

《关于禁止发展、生产和储存细菌(生物)
及毒素武器和销毁此种武器的公约》
缔约国会议

25 September 2017
Chinese
Original: English

2017 年会议

2017 年 12 月 4 日至 8 日，日内瓦

临时议程项目 8

执行支助股年度报告

执行支助股年度报告

执行支助股提交

概要

本报告叙述执行支助股 2017 年为执行第六、第七和第八次审查会议赋予它的以下任务而开展的活动：在管理和全面执行《公约》方面向缔约国提供支助；促进普遍加入《公约》；便利交流建立信任措施；建立和管理援助数据库；管理赞助方案。第七次审查会议决定，执行支助股“将向所有缔约国提交一份履行任务活动情况简明年度书面报告”(BWC/CONF.VII/7, 第三部分, 第 36 段)，第八次审查会议决定，继续采用这一做法(BWC/CONF.VIII/4, 第三部分, 第 8 段)。



一. 导言

1. 2017 年，执行支助股(支助股)根据第八次审查会议的决定和建议(BWC/CONF.VIII/4, 第三部分)开展活动；第八次审查会议决定，按照第七次审查会议的延期，将第六次审查会议原先决定的支助股的任务授权从 2017 年延至 2020 年。

2. 支助股由《公约》缔约国会议提供经费，作为 2017-2020 年闭会期间方案费用的一部分；第八次审查会议决定，“闭会期间方案费用将由《公约》所有缔约国按照联合国会费分摊比例表分摊，同时根据《公约》缔约国数目与联合国会员国数目之间的差异按比例作出调整”。支助股 2017 年的预算见于第八次审查会议核准的估计费用，BWC/CONF.VIII/5。然而，正如向第八次审查会议所报告的那样，在《生物武器公约》财务状况方面，挑战依然存在，需要注意其财务安排以及一些缔约国的重大拖欠情况。如果不加以重视，这种局面可能在 2018 年对《生物武器公约》造成负面影响。2017 年期间，支助股收到了澳大利亚、加拿大、德国和印度支持《生物武器公约》赞助方案的自愿捐款(详见第七节)。

3. 此外，欧洲联盟正在通过欧洲委员会第 2016/51/CFSP 号决定支持《生物武器公约》；联合国裁军事务厅是其执行机构。该决定涉及在三年期间向裁军事务厅提供 2,340,000 欧元捐款，以开展活动支持《生物武器公约》。¹ 该项目的实施始于 2016 年 2 月，2017 年全年继续开展。根据该项决定，在缔约国开展了许多活动，在裁军事务厅日内瓦办事处雇佣了两名专业职类和一般事务职类工作人员。此外，2017 年 8 月，加拿大向裁军事务厅提供了 382,000 美元自愿捐款，用于一个项目，以加强应对蓄意使用生物制剂的全球机制和能力。这些资金正被用来组织若干小型讲习班，并用来聘用一名顾问，帮助实施该项目。一部分资金还将用于上述赞助方案，以及支持执行支助股的差旅。最后，爱尔兰自愿捐款 3,800 欧元，以支持执行支助股 2017 年的工作。

4. 支助股设在联合国裁军事务厅日内瓦办事处内，办事处为支助股提供一系列支持服务，包括财务、后勤、行政和人事管理。办事处还为支助股遵守联合国的规则和条例提供便利，以提高其工作效率。办事处在协调和联络联合国日内瓦办事处各相关部门，为组织《生物武器公约》的大小会议提供支持方面起了很大作用。

5. 支助股由 3 个定期工作人员职位组成，尽管 2017 年半年时间都是在仅有 2 名工作人员的情况下运作。事实上，正如支助股向第八次审议大会筹备委员会报告(BWC/CONF.VIII/PC/7)中提到的，2014 至 2017 年大部分时间内，由于征聘、产假或其他人员配置变动，支助股一直是在三分之二的预定能力下运作的。由于支助股目前的资金安排不允许征聘临时工作人员以填补这些空缺，也不允许将一年的未动用资金结转到下一年度，导致情况更加恶化。

6. 2017 年，支助股得到几名实习生的协助：Maylis David 女士和 Clarisse Bertherat 女士的 2016 年实习一直继续到 2017 年 3 月；Aurelie Buytaert 女士的实

¹ 欧洲委员会决定全文见 [https://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/\(httpAssets\)/3278FA0ECF3132A8C12580A00035AF4B/\\$file/CFSP-2016-51+Council+Decision+in+support+of+the+BWC.pdf](https://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/(httpAssets)/3278FA0ECF3132A8C12580A00035AF4B/$file/CFSP-2016-51+Council+Decision+in+support+of+the+BWC.pdf)。

