make the recommendation contained therein less preemptory. The words “compliance” and “verification mechanism”, which appeared in paragraph 8, sufficed. The adjectives modifying them, “full” and

“comprehensive”, respectively, could be deleted. Paragraph 9, for its part, should be amended to read simply that the review of article V of the Convention had shown the need to further enhance the participation of States parties in confidence-building measures. Paragraph 16 should be amended to state that the Conference encouraged States parties not, as the paragraph currently had it, to conduct simulation and tabletop exercises but to consider conducting such exercises.

8. The second sentence of paragraph 35 could be amended to state that the Conference decided to renew the mandate of the Implementation Support Unit for the period from 2023 to 2027.

9. The second sentence of paragraph 40, which, in essence, stated that the objective of ensuring that men and women were equally represented at Convention meetings should inform the process of selecting the representatives of developing States parties who would benefit from the sponsorship programme administered by the Implementation Support Unit, should be deleted. A sentence stating that the programme should continue supporting the participation of developing States parties at Convention meetings should take its place. A subordinate clause in which the Conference explicitly recognized that some situations made it difficult for States parties to honour their financial obligations under the Convention should be added to paragraph 41.

10. **Ms. Andarcia** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that the obstacles to the adoption of measures to enhance international cooperation and assistance under article X of the Convention – measures that were to be considered by the group of experts or working group on strengthening the Convention – should be clearly identified in paragraph 24 or in another relevant paragraph of chapter III of the draft final document. Like the delegation of Cuba, her delegation favoured amending paragraph 35 to state explicitly that the mandate of the Implementation Support Unit was to be renewed for the period from 2023 to 2027. It also supported the amendments to paragraphs 37, 40 and 41 proposed by the representative of Cuba.

11. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that paragraph 18 should be amended to include a sentence that alluded to the deliberations that had taken place at the Meeting of States Parties in 2020 and explained why the Conference regretted, as noted in the paragraph, that the 2020 Meeting, like the Meetings of other years, was inconclusive. As the Implementation Support Unit was a provisional unit, the proposal to amend paragraph 35 to have the Conference state explicitly the period for which it wished to renew the Unit’s mandate (2023–2027) was reasonable. Paragraph 36, which stated that the Conference decided to establish two new full-time staff positions in the Unit, should be placed within square brackets to indicate its tentative status, as the Conference had not yet decided exactly what additional services it might turn to the Unit for.

12. The second and third sentences of paragraph 40, which referred to the sponsorship programme and the equal representation of men and women at meetings under the Convention, should be deleted. The Conference should instead prioritize, with the help of the sponsorship programme, the participation of representatives of States parties not previously represented at such meetings or, to promote the universalization of the Convention, of States not parties thereto.

13. In an addition to paragraph 42, the Conference could note that priority should be given to funding the contracts of the Implementation Support Unit and that periodic financial reporting should continue. In paragraph 44, the Conference should stress the need to monitor the financial situation of the Convention not only in general but also in relation to action taken in follow-up to the measures endorsed at the 2018 Meeting of States Parties.

14. **Mr. Poor Toulabi** (Kingdom of the Netherlands) said that, as he had noted at a previous meeting, paragraphs 5, 6, 8 and 9, in the section of the document on national implementation and confidence-building measures, should be retained. The Conference’s recommendations that States parties work on measures to improve biorisk management, which had been removed, should be reinserted.

15. The recommendation made by the Conference in paragraph 5 should not be made less forceful. The paragraph could nonetheless be clarified. His delegation would submit a proposed amendment to that end to the secretariat in due course.

16. **Ms. Petit** (France), noting that she, too, was in favour of retaining paragraphs 5, 6, 8 and 9, said that she would welcome the inclusion of a reference to the importance of biosecurity and biosafety standards. The voluntary transparency exercises mentioned in paragraph 8 were, as the representative of Mexico had noted at a previous meeting, a particularly effective means of facilitating international cooperation and building confidence, even if, as the paragraph stated, they were no substitute for a comprehensive verification mechanism.

17. **Mr. Jain** (India) said that the intersessional programme, which was described in paragraphs 20–34 of the draft document, should not be one-sided. The mandate of the proposed group of experts on the strengthening of the Convention should reflect the priorities of all States parties, and all overlap should be avoided.

