

**Meeting 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**

25 September 2017

Original: English

2017 Meeting
Geneva, 4-8 December 2017
Item 8 of the provisional agenda
Annual report of the Implementation Support Unit

Annual report of the Implementation Support Unit

Submitted by the Implementation Support Unit

Summary

This report describes the activities of the Implementation Support Unit in 2017 to implement the mandate given to it by the Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Review Conferences to support States Parties in the administration and comprehensive implementation of the Convention, to promote universalization of the Convention, to facilitate the exchange of Confidence-Building Measures, to establish and administer the assistance database, and to administer the sponsorship programme. The Seventh Review Conference decided that the Unit "will submit a concise annual written report to all States Parties on its activities to implement its mandate" (BWC/CONF.VII/7, Part III, paragraph 36) and the Eighth Review Conference decided to continue this practice (BWC/CONF.VIII/4, Part III, paragraph 8).

I. Introduction

1. In 2017, the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) operated in accordance with the decisions and recommendations of the Eighth Review Conference (BWC/CONF.VIII/4, part III), which renewed for the period from 2017 to 2020 the mandate of the Unit originally decided by the Sixth Review Conference, and as extended by the Seventh Review Conference.

2. The ISU is funded by the States Parties to the Convention as part of the costs for the 2017–2020 intersessional programme, which the Eighth Review Conference decided would be "shared by all States Parties to the Convention, based on the United Nations scale of assessment pro-rated to take into account differences in membership between the Convention and the United Nations" (BWC/CONF.VIII/4, Part III, paragraph 11). The budget for the ISU in 2017 can be found in the cost estimates approved by the Eighth Review Conference, BWC/CONF.VIII/5. However, as reported to the Eighth Review Conference, challenges persist with respect to the financial situation of the BWC and continuing attention needs to be given to its financial arrangements and to the significant

GE.17-16787(E)



* 1 7 1 6 7 8 7 *

Please recycle 

arrears owed by some States Parties. Without attention, this situation could negatively impact on the BWC in 2018. During 2017, the ISU received voluntary funding from Australia, Canada, Germany and India in support of the BWC sponsorship programme (see section VII for details).

3. In addition, the European Union is supporting the BWC through Council Decision 2016/51/CFSP of which UNODA is the implementing agency. The decision involves a financial contribution to UNODA for activities in support of the BWC of EUR 2,340,000 over three years.¹ Implementation of the project began in February 2016 and continued throughout 2017. Under the decision, numerous activities have been undertaken in States Parties and two staff have been employed within UNODA's Geneva Branch in the professional and general service categories. Furthermore, in August 2017, Canada provided a voluntary contribution of USD 382,000 to UNODA for a project on strengthening global mechanisms and capacities for responding to deliberate use of biological agents. The funds are being used to organize several small workshops, and to hire a consultant to implement the project. A portion of the funds will also be used for the abovementioned sponsorship programme, as well as to support ISU travel. Finally, Ireland made a voluntary contribution of EUR 3,800 to support the work of the ISU during 2017.

4. The ISU is located in the Geneva Branch of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, which supports the ISU through a range of services including financial, logistical, administrative and personnel management. The Branch also facilitates the ISU's compliance with United Nations rules and regulations so as to enhance its effective functioning. The Branch is instrumental in coordinating and liaising with UNOG relevant services that support the organization of BWC meetings and conferences.

5. The ISU comprises three fixed-term staff positions, although it has operated with only two staff members for half of 2017. Indeed, as mentioned in the ISU report to the Preparatory Committee for the Eighth Review Conference (BWC/CONF.VIII/PC/7), for most of the period from 2014 to 2017 the ISU has been operating at two-thirds of its intended capacity, due to recruitment, maternity leave or other staffing changes. This situation has been complicated by the fact that the current funding arrangements for the ISU do not permit the recruitment of temporary staff to cover such gaps and also do not allow unspent funds from one year to be rolled over to the next year.

6. In 2017, the ISU was assisted by several interns: Ms. Maylis David and Ms. Clarisse Bertherat continued their internships from 2016 until March 2017; Ms. Aurelie Buytaert from April to June 2017; Ms. Madeline McSherry from June to August 2017; Mr. Keishi Abe from June to August 2017; and Ms. Maria Elena Amadori will start her internship on 25 September 2017.

7. This report contains sections devoted to each of the main elements of the ISU mandate, as well as four annexes (in English only):

- 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; and
- Annex IV: Summary of national inputs on improving the Cooperation and Assistance Database

¹ For the full text of the Council Decision see [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)

II. Administrative support for the Convention

8. The ISU forms the substantive Secretariat for the 2017 Meeting of States Parties and also supports the activities of the Chairman and Vice-chairs. The Unit continued to undertake a broad range of administrative functions as described in past reports.

9. In 2017 the ISU produced a publication entitled “The Biological Weapons Convention: An Introduction” which is intended to provide practical information on the BWC, its obligations, provisions and options for assistance. The publication is available in both hard copy for distribution at workshops and other such events, as well as on the BWC website.² If funding can be found, the publication will also be translated. In addition, the ISU has started to publish a regular “BWC Newsletter”, an informal publication which provides information on developments relevant to the BWC, updates on ISU activities, details of assistance opportunities for States Parties and links to publications of relevance to the BWC. The Newsletter is circulated by e-mail and also posted on the BWC website.³

10. The ISU continued to maintain and update the BWC website (<http://www.unog.ch/bwc>) to increase its utility not only for States Parties, but also for outreach, awareness-raising and communication to a global audience. More prominence has been given to the sections on the cooperation and assistance database and the sponsorship programme.

11. The ISU has also made use of social media to increase awareness about the BWC. In early 2015, the ISU created a Facebook page which now has over 520 “likes”.⁴ At the same time, the ISU also maintains a Twitter account which has attracted around 1,100 followers.⁵ Both tools are designed to complement the BWC website which remains the primary repository of documents and information on the Convention.

12. The ISU maintained regular contact with many scientific, professional and academic institutions as well as industry and non-governmental organisations. These contacts have provided insight and information that assisted the ISU in supporting the efforts of States Parties. The ISU also maintained regular contact with a wide range of international organizations relevant to the Convention. The ISU, in activities consistent with its mandate, remains an active participant in regular processes, outreach and implementation efforts undertaken by these organizations.

III. Implementation of the Convention

13. The ISU continued to collect and update details of national points of contact for the Convention in 2017 (see Annex II). As of 22 September 2017, 110 States Parties had nominated a national point of contact. Two signatory States, three States not party and one regional organization have also provided points of contact. Contact information for these national points of contact is provided in the restricted area of the BWC website.

14. Participation by the ISU in workshops and seminars plays a crucial role in raising awareness of the Convention and its implementation, both for national governments and other relevant actors such as international and regional organizations, the scientific

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

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

⁴ www.facebook.com/1972BWC

⁵ www.twitter.com/BWCISU

community, professional associations, academia and the private sector. The ISU also co-hosted or otherwise supported the planning and organisation of several meetings and events directly related to improving implementation of the Convention. The ISU accepted invitations to participate in a range of meetings and events throughout the year (see Annex I), but also had to decline many invitations due to resource limitations.

15. The ISU has noticed a significant increase in the number of States Parties, regional and international organizations and other entities seeking assistance with the implementation or other aspects of the BWC. Such interest is expressed in the form of assistance requests submitted either through the cooperation and assistance database or raised bilaterally, or through approaches to the ISU regarding its participation in national assistance activities. These include national or regional activities in the context of, inter alia, EU Council Decision 2016/51/CFSP, United Nations Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) or the EU CBRN Risk Mitigation Centres of Excellence. Details of all such activities, and others, are provided in Annex I to this report.

16. However, due to the limited ISU travel budget and the staffing situation described above, many invitations to participate in meetings or other events had to be declined and the ISU has continued to be unable to meet all assistance requests submitted to it.

IV. Confidence-Building Measures (CBMs)

17. In accordance with the decisions of previous Review Conferences, the ISU supports the exchange of confidence-building measures (CBM). The ISU maintains electronic versions of the CBM forms on the BWC website in all official languages. Annex III lists the 2017 submissions (covering the 2016 calendar year) and includes a breakdown by each CBM form.

18. All 2017 CBM returns are available to States Parties in the restricted area of the BWC website (<http://www.unog.ch/bwc/restricted>). Twenty-five States Parties, have so far requested that their CBM submissions are also made available in the public area of the website (<http://www.unog.ch/bwc/cbms>).

19. In accordance with the decision of the Sixth Review Conference, on 15 January 2017, the Chief of the Implementation Support Unit, wrote to the permanent missions and the national points of contact of the States Parties informing them of the deadline (15 April 2017) for the annual CBM submission.

20. As of 22 September 2017:

(a) 68 States Parties (38.2 per cent of States Parties) had submitted a CBM covering the calendar year 2016;

(b) Of these, 40 submitted their CBM on or before the deadline of 15 April 2017;

(c) 19 States Parties which submitted a CBM in 2016 had not yet done so in 2017; and

(d) Five other States Parties which did not submit a CBM in 2016 had done so in 2017.

21. A total of 55 States Parties have never submitted a CBM.

V. Promotion of universalization

22. The ISU supported the Chairman and Vice-chairs in their activities to promote universalization by preparing correspondence and briefing material.

23. The ISU also provided information and advice on the Convention to several signatories and States not party. The ISU promoted universalization during the seminars and events in which it participated, at which representatives of States not party were present (see Annex I). For example, the ISU participated in the regional workshop on BWC universalization which took place in Fiji in July 2017 and which was organized in the framework of EU Council Decision 2016/51/CFSP. The ISU engaged with representatives of the four States not party which attended the workshop (Kiribati, Niue, Samoa and Tuvalu).

24. More detailed information on these activities, and the results to date, can be found in the Report of the Chairman on Universalization Activities (BWC/MSP/2017/3).

VI. Database for assistance requests and offers

25. The Seventh Review Conference decided to establish a database system to facilitate requests for and offers of exchange of assistance and cooperation among States Parties (BWC/CONF.VII/7, part III, paragraphs 17–20). The Conference mandated the ISU to establish and administer the database; to facilitate, on request, the exchange of information among States Parties relating to the database and any resulting cooperation and assistance activities; and to report to States Parties on the operation of the database detailing the offers made, requests sought and matches made during a calendar year. The ISU has continued to maintain and administer the database during 2017. The offers of assistance are available on the public area of the BWC website, while the requests for assistance are available to States Parties in the restricted area of the website. Usage of the database has followed two tracks: either States Parties have approached the ISU regarding offers of/requests for assistance so that it acts as a liaising body with the offering/requesting State(s), or requesting/offering States Parties have approached offering/requesting States Parties bilaterally. In 2017, the ISU continued to facilitate contacts between offering and requesting States Parties, with two such match-making activities undertaken since the Eighth Review Conference.

26. As noted in the Report of the ISU submitted to the Preparatory Committee for the Eighth Review Conference (BWC/CONF.VIII/PC/7 and Amend.1), the objective of a "database system" has not yet been reached. The Seventh Review Conference tasked the ISU with the establishment and maintenance of the database, but did not allocate any additional resources for the development of a fully functioning database. Consequently only a basic database was established in 2012 and the function of matching offers of and requests for assistance has not worked as well as was hoped. Furthermore, as recognized by the 2014 Meeting of States Parties, usage of the database by States Parties has been "low". Until recently, few offers or requests had been submitted to the ISU and there are approximately twice the number of offers of assistance than requests. This could partly be a result of the requests for assistance being placed on the restricted area of the BWC website. It has become apparent that some potential requesting States Parties would rather have their needs addressed informally or on a bilateral level, rather than having the information appear in the database. Another challenge is the lack of precision in some requests, which could derive from a lack of structure to the whole process.

27. In response, the ISU has dedicated much effort in 2017 to further promoting and making more effective use of the database. A notification of each new offer is immediately sent to all States Parties, while new requests are sent to all States Parties that have offered assistance. The ISU has made use of its newly established newsletter to promote the database with States Parties and other relevant actors and to provide updates on the status of offers and requests in the database. The ISU has also promoted the database in other outreach activities such as seminars on security assistance, presentations to research institutes, academic workshops and governmental and university visits to Geneva. The

database is also featured in the abovementioned new publication, *The Biological Weapons Convention: An Introduction*.

28. As of 22 September 2017, the database contains:

(a) 60 offers for assistance, from nine States Parties and one group of States Parties; and

(b) 31 requests for assistance, from seven States Parties; and one update of a request of assistance.

29. Most significantly, in response to the situation described above in para 26, the Eighth Review Conference tasked the ISU, with inputs to be provided by States Parties, to “seek to improve the database to ensure that it is more user-friendly and comprehensive, and ensure that specific, timely and concrete offers of and requests for cooperation be provided by States Parties in the database” (BWC/CONF.VIII/4, part III, paragraph 9). Inputs were received from eight States Parties (Albania, Canada, Cuba, Germany, Qatar, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and are summarized in Annex IV to this report. In accordance with the mandate from the Eighth Review Conference, the ISU has therefore worked during 2017 to update the database on the basis of the inputs received. The new improved version of the database will be presented at the MSP in December 2017.

30. The ISU has also maintained regular contact with relevant assistance providers in other settings. For example, the ISU continued to work closely with providers of assistance for related national legislation and enforcement measures such as the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), Parliamentarians for Global Action (PGA), the Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC) and the Committee established pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540 (2004).

VII. Sponsorship programme

31. The ISU administers the sponsorship programme established by the Seventh Review Conference to “support and increase the participation of developing States Parties in the meetings of the intersessional programme” (BWC/CONF.VII/7, part III, paragraph 21).

32. As of 22 September 2017, voluntary contributions to the sponsorship programme have been received from three State Parties (Australia, Canada and India). A contribution has been pledged by Germany, and the appropriate agreement was being processed at the time of writing. In addition, other States Parties are supporting the sponsorship programme through bilateral arrangements.

33. As of 22 September 2017, applications for sponsorship to participate in the 2017 Meeting of States Parties had already been received from 20 States. In accordance with the decision of the Seventh Review Conference, the ISU will allocate the available sponsorship resources in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-chairs of the Meeting of States Parties, giving priority to those States Parties which had previously not participated in the meetings, or had been unable to regularly send experts from capital, and giving consideration to participation by States not party in order to promote universalization of the Convention.

VIII. Conclusions and future work

34. During 2017, the ISU has noticed a significant increase in interest in and attention to the BWC at a national and regional level. This has been expressed in additional assistance requests, guidance regarding the submission of CBMs, interest from States not party in joining the Convention, an increased number of sponsorship applications, an increased number of national contact points and a rise in the number of events to which the ISU is invited. This reflects a welcome acknowledgement of the importance of the BWC within the multilateral disarmament framework.

35. Despite the resource limitations and challenges described above, the ISU has continued to make its best efforts to meet this increased demand, and has been able to do so through cooperation with States Parties and relevant international organizations and other entities.

36. The ISU would therefore like to record its appreciation for the cooperation and support of States Parties in the course of the implementation of its mandate during 2017.

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

<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>
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
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

<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>
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
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.