习为 2017 年 4 月至 6 月；Madeline McSherry 女士的实习为 2017 年 6 月至 8 月；Keishi Abe 先生的实习为 2017 年 6 月至 8 月；Maria Elena Amadori 女士的实习将在 2017 年 9 月 25 日开始。

7. 本报告有专节叙述支助股的每项主要任务，还载有以下四个附件(只有英文本):

- Annex I: Meetings and events attended by the Implementation Support Unit;
- Annex II: National Points of Contact;
- Annex III: Participation in the Confidence-Building Measures;
- Annex IV: Summary of national inputs on improving the Cooperation and Assistance Database

二. 对《公约》的行政支助

8. 执行支助股是 2017 年缔约国会议的实务秘书处，也为主席和副主席的活动提供支助。支助股继续履行以往报告所述的广泛行政职能。

9. 2017 年，支助股编写了一份出版物，题为《生物武器公约：简介》，旨在提供关于《生物武器公约》、《公约》义务、条款和援助方案的实用信息。该出版物可在研讨会及其他此类活动中以纸质本分发，也可在《生物武器公约》网站上获得。² 如果能够找到资金，该出版物还将翻译为其他语文。此外，支助股已开始定期发布“生物武器公约通讯”，这是一份非正式出版物，其中介绍了与《生物武器公约》相关的动态、支助股活动的最新情况、缔约国援助机会详情以及《生物武器公约》相关的出版物链接。“通讯”通过电子邮件分发，并张贴在《生物武器公约》网站上。³

10. 支助股继续维护和更新《生物武器公约》网站(<http://www.unog.ch/bwc>)，以不但提高该网站对缔约国的实用性，而且使其更便于向全球受众传播、提高认识和交流。更加突出了关于合作与援助数据库及赞助方案的章节。

11. 支助股还利用社交媒体，提高对《生物武器公约》的认识。2015 年初，支助股建立了一个 Facebook 网页，该网页现在有 520 多个“点赞”。⁴ 同时，支助股还设有一个 Twitter 账户，吸引了大约 1,100 名关注者。⁵ 设计这两个工具都是为了补充《生物武器公约》网站，该网站仍是《公约》相关文件和信息的主要存储库。

12. 支助股与许多科学、专业和学术机构以及工业界和非政府组织保持经常联系。这些联系提供了见解和信息，有助于支助股支持缔约国的努力。支助股还同

² 见 [https://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/\(httpAssets\)/6D16C7B1933F0937C125815D00349763/\\$file/BWS+brochure.pdf](https://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/(httpAssets)/6D16C7B1933F0937C125815D00349763/$file/BWS+brochure.pdf)。

³ 见 <http://mailchi.mp/734eb0c7439d/news-from-the-bwc-isu>。

⁴ www.facebook.com/1972BWC

⁵ www.twitter.com/BWCISU

与《公约》相关的各种国际组织保持经常联系。支助股，在与其任务授权相一致的活动中，积极参与这些组织开展的常规程序、对外宣传和执行活动。

三. 《公约》的执行情况

13. 2017 年，支助股继续收集并更新《公约》国家联络点的详情(见附件二)。截至 2017 年 9 月 22 日，110 个缔约国指定了国家联络点。2 个签署国、3 个非缔约国和 1 个区域组织也提供了联络点信息。在《生物武器公约》网站限制区中提供了这些国家联络点的联系信息。

14. 支助股参加讲习班和研讨会十分有助于提高各国政府以及国际和区域组织、科学界、专业协会、学术界和私营部门等其他相关行为方对《公约》及其执行情况的认识。支助股还共同主办或协助规划和组织了与改善《生物武器公约》执行工作直接有关的一些会议和活动。在整个一年中，支助股接受邀请参加各种会议和活动，(见附件一)，但由于资源限制，也不得不拒绝许多邀请。

15. 支助股注意到，寻求援助《生物武器公约》执行工作和其他方面的缔约国、区域和国际组织和其他实体的数目大量增加。这种兴趣是以援助请求形式表达的，这种请求是通过合作与援助数据库或以双边方式提出的，或者，通过接触支助股，了解其参与国家援助活动的事宜。这些援助活动包括，在欧盟欧洲委员会第 2016/51/CFSP 号决定、联合国安全理事会第 1540(2004)号决议、欧盟化生放核风险化解卓越中心等框架内开展的国家或区域活动。所有这些活动及其他活动的详情列于本报告附件一。

