
**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**

18 October 2018

Original: English

2018 Meeting

Geneva, 4-7 December 2018

Meeting of Experts on Strengthening National Implementation

Geneva, 13 August 2018

Item 9 of the agenda

**Adoption of the factual report reflecting the deliberations of the meeting,
including possible outcomes**

**Report of the 2018 Meeting of Experts on strengthening
national implementation**

I. Introduction

1. At the Eighth 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 (BWC/CONF.VIII/4), States Parties decided to hold annual meetings and that the first such meeting, in December 2017, would seek to make progress on issues of substance and process for the period before the next Review Conference, with a view to reaching consensus on an intersessional process.

2. At the Meeting of States Parties in December 2017, States Parties reached consensus on the following:

“(a) Reaffirming previous intersessional programmes from 2003-2015 and retaining the previous structures: annual Meetings of States Parties preceded by annual Meetings of Experts.

(b) The purpose of the intersessional programme is to discuss, and promote common understanding and effective action on those issues identified for inclusion in the intersessional programme.

(c) Recognizing the need to balance an ambition to improve the intersessional programme within the constraints – both financial and human resources – facing States Parties, twelve days are allocated to the intersessional programme each year from 2018- 2020. The work in the intersessional period will be guided by the aim of strengthening the implementation of all articles of the Convention in order to better respond to current challenges. The Meetings of Experts for eight days will be held back to back and at least three months before the annual Meetings of States Parties of four days each. Maximum use would be made of the Sponsorship Programme funded

GE.18-17346(E)



* 1 8 1 7 3 4 6 *

Please recycle 



by voluntary contributions in order to facilitate participation of developing States Parties in the meetings of the intersessional programme.

(d) The meetings of the MSP will be chaired by a representative of the EEG in 2018, a representative of the Western Group in 2019 and a representative of the Group of Non-Aligned Movement and Other States in 2020. The annual Chair will be supported by two annual vice-chairs, one from each of the other two regional groups. In addition to the reports of the Meetings of Experts, the Meetings of States Parties will consider the annual reports of the ISU and progress on universality. The Meetings of Experts will be chaired in 2018 by [the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States Parties to the BWC] (MX 1 and MX 2) and the Western Group (MX 3 and MX4), in 2019 by EEG (MX1 and MX 2) and NAM (MX 3 and MX 4), and in 2020 by Western Group (MX 1 and MX 2) and by EEG (MX 3 and MX 4); MX 5 will be chaired by the regional group chairing the MSP.

| | <i>MSP</i> | <i>MX 1</i> | <i>MX 2</i> | <i>MX 3</i> | <i>MX 4</i> | <i>MX 5</i> |
|------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 2018 | EEG | NAM | NAM | WG | WG | EEG |
| 2019 | WG | EEG | EEG | NAM | NAM | WG |
| 2020 | NAM | WG | WG | EEG | EEG | NAM |

All meetings will be subject mutatis mutandis to the rules of procedure of the Eighth Review Conference.

(e) The Meetings of Experts would be open-ended and will consider the following topics:

[...]

MX.3 (1 day): Strengthening national implementation:

- Measures related to Article IV of the Convention;
- CBM submissions in terms of quantity and quality;
- Various ways to promote transparency and confidence building under the Convention;
- Role of international cooperation and assistance under Article X, in support of strengthening the implementation of the Convention
- Issues related to Article III, including effective measures of export control, in full conformity with all Articles of the Convention, including Article X.

[...]

(f) Each Meeting of Experts will prepare for the consideration of the annual Meeting of States Parties a factual report reflecting its deliberations, including possible outcomes. All meetings, both of Experts and of States Parties will reach any conclusions or results by consensus. The Meeting of States Parties will be responsible for managing the intersessional programme, including taking necessary measures with respect to budgetary and financial matters by consensus with a view to ensuring the proper implementation of the intersessional programme. The Ninth Review Conference will consider the work and outcomes it receives from the Meetings of States Parties and the Meetings of Experts and decide by consensus on any inputs from the intersessional programme and on any further action.”

3. By resolution 72/71, adopted without a vote on 4 December 2017, the General Assembly, *inter alia*, requested the Secretary-General to continue to render the necessary assistance to the depositary Governments of the Convention and to continue to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the review conferences.

