

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

12 December 2023

Original: English

**Geneva, 28 November–16 December 2022**

**Summary record of the 11th meeting**

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Wednesday, 14 December 2022, at 4.20 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Bencini .....(Italy)

**Contents**

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

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

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



Please recycle 

*The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.*

**Preparation and adoption of the final document(s) (continued) (BWC/CONF.IX/CRP.2)**

*Chapter III. Decisions and recommendations (continued)*

1. **The President** invited the delegations to continue their consideration of chapter III of the draft final document of the Ninth Review Conference (BWC/CONF.IX/CRP.2).
2. **Ms. Schiaffino** (Argentina) said that the order of the various sections of chapter III should be reviewed. Her delegation saw merit to the proposals made in both section A, on international cooperation and assistance, and section B, on the review of scientific and technological developments relevant to the Convention, but was unable to lend its full support to them until their financial implications were made clear.
3. **Ms. Horoşanu** (Romania) said that she agreed that the structure of chapter III should be reviewed, including by placing section E, on the outcome of the intersessional programme for 2017–2020, before what was currently section A. While the proposal to establish a mechanism for promoting international cooperation and assistance was not without merit, there had to be a proper balance between section A and section B, in which the establishment of a mechanism for the review of scientific and technological developments was proposed. The Convention was first and foremost a disarmament treaty, and the Conference's priority should be to promote that core aspect of the Convention while bringing it into the twenty-first century. To that end, it was essential for the Conference to be kept abreast of developments in the life sciences, biodynamics and biotechnology.
4. The establishment of the voluntary trust fund described in section A was not necessary for the full implementation of article X of the Convention, notwithstanding the current wording of paragraph 1 (c). It would be very difficult for a steering group set up to facilitate international cooperation to carry out the mapping exercise proposed in paragraph 1 (a). Further information was needed on the action plan on article X that, according to paragraph 1 (b), was to be elaborated by the steering group.
5. The time frames for the work of the group of experts should be clearer. Whether the group would have the power to determine the mandates of the mechanisms proposed in sections A and B and the order in which the steps proposed in sections A and B would be taken – as well as the resource implications – should also be made clear.
6. Generally, the Conference should prioritize the items on which there was already agreement, such as the scientific and technological development advisory process. A decision should be made on such items immediately so that work could begin on them right away. Lastly, her delegation agreed with the representative of Belgium that the issues of biorisk management, biosafety and biotechnology should be mentioned in chapter III, probably in section B.
7. **Ms. Roa Vargas** (Mexico) said that a better organized and more effective cooperation system that ensured that all countries were equally prepared for potential biological incidents, especially in the light of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, was needed. Keeping abreast of developments in the biological sciences would allow the Conference to design the tools necessary to fully implement the Convention. Her delegation was willing to support a general decision to facilitate work on both international cooperation and assistance and scientific and technological developments. The group of experts should address those issues in a comprehensive manner during the intersessional period.
8. Her delegation also supported all the proposed decisions contained in section A. However, it would be useful to know precisely what the mandate of the proposed mechanism to promote cooperation and assistance would be and by what date the mechanism should be in place. The action plan described in paragraph 1 (b) should be formulated during the intersessional period by a body other than the steering group, which should have a more operational role.
9. It was important to ensure that the mechanism for the review of scientific and technological developments proposed in section B was efficient. Duplication of work was to be avoided.

10. The mandates and structures of the two mechanisms should be determined as soon as possible so that they could begin their work. Facilitators should be appointed to help define those mandates during the intersessional period. They could then be asked to make a proposal in that regard at the forthcoming Meeting of States Parties.

11. Mexico supported the proposed creation of additional staff positions within the Implementation Support Unit to work on issues related to science and technology and international cooperation. While her Government was willing to assume its share of the financial costs of strengthening the Convention, such costs, an estimate of which she would welcome, should not be excessive.

12. Her delegation agreed that, in section D, the Conference should welcome rather than merely take note of the proposal by Argentina and Brazil to establish what was referred to as a one health surveillance network. It supported the call to incorporate additional language into chapter III on voluntary measures, biosafety, biosecurity and biorisk management.

13. **Ms. Pek** (Singapore) said that her delegation supported the establishment of a steering group on international cooperation and a mechanism for the review of scientific and technological developments relevant to the Convention. However, duplication of the activities of those mechanisms and the activities of similar mechanisms set up under other forums should be avoided. Her delegation welcomed paragraph 1 (d), which combined various proposals for the establishment of databases to facilitate the implementation of articles VII and X, and hoped to see further such synergistic proposals in other parts of the draft document.

14. Her delegation echoed the call made by the representatives of a number of States parties for an estimate of the costs of the decisions proposed in chapter III, in particular in sections G, on the Implementation Support Unit, and I, on financial matters. It supported the references made in section C, on national implementation and confidence-building measures, to the role of regional and subregional organizations, the Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines for Codes of Conduct for Scientists and voluntary transparency exercises, which should help to deepen mutual trust among States parties.

15. The Singaporean delegation also supported the decisions proposed in section D, on assistance, response and preparedness, including the decision to establish a database to facilitate assistance under article VII and the call for States parties to conduct simulation and tabletop exercises to prepare for potential biological incidents. States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations had been conducting such exercises for some time.

16. **Mr. Berkat** (Algeria) said that his delegation was in favour of the establishment of a mechanism to facilitate the implementation of article X. It was not necessary to draw up an exhaustive list of the components of such a mechanism immediately, since they could be determined during the intersessional period. The establishment of the steering group proposed in section A would be a step in the right direction; the exact mandate and composition of that group should be determined quickly. The existence of mechanisms in other forums that played a similar role should not be an obstacle to the establishment of a mechanism for the review of scientific and technological developments relevant to the Convention.

17. **Mr. Napoleón García** (El Salvador) said that his delegation welcomed the proposed decision to establish a mechanism to facilitate international cooperation, which was a priority for El Salvador. It also supported the decisions set out in section B. However, the proposed mechanism for the review of scientific and technological developments, the structure and mandate of which should be clarified, should be simplified. In view of the continued financial consequences of the pandemic and the economic crisis currently affecting his country, it would be difficult for El Salvador to agree to a significant increase in the budget for activities under the Convention.

18. **Mr. Walsh** (Ireland) said that the primary purpose of the Convention was not clearly reflected in chapter III. The false assumption that the Convention's purpose as an instrument of disarmament and certain aspects of its application, such as the full implementation of article X, could not be promoted in a mutually beneficial fashion should be shown for what it was.

19. His delegation supported the establishment of a mechanism to promote international cooperation and assistance. However, some of the wording of section A should be clarified. For example, the implementation of article X was a legal obligation for all States parties; full implementation of the article could therefore not be ensured by a limited mechanism, as implied in paragraph 1.

20. The results-oriented action plan described in paragraph 1 (b) was a good idea, but the plan would need to be put together and agreed upon by States parties in the group of experts, not in a steering group. The sequence of the activities described in section A should be indicated more clearly, and it should be made explicit that the purpose of the voluntary trust fund proposed in paragraph 1 (c) was to buttress efforts to implement article X. The exact mandate of the person who would fill the additional Implementation Support Unit position whose creation was proposed in paragraph 1 (e) would also need to be clarified.

21. The review of scientific and technological developments relevant to the Convention, addressed in section B, was critically important. The mechanism proposed in that section would contribute to the implementation of the Convention as a whole and bring it into the twenty-first century. Again, however, the language of section B required considerable clarification. It was not entirely clear which bodies were to be established, what their functions or mandates would be or how they would interact.

22. The introduction to paragraph 3, for example, would be clearer were it to indicate that the Conference had decided to establish a scientific and advisory board, not a mechanism, and that the board would provide advice to States parties on scientific and technological developments relevant to the Convention. The subparagraphs would then describe the board's composition and the time frames for its establishment and work.