18. The proposed group's discussions should be organized along four thematic lines – first, compliance and verification measures; second, measures to enhance international cooperation and assistance under article X and measures to strengthen assistance, response and preparedness under article VII; third, measures to achieve national implementation of the Convention; and, fourth, measures to consider scientific and technological developments relevant to the Convention. The thematic discussions should take place over the entire annual cycle of the work of the group, whose Chair should be elected from among the representatives of a different regional group every year. Paragraph 43 should be amended to state that the Working Capital Fund should continue to be financed solely by voluntary contributions made by States parties.

Chapter II. Final declaration

Preamble

19. **The President** said that, as it was too late to consider newly proposed amendments to chapter II of the draft final document, delegations commenting on the chapter should focus exclusively on their top priorities.

20. **Mr. Jain** (India) said that, in paragraphs (i) and (xiii) of the declaration, the word “regional” should be removed from the phrase “international and regional peace and security”.

21. **Mr. Omar** (Pakistan) said that his delegation was opposed to the deletion of the word “regional”.

22. **The President** said that, as he had noted at a previous meeting, priority would be given to wording on which consensus had been reached in the past in the event of disagreement. As the Conference had not previously used the word “regional” to modify “peace and security” in its declarations, it would be deleted.

23. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation), expressing regret that a number of the proposals made by his delegation were not reflected in the draft final declaration, said that, as he had already noted, the words “threat of use” should be removed from paragraph (vi). In paragraph (xi), the parenthetical phrase “as well as all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever, by whomever, against whomsoever committed and whatever its motivation” should be deleted. Paragraph (xv), on the equal participation of men and women in activities under the Convention, should be removed in its entirety. Paragraph (xvi) should be amended to refer explicitly to scientific and technological development as one of the issues to be considered by States parties in their review of the operation of the Convention.

24. **The President** said that there had simply been no time to consider the proposals made by the delegation of the Russian Federation, as they had been received after the preparation of the current version of the text.

25. **Ms. Lohman** (United States of America) said that paragraph (ii) should make no mention of the verified elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, a recent addition to

the paragraph, as the words “verify” and “verification” did not appear in the preamble to the Convention, on which the paragraph drew. Paragraph (iv) should retain the wording adopted at the Eighth Review Conference.

26. **Mr. Omarov** (Kazakhstan) said that the coronavirus disease (COVID) pandemic had underscored not only the relevance of surveillance, international cooperation, prevention, preparedness, response and assistance under the Convention, but also the need to establish an institution to strengthen that work, a point that should be made explicit in paragraph (iii).

27. **Ms. Stromšíková** (Czechia) said that, as it was still unclear how international organizations, the World Health Organization in particular, would share responsibility for pandemic-related activities, the establishment of an institution such as that proposed by the representative of Kazakhstan was premature.

28. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba), noting that the aim of the declaration in the preamble was not to restate the preamble to the Convention verbatim, said that most States parties, including those in the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States, favoured progress towards the adoption of a legally binding verification protocol to strengthen the Convention and would like wording to that effect to appear throughout the final document.

29. If a mention of the verified elimination of weapons of mass destruction could not be made in paragraph (ii), a new paragraph (xxiii), should be added to the preamble, in which States parties would recognize the need to adopt a legally binding verification protocol.

30. **The President** said that a reference to possible legally binding measures to enhance the implementation of the Convention had been made in paragraph (x) in an attempt to accommodate the delegation of Cuba and other delegations.

31. **Ms. Rodríguez Ramírez** (Panama) said that the proposal to delete paragraph (xv), in which States parties reaffirmed their commitment to gender equality in activities related to the Convention, was unacceptable. Paragraph (iii) should state that institutional efforts to respond to biological safety risks should be stepped up.

32. **Mr. Robotjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation did not object to the first part of paragraph (xv), in which States parties expressed their commitment to ensuring the equal, full and meaningful participation and leadership of both women and men in the implementation and review of the Convention. The second part, which mentioned what was referred to as their conviction that a gender perspective should be further integrated into all aspects of the implementation of the Convention, should, however, be deleted.

33. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that the idea that the declaration should reproduce the wording of the preamble to the Convention, which had been drafted more than fifty years earlier, was unpersuasive. The purpose of the Conference was in part to ensure that the Convention was an appropriate instrument with which to address contemporary challenges. As representatives of the United States themselves had stated in many a forum, verification was a basic component of any arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation agreement. The puzzling refusal of the United States to countenance the development of a verification mechanism under the Convention was deeply regrettable.