II. Organization of the Meeting of Experts

4. In accordance with the decisions of the Eighth Review Conference and the 2017 Meeting of States Parties, the 2018 Meeting of Experts on Strengthening National Implementation was convened at the Palais des Nations in Geneva on 13 August 2018, chaired by Ambassador Julio Herráiz España of Spain.

5. On 13 August 2018, the Meeting of Experts adopted its agenda (BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/1) as proposed by the Chair. The Chair also drew the attention of delegations to a background paper prepared by the Implementation Support Unit (BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/2).

6. At the same meeting, following a suggestion by the Chair, the Meeting of Experts adopted as its rules of procedure, *mutatis mutandis*, the rules of procedure of the Eighth Review Conference, as contained in document BWC/CONF.VIII/2.

7. Mr. Daniel Feakes, Chief, Implementation Support Unit, Office for Disarmament Affairs, Geneva, served as Secretary of the Meeting of Experts. Mr. Hermann Lampalzer, Political Affairs Officer, Implementation Support Unit, served as Deputy Secretary and Ms. Ngoc Phuong van der Blij, Political Affairs Officer, also served in the secretariat.

III. Participation at the Meeting of Experts

8. One hundred States Parties to the Convention participated in the Meeting of Experts as follows: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and Zimbabwe.

9. In addition, two States that had signed the Convention but had not yet ratified it participated in the Meeting of Experts without taking part in the making of decisions, as provided for in rule 44, paragraph 1 of the rules of procedure: Haiti and the United Republic of Tanzania.

10. One State, Israel, neither a party nor a signatory to the Convention, participated in the Meeting of Experts as an observer, in accordance with rule 44, paragraph 2.

11. The United Nations, including the United Nations 1540 Committee Group of Experts, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), the United Nations

Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI), and the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), attended the Meeting of Experts in accordance with rule 44, paragraph 3.

12. The European Union, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Science and Technology Center (ISTC), the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) were granted observer status to participate in the Meeting of Experts in accordance with rule 44, paragraph 4.

13. Twenty-six non-governmental organizations and research institutes attended the Meeting of Experts under rule 44, paragraph 5.

14. A list of all participants in the Meeting of Experts is contained in document BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/INF.1.

IV. Work of the Meeting of Experts

15. In accordance with the provisional agenda (BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/1) and an annotated programme of work prepared by the Chair, the Meeting of Experts had substantive discussions on the issues allocated by the 2017 Meeting of States Parties.

16. Under agenda item 4 (“Measures related to Article IV of the Convention”), Spain introduced a joint working paper with Chile, Colombia and Panama (BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.1), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland introduced working paper BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.4, Morocco introduced working paper BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.5, the Islamic Republic of Iran introduced working paper BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.7 and France delivered a technical presentation. There then followed an interactive discussion in which the following States Parties took the floor: Australia, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Germany, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Mexico, Poland, Russian Federation, Spain, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States Parties to the BWC. The European Union and the Group of Experts under United Nations Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) also made statements. Various views were expressed during the consideration of this agenda item.

17. Under agenda item 5 (“Confidence Building Measures (CBM) submissions in terms of quantity and quality”), the Implementation Support Unit introduced relevant sections from its background paper (BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/2), the United States of America introduced working paper BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.3, Japan introduced a working paper co-sponsored by Australia, Germany, Malaysia, Republic of Korea and Switzerland (BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.6) and the Russian Federation presented a previously-submitted working paper (BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.9). There then followed an interactive discussion in which the following States Parties participated: Brazil, China, Germany, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States Parties to the BWC. The European Union also made a statement. Various views were expressed during the consideration of this agenda item taking into account, inter alia, relevant sections of Final Documents of previous Review Conferences.

18. Under agenda item 6 (“Various ways to promote transparency and confidence building under the Convention”), Georgia introduced a working paper co-sponsored with Germany (BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.2). There then followed an interactive discussion in

which the following States Parties participated: Brazil, Colombia, France, Georgia, Germany, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Netherlands, Russian Federation, Spain, Switzerland, United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States Parties to the BWC. The European Union also made a statement. Various views were expressed during the consideration of this agenda item.

19. Under agenda item 7 (“Role of international cooperation and assistance under Article X, in support of strengthening the implementation of the Convention”), the Islamic Republic of Iran introduced working paper BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.7. There then followed an interactive discussion in which the following States Parties participated: Colombia, Germany, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Nepal, Sweden, United Arab Emirates, United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States Parties to the BWC. Various views were expressed during the consideration of this agenda item.