23. Lastly, his delegation agreed that biorisk management standards were not covered in chapter III. Clear language in that regard had been submitted by a broad cross-regional group; that language should be reflected in section C, on national implementation and confidence-building measures.

24. **Mr. Khalid** (Pakistan) said that there was a need for further reflection on the mandate and title of the group of experts, as well as on the list of topics proposed for the group's consideration. Since the group was intended to replace the Meeting of Experts, it should be established for a full four-year period; if it finished its work early, a special conference could be convened. The group should be given an appropriate amount of time for its annual meetings.

25. The specifics of the proposals grouped under section A were unclear. States parties were being asked to agree to the establishment of a mechanism to promote international cooperation and assistance without being given information on its mandate, budget or working methods. A proposal for the establishment of a cooperation committee with clear functions, as outlined by the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States, would be a better starting point.

26. The proposed decisions set out under section B were equally vague. It was unclear what the mandate of the mechanism proposed under that section would be or how that mandate related to the work to be done during the intersessional period. Only by clarifying those points would it be possible to reach an early agreement on the draft final document.

27. **Ms. Díaz Flores** (Nicaragua) said that the draft final document could be strengthened by including elements proposed by the Group of the Non-Aligned Movement and Other States, in particular the establishment of an international cooperation committee and an article X verification mechanism, as well as other proposals intended to ensure progress towards the negotiation of a protocol to the Convention. Her delegation echoed the statements made by the representatives of Cuba and Venezuela in relation to the unilateral coercive measures and discriminatory restrictions imposed, in violation of article X of the Convention, by some countries.

28. Her delegation supported the proposal for the establishment of an open-ended scientific advisory group. Like other delegations, it would welcome an estimate of the financial implications of the decisions contained in the draft document.

29. **Ms. Reddiar** (South Africa) said that her delegation supported the establishment of mechanisms that would strengthen the Convention, the expansion of the Implementation Support Unit and the establishment of a group of experts for the intersessional period. It also supported the elaboration of the action plan described in paragraph 1 (b) but agreed that the composition and mandate of the steering group mentioned in paragraph 1 (a) should be clarified.

30. A combination of both voluntary and assessed contributions should be used to fund the mechanisms proposed in sections A and B, since voluntary contributions alone, which some countries could have difficulty making, might not be sufficient. Lastly, reference should be made in the text to the need for all newly established mechanisms to produce reports on their work and recommendations for consideration at the Meeting of States Parties.

31. **Ms. Lemus Álvarez** (Guatemala) said that, in common with other delegations, her delegation was particularly keen to know the financial implications of the decisions made by the Conference. Any action taken on the basis of the Conference's decisions should be cost-effective and efficient. Section A contained ambiguous language that should be amended to reflect the requests made by a significant number of delegations for the establishment of a body tasked with promoting international cooperation. The name of the body was of secondary importance; it was more important to determine how it should be established and how it would operate. The decision to establish the body should be linked to decisions relating to the voluntary trust fund and the creation of additional posts within the Implementation Support Unit.

32. Her delegation would welcome further information on the objectives of the bodies related to the science and technology review mechanism mentioned in section B. It would be interesting to know how those bodies would coordinate with each other and what the hierarchical relationship between them would be. The draft final document stated that the group of experts would be responsible for establishing the mandate, composition and modalities of the science and technology review mechanism. In her view, however, such matters should be discussed by the Conference or determined by specially appointed facilitators, in line with the proposal made by the Mexican delegation. The mechanism for implementing article X, referred to in section A, and the science and technology review mechanism, referred to in section B, were complementary mechanisms and should therefore be addressed in parallel. Paragraph 24, on the group of experts, should specify the way in which the group would approach its mandate and the time frames for the adoption of its decisions.

33. **Ms. Park Sujin** (Republic of Korea) said that her delegation supported the proposals for amendments to section A made by the delegation of the United States at the previous meeting. Section B should be amended to clarify the difference between the scientific advisory board and the open-ended scientific advisory group mentioned in paragraph 3 (a) and (b). She supported the retention of paragraph 16, which referred to simulation and tabletop exercises. Chapter III should be amended to include a reference to biorisk management standards, and closer links should be established between chapters II and III.

34. **Mr. Domingo** (Philippines) said that his delegation welcomed the decision to establish the group of experts referred to in paragraph 24. In his understanding, the group's work might lead to the issuance of a recommendation to initiate negotiations on a legally binding instrument that included verification measures. As other delegations had noted, there was a need to draw up a clear schedule for the meetings referred to in section F. In his delegation's view, the most important measures listed in paragraph 24 were those relating to compliance and verification.

35. Consideration should be given to the possibility that the overarching nature of the group of experts' mandate might hinder its ability to establish the mechanisms referred to in sections A and B. As the group would be tasked with defining the mandate, modalities and composition of both mechanisms, it might take up to five years for the mechanisms themselves to be established. The group could therefore be tasked with defining the mandate, composition and modality of the two mechanisms in the first or second year of the intersessional period, separately from the process of identifying measures for strengthening

and institutionalizing the Convention. That task could be defined in a new paragraph, paragraph 24 bis.

36. Alternatively, facilitators could be appointed to work out the mandates and structures of the two mechanisms, in line with the proposal made by the delegation of Mexico. The facilitators could then report on their efforts so that the two mechanisms could be established. The decision to establish the two mechanisms should not be deferred.

37. His delegation supported the call for States parties to conduct simulation and tabletop exercises, set out in paragraph 16. It also supported the proposal to include a reference to biorisk management standards in the draft final document.

38. **Mr. Cleobury** (United Kingdom) said that the actions that States parties would be expected to carry out under paragraph 7 were not clearly defined and did not relate either to the intersessional process or to the Tenth Review Conference. The references to the process and the Tenth Review Conference should therefore be removed.

39. The first sentence of paragraph 7 might be reworded, as it was not clear how States parties should respond to the statement that the Conference had endorsed the Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines for Codes of Conduct for Scientists. As other delegations had stated, section C should be amended to include a reference to biorisk management standards.

40. **The President** said that delegations were encouraged to submit proposals for specific amendments to the draft final document in writing.

41. **Mr. Manglano Aboín** (Spain) said that a mention of biorisk management standards in section C of chapter III would considerably enrich the text. Paragraph 24 should be amended to include a reference to the intersessional process, in line with earlier drafts of that paragraph. The reference to measures to address compliance and verification, in paragraph 24 (b), was insufficient, as it did not address the need for a structured preparatory dialogue on verification.

42. **Mr. Bilgeri** (Austria) said that paragraph 1 should contain additional information on the role of the additional official to be employed by the Implementation Support Unit. In his delegation's view, the official concerned should be tasked with maintaining the article X database and conducting a review of existing cooperation mechanisms and their relation to the work of the Conference. His delegation shared the view that section B, and possibly section C, should be amended to include a reference to biorisk management standards. He was pleased to note that a number of other delegations shared his delegation's view that the mechanisms referred to in sections A and B would complement each other. As the delegation of the United Kingdom had stated, paragraph 7 should be amended to more clearly define the actions to be taken by States parties during the intersessional period.

43. **Ms. Mohd Pista** (Malaysia) said that her delegation supported the decision to establish the mechanisms referred to in sections A and B and the continuation of efforts to establish the right balance between the two mechanisms. Sections A and B might be amended to include clearer information on the structure and functions of the two mechanisms. Her delegation supported the view, expressed by the delegation of Indonesia, that there should be a clear time frame for the establishment of the article X mechanism.

44. It would be useful to have a clearer picture of the financial implications of the proposals set out in the draft final document. Like the delegation of Brazil, her delegation would be interested to know whether the scale of assessments used to determine the contributions made by States parties to the budget of the Conference would be the same for 2025 as it had been for the years 2022–2024. Her delegation supported the current wording of paragraphs 57, 58 and 63;

45. **Mr. Dzwonek** (Poland) said that the order of the paragraphs in sections A and F should be reviewed. Sections A and B should include clearer information on the structure of the mechanisms referred to in those sections. His delegation supported the calls made for the inclusion of a reference to biorisk management in the draft final document and the proposed measures for strengthening the Implementation Support Unit.

46. **Mr. Kordasch** (Germany) said that, contrary to what was implied in paragraph 9, States parties should not wait until the Tenth Review Conference to address

confidence-building measures. Such measures should also be addressed during the intersessional period. His delegation supported the view that section C should include language relating to biorisk management standards.

47. The measures to determine the mandates and terms of reference of the mechanisms referred to in sections A and B should be taken as a matter of priority so that those mechanisms could begin their work. Of the measures listed in paragraph 24, which were intended to improve the implementation of the Convention, priority should be given to those relating to compliance and verification.

48. **Mr. Omarov** (Kazakhstan) said that his delegation supported the proposal to appoint facilitators to develop the mandate, composition and modalities of the mechanisms referred to in sections A and B. If the group of experts were given those tasks, measures that the Conference had already decided to take, such as the creation of additional staff positions in the Implementation Support Unit, might not be taken. According to the intersessional programme for 2023–2026, set out in section F, States parties would be holding annual meetings that lasted three days rather than the five days originally proposed. The length of the meetings could perhaps be reduced, but the question should first be discussed by the Conference.

49. He was surprised to note that paragraph 24 did not contain a reference to the possibility of establishing an international biosafety agency. The measures to address compliance and verification mentioned in paragraph 24 (b) should include possible legally binding measures. Section G should be amended to include a new paragraph relating to measures for the institutional strengthening of the Convention, including the possible establishment of an international biosafety agency.

50. **Mr. Fougner Rydning** (Norway) said that the various elements that made up chapter III should be reordered to reflect the fact that the Convention was a disarmament and non-proliferation treaty created to ensure that biological weapons were never used. As other delegations had stated, the mechanisms referred to in sections A and B were not in competition with each other. The science and technology review mechanism proposed in section B would bolster the implementation of article X.

51. The steering group mentioned in section A could possibly assist in preparing the groundwork for an action plan. Steps should be taken to enable States parties to participate in developing the plan, possibly through an intersessional working group. The proposal to appoint facilitators to take on work related to the mechanisms was also worthy of consideration.

52. Paragraph 1 (c), on the voluntary trust fund, should be reworded to avoid overstating the fund's importance to the implementation of article X, which was an obligation incumbent on all States parties, not something that could be achieved only through a fund. The specifics of the plan for the establishment of the article X steering group could be fleshed out during the intersessional period, although certain decisions relating to the group should be made at the current Conference. The name of the steering group was less important than its mandate, although retaining the name proposed in the draft final document would obviate the need to discuss that question any further.

53. Some of the key decisions relating to the scientific advisory group mentioned in section B should be made before the closure of the Conference. The situation was made urgent by the pace of scientific and technological developments and the need to ensure that the Conference kept abreast of them. As other delegations had stated, language on biorisk management standards should be included in the draft final document.

54. **Mr. Ogasawara** (Japan) said that Japan shared the sense of urgency that some delegations had expressed regarding the establishment of the mechanisms envisaged under section A, on international cooperation and assistance, and section B, on the review of scientific and technological developments. His delegation supported the call by the Philippines for clear timelines for the work of the group of experts on the strengthening of the Convention. Therefore, at the end of paragraph 28, he proposed to change the deadline for the completion of the group's work from 2025 to 2024 and to add the words "especially with regard to the work entrusted to it under paragraphs 2 and 4". The proposal to bring the

deadline forward was in line with proposals made by the delegations of Canada and the Netherlands.

55. The Conference's decision to establish two new full-time staff positions within the Implementation Support Unit was sound. Since the new positions mentioned in paragraph 36 were the same as those mentioned in paragraphs 1 (e) and 3 (e), he proposed to add, at the end of the first sentence of paragraph 36, the phrase "in accordance with paragraphs 1 (e) and 3 (e)".

56. **Ms. Beşkardeş Karagöl** (Türkiye) said that paragraph 33 implied, in breach of the general rule that the decisions of the Conference must be taken by consensus, that a majority of States parties could decide to convene a conference to examine the final report of the group of experts. She proposed that the paragraph should be amended to state that the States parties could convene such a conference if they decided to do so by consensus. The delegation of Türkiye would be open to other formulations that respected consensus-based decision-making.

57. While the work of the Implementation Support Unit was critical to the implementation of the Convention, her delegation nonetheless believed that the Unit's mandate should be renewed only for the next intersessional period, in keeping with the Conference's usual practice. Accordingly, paragraph 35 should make clear that the mandate was being renewed for the period from 2023 to 2026. The future establishment of a permanent secretariat should not be ruled out, however. Lastly, her delegation supported the reinsertion of the language on biorisk management.

58. **Ms. Moodie** (United States of America) said that issues related to the scientific advisory process outlined in section B could be presented more clearly. It was worth considering including language that had been prepared on the subject of guidelines and the strengthening of biosafety and biosecurity. The proposal by the Philippines to expedite the establishment of the mechanism to ensure the review of scientific and technological developments, perhaps by appointing facilitators, also merited further consideration.

59. Paragraph 7 should draw on the language that had been used in relation to the Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines for Codes of Conduct for Scientists. The final clause of paragraph 8 should be removed, as it unnecessarily diminished the importance of voluntary transparency exercises.

60. Finally, her delegation did not agree that mobile biomedical rapid reaction units were, as stated in paragraph 14, "necessary in aiding and delivery of protection against biological weapons". The United States would therefore support amending the paragraph to state that those units were relevant to or useful for efforts to provide protection from biological weapons.

61. **Mr. Robatjazi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, in respect of section C, on national implementation and confidence-building measures, his delegation did not support the inclusion of paragraphs 5–8, which related to issues on which there was no consensus. In paragraph 9, the Conference encouraged States parties to take a number of measures related to the submission of reports on confidence-building measures and the organization of training courses. Such expressions of encouragement had no place in chapter III, the Conference's decisions and recommendations. Nor could his delegation support the inclusion of proposed language on biorisk management standards. However, paragraphs 10 and 11, which reflected the past practice of the Conference, should be included.

62. Paragraph 12 of section D, the section on assistance, response and preparedness, did not contain sufficient detail regarding the nature of the voluntary guidelines that the Conference aimed to establish. His delegation was unable to support the decision set forth in paragraph 13 – namely, to establish a database open to all States parties to facilitate assistance under article VII – as the financial implications of that decision were still unclear. Paragraphs 15 and 16 should not be included in chapter III because they referred to ideas that, requiring further consideration, might be discussed during the intersessional period and because they merely took note of proposals or encouraged States parties to conduct certain activities. In section E, the topics considered and discussed during the 2017–2020 intersessional period



should be listed, following the example of the final document of the Eighth Review Conference.

63. In section G, paragraph 35 should be amended to state, as the representative of Türkiye had proposed, that the Conference decided to renew the mandate of the Implementation Support Unit from 2023 to 2027. The phrase “subject to any decisions by future Conferences to modify or terminate it” should be deleted. His delegation could not support paragraph 36, as it did not explain why it was necessary to establish two new full-time staff positions within the Unit.

64. In section I, on financial matters, the last sentence of paragraph 41 should be deleted, as it contained a misleading reference to the financial obligations of States parties. Paragraph 46, which contained agreed language from the Eighth Review Conference on the need for the timely payment by States parties of assessed contributions, should be incorporated into the amended paragraph 41.

65. **Mr. Vorontsov** (Russian Federation) said that, despite the serious concerns raised by his delegation, sections C and D had barely changed during the Conference’s deliberations. Paragraphs 5, 8, 9, 11, 15 and 16 did not strictly relate to decisions and therefore ought not be included in chapter III of the final document. Language in which the Conference reaffirmed facts or encouraged or urged States parties to take measures was better suited to chapter II.

66. The remaining paragraphs were either unclear or required additional consideration. For example, his delegation did not fully understand the recommendation in paragraph 6 for States parties to consider making use of model legislation. Paragraphs 12–14 should be worded clearly and with vigour. Vague language would not enable the creation of comprehensive and viable mechanisms for providing assistance to States parties under article VII.

67. **Mr. Bouhenna** (Algeria) said that the number of activities entrusted to the group of experts during the intersessional period should be limited and the deadlines for the various measures should be specified more clearly. Paragraph 21 should be understood to apply to the intersessional period 2023–2026; there was to be no general transfer of competences from the Conference to the Meetings of States Parties. His delegation was ready to support the most ambitious wording possible in sections A and B. Lastly, in paragraph 24, he proposed to add an item to the list of areas to be considered by the group of experts. It would read: “Organizational and institutional arrangements for strengthening the Convention”.

68. **Mr. Bilgeri** (Austria) said that the focus of section F should be on verification. Verification should therefore be the first topic listed in paragraph 24. During the intersessional period, as much time as possible should be devoted to verification and compliance issues, and the text should include wording to that effect. His delegation was open to the proposals to expedite certain processes and to set clear deadlines for activities during the intersessional period; however, the Conference should not fill that period with too many activities.

69. **Mr. Khalid** (Pakistan) said that there was a need for further discussion of paragraphs 6, 15 and 16. His delegation would submit written proposals for the amendment of those paragraphs.

70. **Mr. Poor Toulabi** (Kingdom of the Netherlands) said that his delegation had been surprised by some of the statements that had been made regarding the national implementation measures described in paragraphs 5–9. The removal of those paragraphs, which enjoyed broad cross-regional support and were the outcome of intersessional work by many States, would leave only two paragraphs – 10 and 11 – on national implementation and confidence-building measures. It would not send a good message if the Conference were to end with the adoption of very limited language on the implementation of the Convention. For the same reasons, his delegation supported the reinsertion of the paragraphs on biorisk management.

71. **Mr. Espinosa Olivera** (Mexico) said that, in paragraph 7, the specific tasks to be undertaken during the intersessional period with regard to the Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines for Codes of Conduct for Scientists should be clarified. His delegation recognized the

importance of voluntary transparency exercises and therefore supported the retention of paragraph 8. Under section D, in paragraph 12, he proposed that the Conference should decide not, as stated in the paragraph, to establish a set of voluntary guidelines in respect of assistance under article VII but to endorse them. The guidelines themselves should be annexed to the final document.

72. His delegation supported the proposal to insert a new paragraph, paragraph 24 bis, in which the Conference would task the group of experts with finalizing and implementing the decisions contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 within the first two years of the intersessional period. The new paragraph would ensure that the proposed international cooperation and assistance mechanism was functioning as soon as possible.

73. **Mr. Walsh** (Ireland) said that the specific tasks that should be assigned in relation to the Tianjin Guidelines could indeed be clarified. His delegation supported the proposal to annex the voluntary guidelines mentioned in paragraph 12. It agreed that section F should focus on verification and that there should not be too much intersessional work. The proposal of the Philippines to establish the mechanisms envisaged under sections A and B promptly, thereby ensuring that the Review Conference had a tangible outcome, was a welcome one.

74. **The President** invited all delegations to submit written proposals on chapter III without delay so that they might be incorporated into a revised version of the draft final document.

*The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.*