34. The proposal to revert to the wording of the fourth paragraph as adopted at the Eighth Review Conference was similarly regrettable. The subsequent addition to that paragraph, on the non-discriminatory implementation of the Convention, should be retained.

35. **Mr. Horna Chicchón** (Peru) said that his delegation, like the delegation of Kazakhstan, supported efforts to enhance the institutional response to biological safety hazards. It also supported the President’s inclusion of a reference to possible legally binding verification measures in paragraph (x). The proposal to delete paragraph (xv) was, as the representative of Panama had stated, unacceptable.

36. **Mr. Omarov** (Kazakhstan) said that delegations should keep in mind that, in the declaration, the States parties to the Convention were not making decisions or recommendations. His delegation was not opposed to paragraph (xv), but the Iranian proposal would also make for an acceptable compromise.

37. **Mr. Cleobury** (United Kingdom), expressing appreciation for the President's efforts to approach the issue of legally binding verification measures in a manner on which consensus could be reached, said that there was unlikely to be general agreement on other proposals for allusions to verification measures, including in paragraph (ii). Wording to which his delegation objected also appeared in paragraphs (i), (iv) and (viii). Paragraph (xv), on the other hand, should be retained.

38. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that he wondered whether he had understood correctly that the President intended to revert to the wording adopted at the Eighth Review Conference whenever at least one delegation objected to newly proposed wording. Did every delegation have a veto?

39. **The President** said that efforts would be made to reconcile opposing views. Only if such reconciliation proved impossible would he revert to language on which there had been general agreement at the Eighth Review Conference.

40. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that key elements of the text, including paragraphs related to important principles, should not be sacrificed owing to a lack of time. If the Conference could not reach consensus on certain language, then that language could be placed in square brackets and reconsidered at a later stage.

41. **The President** said that he did not think that the use of square brackets was the best approach. He and the secretariat were aware of the issues that were a source of disagreement and would attempt to reconcile different views in order to come to an agreed text. If those efforts were unsuccessful, then the Conference would revert to previously agreed language as the safest option.

42. **Mr. Fetz** (Canada) said that his delegation supported the method proposed by the President. The use of square brackets was unlikely to be helpful, given the time constraints.

43. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that the preambular paragraphs of the final declaration were crucial. If any delegations did not agree to the language proposed in those paragraphs, then the Conference should set them aside, in square brackets, pending further efforts to find a consensus, rather than deleting them.

Articles I–IV (paras. 1–24)

44. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that it was important to restore the wording that the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States had proposed as paragraph 1 bis in the previous draft of chapter II of the final document, which reaffirmed that the implementation of all provisions of the Convention should be “full, effective and non-discriminatory”. His delegation also requested that certain of its proposals that had not been included in the text under consideration, including proposals to delete language from paragraph 3 and to add new wording under paragraphs 4 bis and 4 ter, should be introduced.

45. **Mr. Robotjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, as the value of the phrase “or other living beings”, which had been introduced in paragraphs 1 and 4, was uncertain, his delegation proposed that it should be removed from both paragraphs. In the second line of paragraph 13, in which the Conference stressed the vital importance of taking the necessary national measures under article IV, he proposed that the word “vital” should be deleted. Paragraph 16 (e), instead of referring to “activities with significant dual-use potential” should refer to activities with the potential for misuse, or simply “activities”. The term “dual-use” had not appeared previously in the final documents of the Review Conferences.

46. In the third sentence of paragraph 17, in which the Conference encouraged States parties to provide assistance or training to other States parties, he proposed deleting the phrase “noting that such assistance contributes to implementation of article X”. That phrase offered an interpretation that was not shared by all States parties.

47. **Mr. Antunes Mariosi** (Brazil) said that paragraph 4 should be left unchanged, because experimentation involving pathogens or toxins should be subject to the strictest biosafety norms. His delegation wished to retain the phrase “humans, animals, plants or other living beings” in paragraphs 1 and 4, considering that it was an objective and

all-encompassing formulation that was aligned with the references to animals and plants in the final document of the Eighth Review Conference.

48. **Ms. Petit** (France) proposed to replace, in paragraph 23, the words “The Conference was informed of voluntary initiatives” with “The Conference acknowledges voluntary initiatives”.

49. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) proposed to insert, in paragraph 12, following the reference to cooperation under article X being taken forward in mutual confidence, the phrase “and without undue restrictions or limitations to the economic and technological development of States parties”. In paragraph 16 (a), which noted the value of encouraging States parties to work cooperatively with various stakeholders to effectively implement voluntary management standards on biosafety and biosecurity, the words “as appropriate” should be included after “work cooperatively”. In paragraph 16 (c), the words “if possible” should be added in relation to the documenting of information in dedicated electronic databases on entities that store or maintain dangerous pathogens. Furthermore, the verb “prohibit” should be inserted in the second sentence of paragraph 22, which would thus read: “The Conference notes that resolution 1540 affirms support for the multilateral treaties whose aim is to prohibit, eliminate or prevent proliferation of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons.”

50. **Mr. Ogasawara** (Japan) said that the delegation of Japan had previously submitted a written proposal on the importance of the role of education in disseminating knowledge about biosafety and biosecurity to professionals in both the private and the public sectors. He proposed to restore the relevant wording that had been included in the previous draft, inserting it at the end of paragraph 18.

51. **The President** said that the Japanese delegation’s proposal had been accommodated in paragraph 16 (g), in which the Conference noted the value of national implementation measures to “promote the development of training and education programmes, including with respect to biosafety and biosecurity for those granted access to biological agents and toxins relevant to the Convention and for those with the knowledge or capacity to modify such agents and toxins”.

52. **Mr. Robotjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation would not accept the insertion of new language in paragraph 23. The current wording of the paragraph appropriately reflected the discussions of the Conference and the concerns of all delegations.

53. **Ms. Andarcia** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation firmly supported the proposal of Cuba in relation to paragraph 12.

54. **Mr. Cleobury** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation did not recognize the value of the proposed additions to paragraphs 9 and 13 and preferred to retain the language that had been agreed at the Eighth Review Conference. In paragraph 15, the phrase “and that they are in full conformity with the objectives and provisions of all the articles of the Convention” was redundant; again, it would be preferable to retain the agreed language from the Eighth Review Conference. Regarding the proposal by the representative of Iran to amend paragraph 16 (e), the delegation of the United Kingdom took the view that the existing language was the most accurate way to reflect the activities concerned. The term “dual-use” was widely used and well understood.

55. **Mr. Bedi** (India) said that his delegation did not see the added value of the repeated references to biosafety, biosecurity and biorisk management standards in paragraphs 16 (a) and (j) and 24. It would be preferable for such language to be consolidated in a single paragraph.

Articles VII–IX (paras. 41–74)

56. **Ms. Lohman** (United States of America) said that her delegation could not accept the reference in paragraph 62 to the possible establishment and employment of multi-purpose biomedical rapid reaction units”. The clearly stated position of the United States was that any establishment or employment of such units must be done in a national capacity and should not be considered under the Convention. Therefore, the paragraph should be deleted or reformulated.

57. **Mr. Robotjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, to reflect proposals by various delegations, a new sentence should be added to paragraph 50, to read: “States parties should avoid any measures which could hinder the provision of timely humanitarian assistance.” In paragraph 61, the words “The Conference welcomes the operationalization of a database” might be replaced with the words “The Conference supports the establishment of a database”, as the outcome of the Conference’s discussions in respect of the database was not yet clear. Paragraph 64 was new language that was not relevant to article VII; he proposed that it should be deleted. His delegation could not accept the new language contained in the second sentence of paragraph 74, according to which the Conference encouraged dialogue between the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention experts.

58. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that it was disappointing to note, once again, that positions put forward by the Russian Federation were not reflected in the draft. He had expected the relevant corrections to be made, in line with the proposals his delegation had made concerning paragraphs 54, 57, 58, 63 and 64. His delegation did not believe that it would be appropriate to include paragraph 45.

59. Regarding the section on article VIII, he pointed out that the language from paragraph 53 of the final document of the Eighth Review Conference had been omitted from the draft and should be included. The Russian Federation supported the proposal of Iran to delete the second sentence of paragraph 74.

60. Regarding the use of biomedical rapid reaction units, his delegation considered that paragraph 62 was fundamental for the implementation of article VII, as it related to an initiative whereby assistance could be provided to States parties exposed to the possible use of biological weapons, and therefore should be retained.

61. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that, in the section on article VII, a new paragraph 50 bis might be inserted on the basis of language proposed previously by the Islamic Republic of Iran. It would read: “The Conference notes with concern that the application of unilateral coercive measures against States parties to the Convention undermines the targeted States parties’ preparedness and capacities for response, investigation and mitigation of outbreaks of disease and for receiving prompt and effective assistance in addressing outbreaks of disease.” He also proposed to amend paragraph 57 so that, instead of being encouraged to conduct national, regional and international exercises to test and refine their responses to the use of biological and toxin weapons, States parties would be encouraged to consider the feasibility of such exercises. The first sentence of paragraph 58 should be amended to read: “The Conference encourages States parties to consider the promotion of capacity-building through cooperation, as appropriate, with relevant regional and subregional organizations that have mandates relevant to assistance and protection against biological and toxin weapons.” The Cuban delegation supported the proposal to delete the second sentence of paragraph 74.

62. **Ms. Petit** (France) said that, in respect of paragraph 61, she understood that the representative of Iran proposed to revert to the language of the Eighth Review Conference. Since the purpose of the final document was to take account of activities during the current review cycle, as it was no longer a question of the establishment of a database, she proposed that the paragraph should begin: “The Conference supports the operationalization of a database”.

63. *Ms. Ramírez Rodríguez (Panama), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

64. **Mr. Jain** (India) said that his delegation saw merit in the proposal by Iran to make reference in paragraph 50 to the humanitarian dimension. On the other hand, it supported the view expressed by France in respect of paragraph 61, considering that the final document should reflect developments since the Eighth Review Conference and the work done during the current Review Conference. The phrase “supports the operationalization” would give a truer reflection of how things stood.

65. **Ms. Stromšíková** (Czechia) said that her delegation supported neither the proposed addition of a new sentence to paragraph 50, nor the proposed insertion of a paragraph 50 bis, considering that paragraph 50 was adequate as it stood. Referring to humanitarian assistance was unnecessary because the text already provided that States parties should facilitate the

provision of emergency assistance. The proposals that had been made in respect of paragraphs 58 and 63 were regrettable, as they would weaken the language on the promotion of international cooperation, but she was prepared to accept them in a spirit of compromise. Her delegation shared the reservations that had been expressed concerning paragraph 62, as the establishment and employment of multi-purpose biomedical rapid reaction units did not enjoy universal support within the Conference.

66. It was difficult to understand why the second sentence of paragraph 74, which encouraged dialogue between the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention experts, would be problematic for any delegation. It was an established fact that toxins were substances that came under the mandate of both Conventions, and the exchange of information under the two treaties would be conducive to efficiency. Her delegation strongly supported the retention of the sentence.

67. **Mr. Cleobury** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation did not support the proposal to add a new sentence in paragraph 50. He shared the concerns expressed by the delegation of the United States regarding paragraph 62, which might be reformulated with a view to reaching consensus. In particular, the notion that the establishment and employment of multi-purpose biomedical rapid reaction units could facilitate the implementation of article VII was problematic. He proposed that the phrase “could facilitate” should be replaced with “could form part of” or “could play a role in”. Paragraphs 64 and 74 should be retained as they were currently drafted.

68. **Mr. Masmajan** (Switzerland) said that, over the previous four years, significant work had been carried out on the subject matter addressed by paragraph 45. Rather than delete the paragraph, as had been proposed, the Conference should either retain it in its current form or reformulate it in a manner that retained its key elements.

69. *Mr. Bencini (Italy) resumed the Chair.*

70. **Mr. Robotjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that he wished to point out that the draft contained many proposals put forward by a small number of delegations, while other proposals had been completely disregarded. His delegation insisted upon the fair treatment of proposals, and trusted that the President would ensure such fair treatment.

71. The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran was willing to go along with the proposal by the representative of France in respect of paragraph 61. It fully supported the proposal to insert a paragraph 50 bis with the wording put forward by the delegation of Cuba. Regarding paragraph 50, he could not understand why the representatives of Czechia and the United Kingdom objected to the inclusion of language on the avoidance of measures that could hinder the provision of timely humanitarian assistance.

72. **Mr. Domingo** (Philippines) said that, according to the methodology outlined by the President, the Conference did not necessarily have to accede to a request by a single State party to delete a paragraph that enjoyed the support of several States parties. With that in mind, he wished to stress his delegation’s strong desire to see paragraphs 57, 58 and 63 retained in the final document, recalling that they had been supported by several delegations, including States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

Articles X–XI (paras. 75–97)

73. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that in paragraph 78, which stated that the rapid pace of scientific and technological development had created new opportunities for tangible progress on the implementation of article X, the words “full, effective and non-discriminatory” should be inserted before “implementation”. Drawing on a proposal by the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States that had garnered broad support, he proposed to incorporate, in paragraph 82, a new subparagraph (h) bis, in which the Conference would call upon States parties not to establish or maintain, either individually or collectively, any discriminatory measures that could hamper the economic and technological development of States parties. Lastly, he proposed to add a clause at the end of paragraph 88, to make clear that the periodic review by States parties of their national regulations governing exchanges and transfers should include “removing any restrictions and/or limitations against States parties that are contrary to the Convention”.