16. 然而，由于上文所述支助股的差旅预算有限和人员配置情况，许多与会或其他活动的邀请不得不拒绝，支助股仍然无法满足所有向它提出的援助请求。

四. 建立信任措施

17. 按照以往审查会议的决定，支助股为交流建立信任措施提供支持。支助股在《生物武器公约》网站上收存了建立信任措施表格的所有正式语文本电子版。附件三列出了 2017 年建立信任措施资料的提交情况(涵盖 2016 日历年)，并按照每个建立信任措施表格分列。

18. 在《生物武器公约》网站限制区内向缔约国提供了所有 2017 年建立信任措施回馈表(<http://www.unog.ch/bwc/restricted>)。迄今共有 25 个缔约国请求将其提交的建立信任措施资料同时放在网站的公开区(<http://www.unog.ch/bwc/cbms>)。

19. 按照第六次审查会议的决定，2017 年 1 月 15 日，支助股股长致函各缔约国常驻代表团和国家联络点，通报了年度提交建立信任措施资料的截止日期(2017 年 4 月 15 日)。

20. 截至 2017 年 9 月 22 日：

(a) 68 个缔约国(占缔约国总数的 38.2%)提交了涵盖 2016 日历年的建立信任措施资料；

(b) 其中，40 个缔约国在截止日期 2017 年 4 月 15 日当日或之前提交了建立信任措施资料；

(c) 19 个缔约国在 2016 年提交了建立信任措施资料，但在 2017 年尚未提交；

(d) 另有 5 个缔约国在 2016 年未提交建立信任措施资料，但在 2017 年提交了资料。

21. 共有 55 个缔约国从未提交过建立信任措施资料。

五. 促进普遍加入

22. 通过准备信函和简报材料，支助股为主席和副主席促进普遍加入的活动提供支持。

23. 支助股向若干非缔约签署国提供了关于《公约》的资料和建议。支助股还在它所参加的研讨会和活动中促进普遍加入，在这些研讨会和活动中，有非缔约国代表在场(见附件一)。例如，支助股参加了 2017 年 7 月在斐济举行的普遍加入《生物武器公约》问题区域研讨会，该研讨会是在欧盟欧洲委员会第 2016/51/CFSP 号决定框架内组织的。支助股与参加研讨会的四个非缔约国(基里巴斯、纽埃、萨摩亚和图瓦卢)的代表进行了接触。

24. 这些活动的更多详情以及迄今为止取得的成果，见主席的普遍加入活动报告(BWC/MSP/2017/3)。

六. 援助请求和援助意愿数据库

25. 第七次审查会议决定建立一个数据库系统，以便利缔约国之间请求提供援助和表示愿意提供援助以及进行合作(BWC/CONF.VII/7, 第三部分, 第 17-20 段)。审查会议授权支助股：建立和管理该数据库；根据请求，便利缔约国之间交流数据库信息及随后的任何合作和援助活动；向缔约国报告数据库运行情况，详述提供援助意愿、所寻求的援助请求和在一个日历年期间完成的匹配。2017 年，支助股继续维护和管理该数据库。援助意愿资料可在《生物武器公约》网站公共区查阅；援助请求资料，缔约国可在网站限制区查阅。数据库的使用沿用两条轨道：缔约国接触支助股，了解援助意愿/援助请求，以便它充当援助提供国/请求国之间的联络机构；或者，援助请求国/提供国以双边方式接触援助提供国/请求国。2017 年，支助股继续为援助提供缔约国和援助请求缔约国之间的联系提供便利，第八次审查会议以来开展了两次此类匹配活动。

26. 正如支助股向第八次审查会议筹备委员会提交的报告(BWC/CONF.VIII/PC/7 和 Amend.1)所指出的，“数据库系统”的目标尚未实现。第七次审查会议请支助股建立和维护数据库，但未分配任何额外资源，以开发一个全面运作的数据库。因此，2012 年，仅建立了一个基本数据库，匹配援助提供和援助请求的功能未能按照所希望的那样运作。此外，正如 2014 年缔约国会议所承认的，缔约国对数据库的使用率比较“低”。直至最近，向支助股提交的援助意向或请求很少，援助意向数目比援助请求大约多一倍。部分原因可能是，援助请求被置于《生物武器公约》网站的限制区。已经很明显的是，一些可能提出援助请求的缔约国更愿意以非正式方式或在双边层面上解决其需求，而不是使信息出现在数据

库中。另一个挑战是，一些援助请求不够明确，这可能是由于整个程序缺乏结构化所致。

27. 为此，2017 年，支助股作出很大专门努力，以进一步推广和更有效地利用该数据库。每个新的援助意愿立即向所有缔约国发送，同时，新的援助请求发送给表示愿意提供援助的所有缔约国。支助股利用其新建立的通讯，以向缔约国和其他相关行为方推广数据库，并更新数据库内的援助意愿和请求状态。支助股还在其他外联活动中推广该数据库，例如，安全援助问题座谈会、向研究机构作专题介绍、学术研讨会、对日内瓦的政府和大学访问。在上述新出版物——《生物武器公约》：简介——中也提到了该数据库。