20. Under agenda item 8 (“Issues related to Article III, including effective measures of export control, in full conformity with all Articles of the Convention, including Article X”), China made a technical presentation on its previously submitted working paper (BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.31) The United States of America presented a previously-submitted working paper (BWC/CONF.VIII/WP.1). There then followed an interactive discussion in which the following States Parties participated: Australia, Brazil, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States Parties to the BWC. Various views were expressed during the consideration of this agenda item.

21. In the course of its work, the Meeting of Experts was able to draw on a number of working papers submitted by States Parties and international organizations, as well as on statements and presentations made by States Parties and international organizations, which were circulated in the Meeting.

22. The Chair, under his own responsibility and initiative, has prepared a paper listing considerations, lessons, perspectives, recommendations, conclusions and proposals drawn from the presentations, statements, working papers and interventions on the agenda items under discussion at the Meeting. The Meeting of Experts noted that this paper had not been agreed and had no status. It was the Chair’s view that the paper could assist delegations in their preparations for the Meeting of States Parties in December 2018 and those in the remaining years of the intersessional programme and in succeeding Meetings of Experts on Strengthening National Implementation in the intersessional programme in 2019 and 2020 and also in their consideration of how best to “discuss, and promote common understanding and effective action on” the topics in accordance with the consensus reached at the 2017 Meeting of States Parties. The paper prepared by the Chair, in consultation with States Parties, is attached as annex I to this report.

V. Documentation

23. A list of official documents of the Meeting of Experts, including the working papers submitted by States Parties, is contained in annex II to this report. All documents on this list are available on the BWC website at <http://www.unog.ch/bwc> and through the United Nations Official Document System (ODS), at <http://documents.un.org>.

VI. Conclusion of the Meeting of Experts

24. At its closing meeting on 13 August 2018, the Meeting of Experts adopted its report by consensus, as contained in document BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/CRP.1 as orally amended, to be issued as document BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/3.

Annex I

Summary report

Submitted by the Chair

1. The Chairman, under his own responsibility and initiative, has prepared this paper which lists considerations, lessons, perspectives, recommendations, conclusions and proposals drawn from the presentations, statements, working papers and interventions on the agenda items under discussion at the Meeting. The Meeting of Experts noted that this paper had not been agreed and had no status. It was the Chair's view that the paper could assist delegations in their preparations for the Meeting of States Parties in December 2018 and those in the remaining years of the intersessional programme and also in succeeding Meetings of Experts on Strengthening National Implementation in the intersessional programme in 2019 and 2020.
2. The Chairman would like to express his gratitude to delegations for their active participation in the Meeting, particularly for the various working papers that were submitted and which together with oral statements and the constructive debate, as well as the interventions by relevant international organizations have served as the basis for this summary report. The report of the Meeting details which delegations spoke under the different agenda items, and which delegations introduced working paper, so such information will not be repeated in this summary report. Discussions cut across the different agenda items, as some of the issues are intertwined and national implementation addresses various articles of the Convention. It emerged from the discussions that there is a variety of proposals on strengthening national implementation and efforts are being undertaken by a number of States Parties to enhance the domestic implementation of the Convention.
3. The following paragraphs summarize and synthesize substantive discussions under agenda items 4 to 8.

Agenda item 4 – measures related to Article IV of the Convention

4. Several States Parties took the floor under this agenda item and shared their views on measures related to Article IV of the Convention. Discussions first focussed on the issue of transport and control of access of biological agents, particularly in the context of threats posed by non-state actors obtaining such material. Some States Parties noted the importance of implementing an effective national biosecurity regime, including the development of a biosecurity culture to address these risks. In addition, the adoption of codes of conduct and specific training for personnel involved in the handling and transport of agents was mentioned as other possible measures. Furthermore, some States Parties informed the Meeting of Experts about their national biosecurity strategies as well as ongoing and continuous efforts to further strengthen national implementation of the Convention. Reference was made to various bilateral and/or multilateral initiatives aiming to increase transparency, such as peer reviews, voluntary visits and transparency exercises. Additionally, the value of legislative or regulatory measures, awareness raising efforts, and biosafety and biosecurity training and education programmes was noted. Moreover, the benefit of a comprehensive approach at the domestic level including engagement with international partners, industry and academia was underlined by several States Parties. In the context of the discussions, some States Parties particularly stressed the importance of strengthening the implementation of Articles III and IV through a set of legislative, administrative, judicial and other measures. They referred to, *inter alia*, the development, harmonization and