74. **Ms. Lohman** (United States of America) said she believed that it would be appropriate to amend paragraph 92 in the light of the ongoing discussions within the Conference on the topic of international cooperation and assistance. Accordingly, she proposed that the reference to “a mechanism to ensure full implementation” of international cooperation and assistance should be replaced with “an entity to facilitate implementation”.

75. **Mr. Robotjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the content of paragraph 82 (e) did not belong in the section on article X and should either be moved to an appropriate place under article IV or deleted altogether. At the end of paragraph 88, he proposed to add the words “including by removing restrictions and/or limitations that are contrary to article X of the Convention.” Paragraph 91, too, should be moved to the section on article IV. In paragraph 92, in which the Conference acknowledged the benefit of establishing a mechanism to ensure full implementation of international cooperation and assistance under article X, he proposed inserting the words “effective and non-discriminatory” before “implementation”.

76. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation supported the timely proposals made by the delegations of Cuba and Iran, which strengthened the text and reflected the positions of the overwhelming majority of States parties to the Convention. As the Russian Federation had presented its position on biorisk management standards several times, it went without saying that paragraph 82 (e) should be removed. Paragraph 82 (i) was superfluous, as subparagraph (h) more than adequately addressed the topic of education.

77. **Ms. Andarcia** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation supported the Cuban representative’s proposals on paragraphs 78, 82 and 88, which were designed to ensure that illegal obstacles were not placed in the way of international cooperation and assistance under the Convention.

78. **Mr. Omarov** (Kazakhstan) said that the Conference might insert a new paragraph, based on language that his delegation had proposed previously, in which the Conference would note that various proposals had been made during the intersessional period for the institutional strengthening of the Convention, including the establishment of an international agency for biological safety. He hoped that all delegations would agree that there was a need to discuss the establishment of such an agency, given the limited role of existing organizations.

79. **Ms. Stromšíková** (Czechia) said that her delegation harboured reservations about the proposed additions to paragraphs 82 and 88, considering that the additional language unnecessarily overloaded the text and created the impression that States parties were subjected to undue restrictions that were contrary to the Convention, which was not the case.

80. **Mr. Cleobury** (United Kingdom) said that, for reasons of accuracy and to reflect the consensus, his delegation would prefer to retain the language from the final document of the Eighth Review Conference in respect of article XI.

81. **Ms. Petit** (France) said that the aim of paragraph 91 was to support best practices for promoting the use of bacteriological (biological) agents and toxins for peaceful purposes; it specifically referred to cooperation under article X. It would therefore be more appropriate to maintain paragraph 91 in the section on article X. For the same reasons, it would be preferable to maintain paragraph 82 (e) in its current position.

82. **Ms. Boels** (Belgium) said that her delegation wished to keep the language on biosafety and biosecurity unchanged, in line with the position of France.

Articles XII–XV (paras. 98–109)

83. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that the wording of paragraph 100 was rather imprecise. Rather than a “mechanism to ensure the review of scientific and technological developments relevant to the Convention”, the text should refer to specialized body within the framework of the Convention. It might also be stated that the mandate of that body would be to assess scientific and technological developments relevant to the Convention and to present appropriate specialized recommendations to States parties. His delegation reserved its position in relation to paragraph 101, for the reasons that it had explained previously.

84. **Mr. Robotjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, in paragraph 100, preceding the reference to the review of scientific and technological developments, the words “mechanism to ensure” should be replaced with “process to continue”. Paragraph 101 should be amended so that the Conference would “encourage States parties to promote the equitable participation of women and men in decision-making in the review conferences of the Convention and in the Bureau”, deleting the reference to gender balance.

85. **Mr. Padilla González** (Cuba) proposed replacing, in paragraph 100, the phrase “mechanism to ensure” with “process to facilitate”. The amended paragraph would read: “The Conference acknowledges the benefit of establishing a process to facilitate the review of scientific and technological developments relevant to the Convention.”

86. **The President** said that consultations with interested delegations regarding the sections on articles V and VI were continuing. All oral and written proposals on the draft final document would be incorporated into a revised version as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.