

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

26 November 2021

Original: English

2020 Meeting

Geneva, 22-25 November 2021

Meeting of Experts on Review of developments in the field of science and technology related to the Convention Geneva, 1-2 September 2021

Item 8 of the agenda

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

Revised Report of the 2020 Meeting of Experts on review of developments in the field of science and technology related to the Convention¹

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) Recognising 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 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

¹ Any entry listed in this document does not imply the expression of any opinion regarding, and is without prejudice to, the legal status of any country or territory or of its authorities.



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 MX 4), in 2019 by EEG (MX 1 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:

[...]

MX2 (2 days): Review of developments in the field of science and technology related to the Convention:

- Review of science and technology developments relevant to the Convention, including for the enhanced implementation of all articles of the Convention as well as the identification of potential benefits and risks of new science and technology developments relevant to the Convention, with a particular attention to positive implications;
- Biological risk assessment and management;
- Development of a voluntary model code of conduct for biological scientists and all relevant personnel, and biosecurity education, by drawing on the work already done on this issue in the context of the Convention, adaptable to national requirements;
- In 2018, the MX2 will address the specific topic of genome editing, taking into consideration, as appropriate, the issues identified above;
- Any other science and technology developments of relevance to the Convention and also to the activities of relevant multilateral organizations such as the WHO, OIE, FAO, IPPC and OPCW.

[...]

(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 75/88, adopted without a vote on 7 December 2020, 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 conduct and 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, the 2017 Meeting of States Parties and the 2019 Meeting of States Parties, the Meeting of Experts was originally scheduled to take place from 27 to 28 August 2020. However, the Meeting was postponed several times due to the COVID-19 pandemic and, according to the agreement by States Parties by written silence procedure², it was instead convened at the Palais des Nations in Geneva from 1 to 2 September 2021, chaired by Mr. Kazuhiro Nakai of Japan.

5. On 1 September 2021, the Meeting of Experts adopted its agenda (BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/1) as proposed by the Chair.

6. 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. Ninety-three delegations participated in the Meeting of Experts as follows: Algeria; Angola; Argentina; Armenia; Australia; Austria; Azerbaijan; Barbados; Belarus; Belgium; Botswana; Brazil; Brunei Darussalam; Bulgaria; Canada; Chile; China; Colombia; Costa Rica; Cuba; Czech Republic; Democratic Republic of Congo; Dominican Republic; Ecuador; Estonia; Finland; France; Georgia; Germany; Ghana; Guyana; Holy See; Hungary; India; Indonesia; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Iraq; Ireland; Italy; Japan; Kazakhstan; Kenya; Kuwait; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Lebanon; Libya; Lithuania; Madagascar; Malaysia; Mauritius; Mexico; Montenegro; Morocco; Myanmar; Nepal; Netherlands; Nigeria; North Macedonia; Norway; Pakistan; Panama; Peru; Philippines; Poland; Portugal; Qatar; Republic of Korea; Romania; Russian Federation; Saudi Arabia; Senegal; Serbia; Slovakia; Slovenia; South Africa; Spain; Sri Lanka; Sudan; Sweden; Switzerland; Thailand; Togo; Tunisia; Turkey; Ukraine; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United States of America; Uruguay; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); Yemen; Zambia; and Zimbabwe.

9. In addition, one State 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: Egypt.

10. Two States, Chad and Israel, neither parties nor signatories to the Convention, participated in the Meeting of Experts as observers, in accordance with rule 44, paragraph 2.

11. The United Nations, including the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI), the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism and the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC) attended the Meeting of Experts in accordance with rule 44, paragraph 3.

12. The European Union (EU), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL), the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), the Organization of American States (OAS) and

² See the letters from the Chair of the 2020 Meeting of States Parties dated 28 July 2020, 23 November 2020 and 9 February 2021.

the World Health Organization (WHO) were granted observer status to participate in the Meeting of Experts in accordance with rule 44, paragraph 4.

13. In addition, at the invitation of the Chair, in recognition of the special nature of the topics under consideration at this Meeting and without creating a precedent, six independent experts participated in informal exchanges in the open sessions as Guests of the Meeting of Experts: Dr. Gigi Gronvall, Senior Scholar, Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security; Dr. Peter McGrath, Coordinator, InterAcademy Partnership; Ms. Jenifer Mackby, Senior Fellow, Federation of American Scientists; Dr. Piers Millett, Vice President for Safety and Security, iGEM Foundation; Mr. Yorgo el Moubayed, Safety and Security Program, iGEM Foundation; and Dr. Leifan Wang, Center for Biosafety Research and Strategy, Tianjin University.

14. Twelve non-governmental organizations and research institutes attended the Meeting of Experts under rule 44, paragraph 5.

15. A list of all participants in the Meeting of Experts is contained in document [BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/INF.1](#).

IV. Work of the Meeting of Experts

16. In accordance with the provisional agenda ([BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/1](#)) 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.

17. Under agenda item 4 (“Review of science and technology developments relevant to the Convention, including for the enhanced implementation of all articles of the Convention as well as the identification of potential benefits and risks of new science and technology developments relevant to the Convention, with a particular attention to positive implications”), working papers were introduced by the Russian Federation ([BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.4](#)), Germany ([BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.5*](#)), the United States of America ([BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.7](#) and [BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.9](#)), Switzerland ([BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.10](#)), the Islamic Republic of Iran ([BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.11](#)) and Cuba ([BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.12](#)). Ms. Jenifer Mackby from the Federation of American Scientists made a presentation as a Guest of the Meeting without prejudice to the positions of the States Parties. Technical presentations were made by France, India and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research. There then followed an interactive discussion on the agenda item in which the following States Parties participated: Algeria; Brazil; Canada; China; Cuba; France; Germany; India, Iran (Islamic Republic of Iran); Italy; Japan; Kenya; Libya; Mexico; Netherlands; Norway; Pakistan; Philippines; Republic of Korea; Russian Federation; Switzerland; Ukraine; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United States of America; and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). The European Union made a statement. Various views were expressed during the consideration of this agenda item.

18. Under agenda item 5 (“Biological risk assessment and management”), working papers were introduced by the United States of America ([BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.1](#) and [BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.8](#)), by Belgium on behalf of Austria, Belgium, Chile, France, Germany, Iraq, Ireland, Netherlands, Spain and Thailand ([BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.2](#)) and by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ([BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.3](#)). Mr. Yorgo El Moubayed and Dr. Piers Millett of the iGEM Foundation made presentations as Guests of the Meeting without prejudice to the positions of the States Parties. The Netherlands and the World Health Organization (WHO) made technical presentations. There then followed an interactive discussion on the agenda item in which the following States Parties participated: Belgium; Brazil; Germany; Ireland; Philippines; Russian Federation; Switzerland; Ukraine; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; and United States of America. The European Union made a statement. Various views were expressed during the consideration of this agenda item.

19. Under agenda item 6 (“Development of a voluntary model code of conduct for biological scientists and all relevant personnel, and biosecurity education, by drawing on the

work already done on this issue in the context of the Convention, adaptable to national requirements”), a working paper was introduced by China and Pakistan (BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.6 and Corr.1). Dr. Gigi Gronvall from the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, Dr. Peter McGrath from the InterAcademy Partnership and Dr. Leifan Wang from Tianjin University made a joint presentation as Guests of the Meeting without prejudice to the positions of the States Parties. There then followed an interactive discussion in which the following States Parties participated: Brazil; Canada; China; Germany; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Japan; Philippines; Republic of Korea; Russian Federation; South Africa; Switzerland; Ukraine; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United States of America; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). The European Union made a statement. Various views were expressed during the consideration of this agenda item.

20. Under agenda item 7 (“Any other science and technology developments of relevance to the Convention and also to the activities of relevant multilateral organizations such as the WHO, OIE, FAO, IPPC and OPCW”), the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) made a technical presentation. There then followed an interactive discussion on the agenda item in which the following States Parties participated: Iran (Islamic Republic of); and United States of America. 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, as well as on statements and presentations made by States Parties, international organizations and Guests of the Meeting, 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 November 2021 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 <https://meetings.unoda.org/section/bwc-mx-2020-mx2-documents/> 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 2 September 2021, the Meeting of Experts adopted its report by consensus, as contained in document BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/CRP.1, as orally amended, to be issued as document BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/2.

Annex I

Summary report

Submitted by the Chairperson of the 2020 Meeting of Experts on Review of Developments in the Field of Science and Technology Related to the Convention

1. The chairperson under his own responsibility and initiative has prepared this paper which lists considerations, perspectives, and conclusions drawn from the presentations, statements, working papers and interventions on the agenda items under discussion at the Meeting held on 1 and 2 September 2021. The Meeting of Experts noted that this paper had not been agreed and had no status. It is the Chairperson's view, however, that this paper could assist delegations in their preparations for the Meeting of States Parties in November 2021 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.
2. The Chairperson 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 procedural report of the Meeting details which delegations spoke under the different agenda items, and which delegations introduced working papers, so such information will not be repeated in this summary report.
3. Discussions cut across the different agenda items, as some of the issues are intertwined and science and technology impacts on various articles of the Convention. The in-depth and substantive discussions indicated the clear interest of delegations in the review of developments in the field of science and technology related to the Convention. The following sections summarize and synthesize substantive discussions under agenda items 4 to 8.

I. Agenda item 4. Review of science and technology developments relevant to the Convention, including for the enhanced implementation of all articles of the Convention as well as the identification of potential benefits and risks of new science and technology developments relevant to the Convention, with a particular attention to positive implications

4. Discussions focussed first on different proposals for establishing a science and technology review mechanism under the Convention. States Parties introduced five working papers, many of which highlighted various options for putting in place such a mechanism and also expressed a range of views concerning the need for such a body. Additionally, a Guest of the Meeting summarized the recommendations from a series of cross-regional/international workshops on the different modalities for the creation of a review mechanism, while a technical presentation contained key findings from a survey of States Parties' views on a possible review mechanism. Additionally, the presentation outlined options for States Parties to consider ahead of the Ninth BWC Review Conference which is scheduled to take place in August 2022.
5. Overall, broad support was expressed for a systematic and structured science and technology review process in the framework of the Convention to monitor relevant developments and assess their potential implications, while divergent views were expressed on methodologies, and one State Party expressed reservation on establishing any standing advisory body that has limited membership. Many States Parties noted that discussions on a

science and technology review process have advanced since the last Meeting of Experts in 2019 and expressed their appreciation to the Chairperson for his efforts, including through informal consultations.

6. In their discussions, guided by a concept note and chart produced by the Chairperson at his own discretion and for the purpose of facilitating discussion, States Parties exchanged views about various issues pertaining to a science and review mechanism, including, *inter alia*, its scope and objectives, structure and composition, costs and funding options, as well as support required for its functioning. It was noted that such a process would need to be, *inter alia*, technical in nature, independent, inclusive, geographically representative, and encompass multi-disciplinary scientific expertise. Several States Parties saw merit in further exploring a hybrid approach to the composition of the mechanism, which, as a potential option, could consist of a two-part body: one part open to experts of all States Parties, and the second part comprising a smaller standing advisory body with limited membership. The latter would solicit input from the open group on a particular topic and develop recommendations for consideration by States Parties. Several States Parties saw the need for sufficient ISU support for the operating of a mechanism, and expressed support for a separate S&T officer within the ISU.

7. Many States Parties felt that there appears to be broad convergence of views concerning the need for an improved review mechanism and on the key features of a mechanism, including: scope and objectives, participation and composition, outputs and independence. Many States Parties expressed their readiness to engage further on this issue with a view to reaching agreement at the Ninth Review Conference. At the same time, one State Party noted the progress already made with respect to reviewing scientific advances under the current intersessional programme and suggested to focus discussions on further improving the existing mechanism instead of trying to establish a new one. Some States Parties also emphasized that any proposal on a strengthened review mechanism should not be seen in isolation but would need to be considered in a balanced manner and in the context of progress made in other areas of relevance to the Convention, most notably on Article X. In this regard, the proposal to establish a Cooperation Committee was raised.

8. The second part of the discussions under this agenda item focused on advances in science and technology related to the Convention. Two States Parties introduced working papers on the subject matter. In the ensuing discussions, States Parties highlighted the benefits of science and technology developments in the context of the global COVID-19 response and specifically referred to technologies like genomic sequencing and newer vaccine technologies. Similarly, some interventions informed about national advances in the development of COVID-19 vaccines and related areas of international collaboration among States Parties.

9. Some States Parties felt that the intersessional process since 2012 had focused a significant part of its time on the potential negative implications of scientific and technological advances for the Convention and how to minimize the risks. They noted that, during the same period, many benefits arising from such advances for public health and industry had also been identified. They therefore argued that ways and means of maximising the actual benefits of new scientific and technological advances in the field of bio sciences should also be given due attention. For example, approaches for increasing availability and promoting access to and use of technologies and know-how in developing countries in order to reduce the existing gaps between developing and developed States Parties.

10. A number of States Parties stressed the importance of international scientific collaboration and the sharing of relevant information. They also highlighted the need to share new technologies among each other, in accordance with the provisions of Article X of the Convention. States Parties also underlined the importance of an effective governance strategy in the areas of biosafety and biosecurity. Additionally, some States Parties stressed the need for a “One Health” approach and they informed about national progress made in the adoption of such an approach.

11. Furthermore, two technical presentations by States Parties highlighted specific technological advances relevant to the Convention. One presentation focussed on the benefits and risks related to gene drives and informed about their application for mosquito control.

The second presentation focussed on emerging technologies for biothreat mitigation and health emergencies and informed about adopting a hybrid transboundary threat modelling approach.

II. Agenda item 5. Biological risk assessment and management

12. Under this agenda item, four States Parties introduced working papers on risk assessment and management and one State Party and one international organization made technical presentations. Additionally, two Guests of the Meeting made a presentation, demonstrating the biosafety and biosecurity work within the International Genetically Engineered Machine (iGEM) Foundation.

13. A number of States Parties emphasized the importance of a systematic approach to examine potential risks and benefits of advances in life sciences with relevance to the Convention. In this regard, one State Party presented a working paper that explored a variety of measures to govern scientific and technological advances in life sciences, ranging from operational processes and policies, informal norms, and laws.

14. One State Party introduced a working paper that suggested developing broad guiding principles for biological risk assessment and management on issues specific to the Convention, which could be adapted to national circumstances. It was noted that current approaches mainly revolve around the application of qualitative frameworks. Accordingly, the need for a wider assessment of possible principles, tools and methodologies was emphasized. It was also highlighted that the various approaches may have potential relevance for the Convention and these risk assessment and management frameworks could supplement existing oversight measures and self-governance methods and help reduce the risk of misuse.

15. Various States Parties informed the Meeting about their existing national bio-risk management approaches and recognized the benefits of sharing best practices among each other. In this regard, they also emphasized that there is no ‘one size fits all’ solution to govern biosafety and biosecurity risks and a multitude of measures needs to be adopted at the domestic level. States Parties also underlined the importance of not only considering risks but also maximizing the benefits of technologies for all States Parties when applying risk assessment frameworks and tools. In a technical presentation, one State Party presented approaches to increase awareness of dual-use concerns among life scientists and presented a dual-use quick scan that is freely available online.

16. Some States Parties suggested to advance discussions on biological risk assessment and management with the aim to provide a set of clear recommendations to the Ninth Review Conference. At the same time, some other States Parties were of the view that the development of a single, universal assessment methodology could be complicated and in fact not viable. In this regard, they suggested to consider focussing on methodologies for some more narrow and specific fields of biosecurity.

17. One State Party introduced a working paper on international bio-risk management standards and their role in the implementation of the Convention. Specific reference was made to ISO 35001:2019 on biorisk management for laboratories and other related organisations. A few States Parties expressed concern that the application of industrial management standards in the framework of the Convention could possibly conflict with national standards, regulations and best practices and were of the view that they could disadvantage developing countries. At the same time, a number of States Parties noted that the application of such standards can play a complementary role and make a valuable contribution to enhancing biosafety and biosecurity and thereby strengthening the implementation of the Convention globally.

18. Discussions among States Parties were complemented by two technical presentations delivered by the World Health Organization (WHO). The first presenter informed about the Organisation’s approach to biosafety including various initiatives underway. Information was provided about the recently issued fourth edition of WHO’s *Laboratory Biosafety Manual*, which promotes a flexible, risk-based approach. The second presentation informed about the development of a “Global Guidance Framework on Responsible Life Sciences” and

the WHO's foresight activities. This mechanism aims to facilitate the identification of novel opportunities and public health risks emerging at the scientific frontier. Several States Parties recognized the important role of the WHO in these areas and expressed their appreciation for its work.

III. Agenda item 6. Development of a voluntary model code of conduct for biological scientists and all relevant personnel, and biosecurity education, by drawing on the work already done on this issue in the context of the Convention, adaptable to national requirements

19. Under this agenda item two delegations presented their joint working paper, co-sponsored by one State Party, on the "Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines for Codes of Conduct for Scientists", which aim to prevent misuse of bioscience research without hindering beneficial outcomes, in accordance with the articles and norms of the BWC, and in advancement of progress towards achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals. The delegations underlined the voluntary and inclusive nature of the "Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines", which had recently been endorsed by the InterAcademy Partnership, the network of more than 140 national, regional and global science, engineering and medical academies. Additionally, three Guests of the Meeting made a presentation about the creation, content, and endorsement of the "Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines".

20. One other working paper also expressed the view that the "Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines" could prove very useful for the further establishment of robust biosafety, biosecurity and dual-use frameworks on national and institutional levels worldwide, since they are broadly applicable and contain the necessary flexibility and adaptability.

21. Many States Parties noted the importance of codes of conduct and expressed their support for the "Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines" including their endorsement at the Ninth Review Conference. A number of States Parties emphasized that any codes of conduct are the prerogative of States Parties and they need to be voluntary in nature. Additionally, it was stressed that codes of conduct need to be developed through a bottom-up approach involving scientists. Some States Parties also emphasized that codes of conduct should not unduly restrict research or avoid hindering international cooperation. Some States Parties expressed their wish to continue discussions on the "Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines" in the following meetings of the Convention.

22. Several States Parties acknowledged that the "Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines" can be easily adapted to national circumstances and are practical in nature, which make them or elements thereof suitable for voluntary domestic adoption. Some welcomed the IAP endorsement of the "Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines" as this will make the process more inclusive in nature. Some States Parties suggested to consider best practices from the OPCW's "The Hague Ethical Guidelines" in the future promotion and promulgation of the Guidelines. In this regard, some States Parties suggested to address in the next intersessional process the exchange of information, experiences and good practices about the dissemination of the "Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines".

IV. Agenda item 7 - Any other science and technology developments of relevance to the Convention and also to the activities of relevant multilateral organizations such as the WHO, OIE, FAO, IPPC, and OPCW

23. The OPCW gave a technical presentation on science and technology related aspects, including an update on the efforts of its Scientific Advisory Board over the last two years. Additionally, the OPCW briefed about issues addressed by the newly established Temporary Working Group (TWG) on Analysis of Biotoxins. The OPCW also reflected on the value of

mechanisms such as the Scientific Advisory Board for addressing concerns and opportunities emerging from rapid scientific and technological developments.

24. A number of States Parties took the floor. In response to a question, clarification on the relevance and relationship between the specific questions addressed by the TWG and the Scientific Advisory Board was provided. Additionally, one State Party noted that toxins are covered by the scope of both the Chemical Weapons Convention and the BWC. In this regard, it emphasized the importance of States Parties being regularly informed about relevant developments at the OPCW.

Annex II

List of documents of the 2020 Meeting of Experts on Review of developments in the field of science and technology related to the Convention

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Title</i>
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/1	Provisional Agenda for the 2020 Meeting of Experts on Review of Developments in the Field of Science and Technology Related to the Convention - Submitted by the Chairperson
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/CRP.1 English only	Draft Report of the 2020 Meeting of Experts on Review of Developments in the Field of Science and Technology Related to the Convention - Submitted by the Chairperson
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/MISC.1 English/French/Spanish only	Provisional list of participants
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/INF.1	List of participants
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.1 English only	Approaches to Governance for Scientific and Technological Advances in the Life Sciences Relevant to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention – Submitted by the United States of America
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.2 English only	Biorisk management standards and their role in BTWC implementation – Submitted by Austria, Belgium, Chile, France, Germany, Iraq, Ireland, Netherlands, Spain and Thailand
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.3 English only	Biological Risk Assessment and Management: A Need for Guiding Principles and Frameworks – Submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.4 English and Russian only	Strengthening the Biological Weapons Convention Proposal for the establishment of a Scientific Advisory Committee – Submitted by the Russian Federation
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.5* English only	Exploring Science and Technology Review Mechanisms under the Biological Weapons Convention – Submitted by Germany
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.6 and Corr.1 Chinese and English only	The Tianjin Biosecurity Guidelines for Codes of Conduct for Scientists – Submitted by China and Pakistan and co-sponsored by Brazil
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.7 English only	A Scientific and Technological Advisory Process for the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention – Submitted by the United States of America
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.8 English only	Summary of October 2020 Experts' Meeting on Strengthening Laboratory Biorisk Management – Submitted by the United States of America
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.9 English only	Benefits of science and technology developments for the global COVID-19 response – Submitted by the United States of America

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Title</i>
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.10 English only	Managing Biosafety and Biosecurity Risks: The Importance of Codes of Conduct and a BTWC Science and Technology Advisory Process – Submitted by Switzerland
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.11 English only	Review Process of Sciences and Technology Developments relevant to the BWC Convention: Some Considerations – Submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran
BWC/MSP/2020/MX.2/WP.12 Spanish only	Examen de los adelantos en la esfera de la ciencia y la tecnología relacionados con la convención – Presentado por Cuba