enforcement of comprehensive national legislation, adopting effective national export control systems and adopting and sustaining robust national implementation measures. Other States Parties highlighted the need for a balanced and full implementation of all provisions of the Convention and noted that the provisions of Article III and IV should not be used to impose restrictions and/or limitations on the transfer or exchange of scientific knowledge, technology, equipment and materials. In this context, the proposal for a reassurance mechanism on monitoring transfers was made and the importance of full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of Article X was stressed by several States Parties. The importance of building national capacity through international cooperation was also noted and some States Parties informed about relevant activities being conducted. In their interventions, quite a number of States Parties also underlined the crucial role of fully implementing UN Security Council Resolution 1540 (2004).

Agenda item 5 – Confidence Building Measures (CBM) submissions in terms of quantity and quality

5. A number of States Parties welcomed the new eCBM platform which was presented by the BWC Implementation Support Unit (ISU). Several States Parties recognized the importance of CBMs as a tool for enhancing transparency and building confidence between States Parties. They also recalled that the CBMs were adopted in order to prevent or reduce the occurrence of ambiguities, doubts and suspicions, and in order to improve international cooperation in the field of peaceful biological activities. Several States Parties highlighted the importance of strengthening the CBMs in terms of quantity and quality and encouraged other States Parties to participate in the CBM process. A number of concrete proposals were made to enhance the utility and use of CBMs. Suggestions included, *inter alia*, technical modifications to the type and range of information requested in the CBM forms, the use of a step-by step process to increase participation, the establishment of a CBM assistance network, or the creation of an informal working group on CBMs open to all interested States Parties. Different views were expressed regarding the nature of CBMs: while some States Parties considered them as politically-binding, other States Parties saw them as voluntary measures. In the discussions some delegations noted that CBMs are neither declarations, nor a substitute for verification and therefore cannot be considered as a tool for assessing compliance. Other delegations saw a role for CBMs as a vehicle for general information exchange and a possible tool to help in the exchange of views around confidence in compliance. Some States Parties made reference to different technical challenges related to the overall low level of participation in CBMs and highlighted also the need for assistance. In this context, a number of States Parties were interested to learn more about specific challenges in order to be able to provide tailored assistance. States Parties also shared recent examples about CBM assistance received from other States Parties.

Agenda item 6 – Various ways to promote transparency and confidence building under the Convention

6. A number of States Parties informed the Meeting of Experts about different voluntary ways to improve transparency and build confidence in the implementation of the Convention in the absence of a compliance mechanism. Reference was made to activities such as peer reviews, voluntary visits and transparency exercises, and it was noted by some States Parties that these activities can also strengthen national implementation, share best practices, improve information exchange and enhance international cooperation. While acknowledging that such activities are neither a substitute for verification nor comparable with a compliance mechanism, numerous States Parties believed that they can bring various benefits, including providing useful information and also giving some level of reassurance. Additionally, the

need to continue exploring additional measures was highlighted and recommendations such as the creation of a compendium of all relevant transparency initiatives or the development of a voluntary assistance fund were made. On the other hand, some States Parties expressed caution towards peer reviews and noted that there are also other ways to enhance transparency. Different views were expressed regarding the overarching purpose and effectiveness of these activities and some questions about the underlying conceptual and methodological issues were raised. Some States Parties noted that assessing compliance could in their view only be undertaken collectively through an appropriate multilateral verification arrangement and highlighted the importance of strengthening the Convention in a balanced manner and in all its aspects.