28. 截至 2017 年 9 月 22 日，该数据库载录了：

- (a) 9 个缔约国和 1 个国家集团表达的 60 项援助意愿；
- (b) 7 个缔约国提出的 31 项援助请求；以及更新的 1 项援助请求。

29. 最重要的是，针对上文第 26 段所述情况，第八次审查会议委托支助股，参考缔约国提供的意见，“设法改进该数据库，以确保数据库更加方便用户和更加全面，并确保缔约国可在数据库中提供专项、及时和具体的合作意愿和合作请求” (BWC/CONF.VIII/4, 第三部分, 第 9 段)。从 8 个缔约国(阿尔巴尼亚、加拿大、古巴、德国、卡塔尔、瑞典、特立尼达和多巴哥、大不列颠及北爱尔兰联合王国)收到了意见，摘要载于本报告附件四。因此，按照第八次审议会议赋予的任务，在 2017 年期间，支助股在已收到的意见基础上，致力于更新该数据库。将在 2017 年 12 月缔约国第四次会议上介绍新的改进版数据库。

30. 支助股还在其他场合与相关援助提供方保持定期接触。例如，支助股继续就相关国家立法和执行措施问题与援助提供方密切合作，例如国际刑警组织、红十字国际委员会、禁止化学武器组织、议员全球行动联盟、核查研究、训练和信息中心、根据联合国安全理事会第 1540(2004)号决议设立的委员会。

七. 赞助方案

31. 支助股管理第七次审查会议“为支持和增加发展中缔约国参加闭会期间方案会议” (BWC/CONF.VII/7, 第三部分, 第 21 段)而建立的赞助方案。

32. 截至 2017 年 9 月 22 日，收到了 3 个缔约国(澳大利亚、加拿大和印度)对赞助方案的自愿捐款。德国作出了认捐；在编写本报告时，正在处理适当协议。此外，其他缔约国通过双边安排为赞助方案提供支助。

33. 截至 2017 年 9 月 22 日，已收到来自 20 个国家的参加 2017 年缔约国会议赞助申请。按照第七次审查会议的决定，支助股将征求缔约国会议主席和副主席的意见，对现有赞助资源进行分配，优先赞助那些未曾参加过这些会议或无法定期从首都派出专家与会的缔约国，并考虑到赞助非缔约国参加会议，以促进《公约》的普遍性。

八. 结论和未来工作

34. 2017 年期间，支助股注意到，在国家和区域层面，对《生物武器公约》的兴趣和关注大量增加。这表现在：更多的援助请求；关于提交建立信任措施的指导；非缔约国表示有兴趣加入《公约》；赞助申请数量增加；国家联络点数目增加；支助股受邀参加的活动数目增加。这反映出，在多边裁军框架内，出现了值得欢迎的对《生物武器公约》重要性的承认。

35. 尽管面临上述挑战和资源限制，支助股还是继续尽最大努力满足这种增加的需求，并通过与缔约国和有关国际组织和其他实体的合作做到了这一点。

36. 因此，支助股谨对缔约国在支助股 2017 年履行任务过程中给予的合作和支持表示感谢。

Annex I

[English only]

Meetings and events attended by the Implementation Support Unit

As of 22 September, representatives of the Implementation Support Unit participated, or are scheduled to participate, in the following 44 meetings and events in 2017:

1. On 12 January, in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a presentation on the BWC to a group of students from the University of Fribourg. (Alex Lampalzer)
2. On 19-20 January at the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons in The Hague (the Netherlands), members of the ISU participated in an inter-agency tabletop exercise organized by the CTITF WMD Working Group project on Effective Inter-Agency Interoperability and Coordinated Communication in Case of Chemical and/or Biological Attacks. (Alex Lampalzer and Daniel Feakes)
3. On 19 January, at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU participated in a panel discussion during a course on “Strategic Foresight: International Governance of Existential Risks” (Daniel Feakes)
4. On 26 January, in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a briefing to the Secretary-General’s Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters on the outcome of the Eighth Review Conference and biosecurity issues (Daniel Feakes)
5. On 9 February, at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a presentation on the BWC during the 21st European Security Course (Daniel Feakes)
6. On 22-23 February, in Rome (Italy), a member of the ISU gave several presentations on BWC issues, focusing on preparedness and response (Article VII) and assistance and cooperation (Article X) during a meeting of the Biosecurity Working Group of the Global Partnership (Daniel Feakes)
7. On 22 February in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a presentation to a visiting group from the German Armed Forces (Alex Lampalzer)
8. On 21 March at the Centre for the Study of Existential Risk in Cambridge (United Kingdom), a member of the ISU gave a presentation on the outcome of the Eighth Review Conference (Daniel Feakes)
9. On 22-24 March in Milan (Italy), a member of the ISU gave a presentation on the BWC during the Seventh Annual International Symposium on “Biosecurity and Biosafety: Future Trends and Solutions” (Daniel Feakes)
10. On 27 March in Freetown (Sierra Leone), a member of the ISU participated via video link in a Regional Africa Workshop on Universality and National Implementation of the BWC organized by Parliamentarians for Global Action (Daniel Feakes)
11. On 29 March in Geneva (Switzerland), members of the ISU participated in a workshop for assistance providers and experts in support of the Extended Assistance Programmes under EU Council Decision 2016/51/CFSP (Daniel Feakes and Alex Lampalzer)
12. On 30 March in Geneva (Switzerland), members of the ISU gave a presentation to students participating in the Geneva International Model United Nations (Daniel Feakes and Alex Lampalzer)
13. On 3 April in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a presentation to a visiting group from the Polish Academy of Diplomacy (Alex Lampalzer)
14. On 4 April in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a presentation to a visiting group from the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights (Alex Lampalzer)

15. On 9-11 May in Rabat (Morocco), a member of the ISU participated in a peer review exercise organized under EU Council Decision 2016/51/CFSP in support of the BWC (Alex Lampalzer)
16. On 15 May in Santiago (Chile), a member of the ISU participated via video link in a Latin America Regional Workshop to Promote Implementation of the BWC organized by Parliamentarians for Global Action (Daniel Feakes)
17. On 17 May in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a presentation to a visiting group of officials from Pakistan (Alex Lampalzer)
18. On 17 May in Brussels (Belgium), a member of the ISU gave a presentation at the Fifth International Meeting of the National Focal Points of the EU CBRN Risk Mitigation Centres of Excellence (Daniel Feakes)
19. On 18 May in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a presentation to a visiting group of officials from Kennesaw State University (Alex Lampalzer)
20. On 24 May in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the gave a presentation on BWC assistance and cooperation activities to the Biosecurity Working Group of the Global Partnership (Daniel Feakes)
21. On 26 May in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a briefing to officials from Colombia on the national implementation of the BWC and avenues for assistance (Daniel Feakes)
22. On 19 June at the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons in The Hague (the Netherlands), a member of the ISU briefed the OPCW Open-Ended Working Group on Future Priorities on the outreach, engagement and assistance activities of the ISU (Daniel Feakes)
23. On 20-22 June in Spiez (Switzerland), a member of the ISU participated in a designated laboratories workshop in the context of the Secretary-General's Mechanism (Alex Lampalzer)
24. On 29 June in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a presentation on the BWC to a group of students from the University of Fribourg. (Alex Lampalzer)
25. On 30 June in Paris (France), a member of the ISU briefed a plenary meeting of the Australia Group on cooperation and assistance activities under the BWC (Daniel Feakes)
26. On 7 July in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a presentation on the BWC to a group of students from the University of Fribourg. (Alex Lampalzer)
27. On 12 July at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU gave a presentation on the BWC to the course on "Building Capacities on Arms Control in the MENA Region" (Daniel Feakes)
28. On 12-14 July in Geneva (Switzerland), members of the ISU participated in the International Network on Biotechnology (INB) partners meeting (Daniel Feakes and Alex Lampalzer)
29. On 26 July in Nadi (Fiji), a member of the ISU participated in a national workshop on implementation of the BWC (Alex Lampalzer)
30. On 27-28 July in Nadi (Fiji), a member of the ISU participated in a regional workshop on the universalization of the BWC for Pacific Island states organized in the context of EU Council Decision 2016/51/CFSP (Alex Lampalzer)
31. On 22-24 August in Ho Chi Minh City (Viet Nam), a member of the ISU gave a presentation on the BWC and assistance and cooperation activities to the Annual Conference of the Asia-Pacific Biosafety Association (Daniel Feakes)
32. On 6 September at the TMC Asser Institute in The Hague (the Netherlands), a member of the ISU gave a presentation on the BWC to the OPCW WMD summer course "Disarmament and Non-Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction in a Changing World" (Daniel Feakes)
33. On 12-15 September at The World Academy of Science in Trieste (Italy), a member of the ISU gave presentations on the BWC and assistance and cooperation activities during

a workshop on “Policy and Diplomacy for Scientists: Introduction to responsible research practices in chemical and biological sciences” (Daniel Feakes)

34. On 7-9 September in Issyk-Kul (Kyrgyzstan), a member of the ISU gave a presentation at a round table on the implementation of the BWC in the context of the realization of the National Action Plan of the Kyrgyz Republic on implementation of UNSCR 1540 (Alex Lampalzer)

35. On 21-22 September at the Ukrainian National Academy for Sciences in Kyiv (Ukraine), a member of the ISU participated in the first regional workshop on implications of developments in science and technology for the BWC organized in the framework of EU Council Decision 2016/51/CFSP (Alex Lampalzer)

36. On 27-28 September in Bangkok (Thailand), a member of the ISU will participate in a “South-East Asian Workshop on Global Challenges to Successful Implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1540 and Regional Efforts to Address Them”

37. On 11-13 October in Hannover (Germany), a member of the ISU will participate in an international workshop assessing the security implications of genome editing technology

38. On 16 October in Vienna (Austria), a member of the ISU will participate in a Consultative Meeting on Turkmenistan’s draft National Action Plan on UNSCR 1540 (2004) and present about national implementation aspects pertaining to the BWC

39. On 17-18 October at the African Union headquarters in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia), a member of the ISU will participate in a joint workshop for BWC national contact points from AU Member States

40. On 31 October – 2 November in Ottawa (Canada), a member of the ISU will participate in the Second Global Biothreat Reduction Conference organized by the World Animal Health Organization

41. On 1-2 November in Sochi (Russian Federation), a member of the ISU will participate in the international conference on “Global Biosecurity Challenges: Problems and Solutions”

42. On 5-6 November on the Dead Sea (Jordan), a member of the ISU will participate in the second regional workshop on implications of developments in science and technology for the BWC organized in the framework of EU Council Decision 2016/51/CFSP

43. On 15-16 November in Rome (Italy), a member of the ISU will participate in the Biosecurity Working Group of the Global Partnership

44. On 28 November in Geneva (Switzerland), a member of the ISU will provide a presentation on the BWC to students from Boston University/Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights

Annex II

[English only]

National Points of Contact

The following States have nominated a national point of contact to the ISU by 22 September 2017.

Full contact details, including telephone numbers and e-mail addresses, are available to States Parties in the restricted area of the ISU website (<http://www.unog.ch/bwc/restricted>).

I. States Parties

Afghanistan
Albania
Algeria
Antigua and Barbuda
Argentina
Armenia
Australia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Bahrain
Belarus
Belgium
Bhutan
Brazil
Bulgaria
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cameroon
Canada
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Croatia
Cuba
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Democratic Republic of Congo
Denmark
Ecuador

Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany
Ghana
Greece
Guinea
Holy See
Hungary
Iceland
India
Indonesia
Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Iraq
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Jordan
Kazakhstan
Kenya
Kuwait
Kyrgyzstan
Lao People's Democratic Republic
Latvia
Lebanon
Libya
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Madagascar
Malawi
Malaysia
Malta
Mauritius
Mexico
Montenegro
Morocco
Mozambique
Netherlands

New Zealand
Niger
Nigeria
Norway
Oman
Pakistan
Palau
Peru
Poland
Portugal
Qatar
Republic of Korea
Republic of Moldova
Romania
Russian Federation
Saint Kitts and Nevis
Saudi Arabia
Senegal
Slovakia
Slovenia
South Africa
Spain
Sri Lanka
Sudan
Sweden
Switzerland
Thailand
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Turkey
Uganda
Ukraine
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United States of America
Uruguay
Uzbekistan
Venezuela
Yemen
Zambia

II. Signatories

Haiti

United Republic of Tanzania

III. States not party

Israel

Micronesia (Federated States of)

Namibia

IV. Regional organizations

European Union

Annex III

[English only]

Report on participation in the Confidence-Building Measures

Provisional summary of participation in 2017 (as of 22 September 2017)

Key: D = declaration submitted; ND = nothing to declare; NN = nothing new to declare.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>A1</i>	<i>A2(i)</i>	<i>A2(ii)</i>	<i>A2(iii)</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>
Albania	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Argentina	D	ND	ND	ND	D	D	NN	ND	D
Australia	NN	NN	D	D	D	D	NN	NN	NN
Austria	D	NN	D	D	ND	ND	NN	ND	ND
Azerbaijan	NN	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	NN	ND	ND
Belarus	D	NN	NN	ND	D	D	D	ND	D
Belgium	ND	D	D	D	ND	D	D	ND	D
Bhutan	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	NN	ND	ND
Bosnia-Herzegovina	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Brazil	D	D	ND	ND	D	ND	D	D	D
Bulgaria	NN	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	NN	ND	NN
Canada	NN	NN	D	D	D	D	NN	NN	D
Chile	NN	ND	ND	ND	D	D	NN	ND	NN
China	D	D	D	D	ND	D	D	NN	D
Colombia	NN	ND	ND	ND	NN	ND	D	ND	D
Cuba	D	NN	NN	NN	ND	D	ND	NN	NN
Czech Republic	NN	NN	NN	ND	ND	ND	NN	NN	NN
Denmark	ND	ND	NN	D	ND	ND	D	NN	D
Finland	D	D	D	D	ND	D	D	ND	ND
France	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
Georgia	ND	NN	ND	D	ND	D	D	D	ND
Germany	D	D	D	D	D	D	NN	NN	D
Hungary	D	NN	NN	NN	D	D	NN	ND	NN
India	D	D	D	D	NN	NN	NN	D	D
Iraq	NN	ND	ND	ND	NN	ND	NN	ND	NN

<i>State Party</i>	<i>A1</i>	<i>A2(i)</i>	<i>A2(ii)</i>	<i>A2(iii)</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>
Ireland	NN	D	ND	ND	NN	NN	D	ND	D
Italy	D	D	D	D	D	NN	NN	D	D
Japan	NN	NN	D	NN	ND	D	NN	NN	D
Jordan	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Kazakhstan	NN	NN	NN	NN	NN	NN	NN	NN	NN
Kyrgyzstan	ND	ND	ND	ND	D	ND	D	ND	D
Latvia	D	D	ND	D	ND	ND	D	NN	ND
Liechtenstein	ND	ND	ND	ND	NN	NN	NN	ND	ND
Lithuania	NN	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	NN
Luxembourg	NN	ND	ND	ND	NN	NN	NN	ND	ND
Madagascar	D	ND	ND	ND	D	ND	ND	ND	ND
Malaysia	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Malta	NN	NN	NN	NN	D	NN	NN	NN	NN
Mexico	NN	ND	ND	ND	ND	D	NN	ND	NN
Montenegro	NN	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	D	ND	ND
Morocco	D	ND	ND	ND	D	ND	D	ND	D
Netherlands	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	NN	D
New Zealand	D	ND	ND	ND	NN	ND	NN	NN	ND
Nicaragua	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Norway	ND	NN	NN	NN	ND	NN	D	NN	NN
Philippines	D	ND	ND	ND	D	D	D	ND	D
Poland	NN	NN	NN	NN	ND	ND	ND	ND	NN
Portugal	NN	NN	ND	ND	ND	ND	NN	NN	ND
Qatar	ND	ND	ND	ND	D	ND	ND	ND	ND
Republic of Korea	D	D	D	D	ND	D	D	ND	NN
Russian Federation	D	D	D	D	ND	D	D	NN	D
Saudi Arabia	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Serbia	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Seychelles	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Singapore	ND	NN	D	D	NN	NN	NN	NN	D
Slovakia	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	D	NN	ND	ND
Slovenia	NN	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	NN	ND	ND
South Africa	NN	D	D	D	ND	ND	NN	NN	ND

<i>State Party</i>	<i>A1</i>	<i>A2(i)</i>	<i>A2(ii)</i>	<i>A2(iii)</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>
Spain	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	ND	ND
Sweden	D	D	D	D	ND	ND	NN	NN	NN
Switzerland	D	NN	D	D	D	NN	D	NN	D
Thailand	NN	ND	ND	ND	NN	D	D	ND	NN
Turkey	NN	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	NN	NN	D
Ukraine	NN	ND	ND	ND	D	D	ND	ND	NN
United Arab Emirates	D	D	D	D	D	ND	D	ND	ND
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	NN	D
United States of America	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	NN	D
Uzbekistan	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

Annex IV

[English only]

Summary of national inputs on improving the Cooperation and Assistance Database

1. In response to the mandate from the Eighth Review Conference, the ISU circulated a letter on 15 December 2016 inviting States Parties to submit inputs on ways to improve the Cooperation and Assistance Database by 28 February 2017. The ISU received inputs from eight States Parties (Albania, Canada, Cuba, Germany, Qatar, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). These inputs are summarized below in four categories.
2. The first category captures suggestions relating to the format and nature of the information to be provided on requests/offers. The second compiles proposals relating to mechanisms for communicating offers and requests to States Parties. The third is concerned with suggestions relating to design features and functionality of the database with a view to improving its user-friendliness. The fourth category summarizes proposals on modalities for reporting on requests responded to by offering States Parties.
3. Implementation of the proposals below will be dependent on feasibility and resources.

Proposals regarding the format and nature of the information to be provided on requests/offers

4. The degree of information on offers of assistance should be widened. States Parties should post about cooperation mechanisms, and not only specific projects. States Parties seeking assistance could then approach a national cooperation mechanism unit and not be limited by the specific projects offered. This information could be made available in a third table called “mechanisms for cooperation under Article X”.
5. States Parties making requests should be encouraged to make more specific requests. Specific and generic requests should be separated in different PDF pages. This would aid specific requests to be taken up by donor states and actioned. One page could host specific requests, and other pages should be created to host thematic requests which would be divided along headers such as “legislative compliance”.
6. States Parties should make use of a guidance form with categories or requests to make more specific requests. This would aid requests to be taken up by donor States and actioned. Suggested categories included, inter alia: national implementation, including biosafety/biosecurity and biorisk management; emergency response and assistance; capacity building, disease surveillance and detection; science outreach and education; assistance with CBM submission; assistance with legislative compliance; transfer of materials, agents and technology; training and education; cooperation and joint research; surveillance/detection of diseases; assistance in the elaboration of codes of ethics; provision of equipment; and support for facilities and advice. Each category could be divided into sub-themes. Each request/offer could be cross-referenced if relevant in more than one category/sub-theme. Categories and sub-themes could be colour-coded.
7. The information available on each request/offer should be more homogenous. This could be facilitated by making requests and offers through the completion of a template or model.
8. More information should be provided regarding the projects’ completion status, including concerning multi-step projects in which one State Party may provide assistance on one aspect of a project and another may step in to address other aspects. This type of update would allow those consulting the database to better determine whether projects are

being completed, by whom and in what manner, in a transparent way. A new column in both the Offers and Requests database could be added to provide this information.

9. Information on offers of assistance should include costs to be met. It should be clear where offers include cost-free assistance, or where sources of funding might be needed to cover costs in full or in part.

10. Information on offers/requests should indicate a timeframe, if applicable.

11. Information on offers/requests should indicate language requirements to take part in a given offer or request.

Proposals regarding mechanisms for communicating offers and requests to States Parties

12. The database should be promoted at meetings of capacity building units (by the ISU). Requests should be matched by the ISU with programmes provided by relevant international organisations (WHO, OIE and FAO).

13. New or amended offers should be highlighted by adding an update on the 'Latest News' page of the BWC website.

14. Uptake of assistance offers should be indicated in an additional column in the offers table.

15. The ISU should notify the missions in Geneva and national contact points via e-mail about new offers and requests entered in the database. Such notifications could include a reference to offers or requests that could satisfy or correspond to, even partially, the new submission.

Proposals for design features and functionality of the database with a view to improving its user-friendliness

16. The information in the Database should be made available in the six official languages of the United Nations.

17. The database should be shorter. Any interested States Parties could then be directed to contact the ISU if they want further information, which would have the positive consequence of tracking interest.

18. Guidelines should be provided outlining the process for submitting a request for assistance.

19. The information should be placed directly on a BWC website page dedicated to the database. If an interface is implemented on the webpage, the template would be obtained by a click of the user.

20. A potential database webpage should be interactive, including search options.

21. There should be options for the selection of different request/offer arrangement modes: by index number, issue or submitting State Party.

22. The index number of offers/requests should feature in the first column of each table.

23. The heading 'additional information provided' on the existing BWC webpage which hosts the PDF links to the databases should be modified because it is unclear what information should be found there.

24. The heading 'assistance & cooperation details prior to the Seventh Review Conference' on the same BWC webpage should be modified because the heading is misleading as it suggests that information to be found there pertains to the actual assistance given to States Parties prior to the Seventh Review Conference.

25. Hyperlinks should be created to access the information classified by country under the two above mentioned headings. Currently, the information classified by country is accessible by developing sub-headers (country names), all on a single webpage.

Proposals for modalities for reporting on requests responded to by offering States Parties

26. The State Party requesting assistance should be able to report on responses to its request(s) in the database to the ISU. Such a mechanism could be used by States Parties as it would not only allow measuring the success of the database, but also highlight the achievement of States Parties in reaching specific cooperation arrangements. Notification to the ISU of a cooperation and/or assistance action resulting from the use of the database should be the prerogative of States Parties.

27. If a new offer/request entered in the database is met by an external request/offer (not captured by the database), two steps should be considered. Firstly, States Parties could still notify the ISU in this case, as the database then still plays a role as an information tool for international cooperation. Secondly, the ISU should consult with the State(s) Party that did not register the offer/request on the pertinence of extending them to the other States Parties through their entry in the database.

28. A template or model should be available to facilitate notifications to the ISU of actions resulting from the use of the database.