Agenda item 7 – Role of international cooperation and assistance under Article X, in support of strengthening the implementation of the Convention

7. Several States Parties acknowledged the important role of international cooperation and assistance in support of strengthening the implementation of the Convention. Some States Parties informed the Meeting of Experts about concrete initiatives and steps taken in collaboration with other States Parties to strengthen the domestic implementation of the Convention. Furthermore, reference was made to existing capacity-building offers and it was noted that offers of assistance are often hampered by an incomplete understanding of States Parties' existing national implementation measures. Furthermore, concrete measures to improve existing reporting on national implementation measures were suggested, such as modifications on CBM Form E or the submission of biennial reports on the implementation of Article IV as well as the nomination of national focal points by all States Parties. In the course of the discussion, a number of States Parties reiterated the importance of the full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of all the provisions of the Convention and noted the strong relation between Article X and national implementation. Some States Parties suggested an institutional mechanism for international co-operation and compliance with Article X and an action plan for full, effective, and non-discriminatory implementation of Article X, including procedures for the settlement of disputes arising from concerns about its implementation. Similarly, concrete proposals were made on which States Parties could reach common understandings and effective action.

Agenda item 8 – Issues related to Article III, including effective measures of export control, in full conformity with all Articles of the Convention, including Article X

8. A number of States Parties underlined the importance of effective export control measures and also informed the Meeting of Experts about domestic measures that they have adopted. At the same time, and while highlighting the importance of UN Security Council resolution 1540 (2004), it was also noted that significant efforts remain to be made to address existing gaps, particularly in the area of biological weapons. In that context, some States Parties shared information about assistance available under Article X of the Convention. It was stressed that any national export control measures should be in full conformity with Convention obligations and conducive to the full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of all Convention provisions. States Parties shared different views regarding the implementation of Article III and proposals to strengthen effective export control measures: while some States Parties expressed support for existing mechanisms, others proposed new instruments such as the establishment of a non-proliferation export control and international cooperation regime under the framework of the BWC. Other proposals referred

to the adoption, of *inter alia*, appropriate legislation, regulatory or administrative provisions to regulate transfers relevant to Article III of the Convention; a list of items requiring authorization prior to export; a national licensing system, export control guidelines; and regular outreach including industry and academia.

Annex II

List of documents

| <i>Symbol.</i> | <i>Title</i> |
|---|--|
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/1 | Provisional agenda for the 2018 Meeting of Experts on strengthening national implementation - Submitted by the Chair |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/2 English only | Background information document - Submitted by Implementation Support Unit (ISU) |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/2/Corr.1 English only | Background information document - Submitted by Implementation Support Unit (ISU) - Corrigendum |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/CRP.1 English only | Draft Report of the 2018 Meeting of Experts on strengthening national implementation – Submitted by the Chair |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/3 | Report of the 2018 Meeting of Experts on strengthening national implementation |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/MISC.1 English/French/Spanish only | Provisional list of participants |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/INF.1 English/French/Spanish only | List of participants |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.1 Spanish only | El transporte de agentes biológicos debe protegerse con medidas de Biocustodia - Presentado por España |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.1/ Rev.1 - Spanish only | El transporte de agentes biológicos debe protegerse con medidas de Biocustodia - Presentado por España - Revision |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.2 English only | Building Confidence in Compliance: Peer Review Transparency Exercise at the Richard Lugar Center for Public Health Research (CPHR) of the National Center for Disease Control and Public Health (NCDC) in Tbilisi, Georgia - Submitted by Georgia, co-sponsored by Germany |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.3 English only | Improving the Quality of CBM Information: A Review of Recent Proposals and Some Suggestions for Future Work - Submitted by the United States of America |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.4 English only | Strengthening national implementation: The UK Biological Security Strategy 2018 - Submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.5 French only | Séminaire sur la mise en œuvre de la Convention sur l'Interdiction des Armes Biologiques et à Toxines (Rabat, 10 et 11 Mai 2018) - Soumis par Le Maroc |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.6 English only | Step-by-Step Approach to CBM Participation - Submitted by Japan - Co-sponsored by Australia, Germany, Malaysia, Republic of Korea and Switzerland |

| <i>Symbol.</i> | <i>Title</i> |
|---|---|
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.6/Corr.1 English only | Step-by-Step Approach to CBM Participation - Submitted by Japan - Co-sponsored by Australia, Germany, Malaysia, Republic of Korea and Switzerland - Corrigendum |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.7 English only | National Implementation under Article IV - Submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.8 Spanish only | Cumplimiento de las Disposiciones de la Convención de Armas Biológicas (CAB) - Presentado por Cuba |
| BWC/MSP/2018/MX.3/WP.9 English only | Strengthening National Implementation - Submitted by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and other States Parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention |
