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Background

- After over 4 decades, several obstacles to the operationalization of Article VII of the BWC

- No documented standard operating procedures or guidelines for requesting assistance in response to a treaty violation
Objectives

- Identify which routes for requesting assistance
- Identify best practices
- Validate previous proposals
- Suggest guidelines for making requests for assistance
Pathways for Requesting Assistance

Key
- --- BWC Pathway
- - - Optional Pathway
- --- Pathway

- State request to International Organization
- State request to State (Bilateral)

- UNGA United Nations General Assembly
- UNSC United Nations Security Council
- UNSGM United Nations Secretary General’s Mechanism

- Immediate confirmation of deliberate use
- Outbreak investigation & samples analysis highlight biological engineering or telling epidemic curve
- DBE Suspicion (Serious and credible but not confirmed)
- Member State request to United Nations

- Request for Assistance Issued to BWC Member States
- Confirmation of Deliberate Biological Event
- BWC

---
1 These appeals refer to actions unrelated to the provisions of the BWC.
2 Consistent with language from the 8th BWC Review Conference, BWC States Parties may submit a provisional request for assistance under Article VII to other BWC States Parties, pending a determination by the UNSC.
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# RFA Procedures, Policies & Templates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal RFA Processes Identified</th>
<th>Alternative RFA Processes Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>ASEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>IAEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>OPCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>NATO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>UNOCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNODA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RFA Procedures, Policies & Templates

- Most RFA processes:
  - Are supported by policy or legislative instruments
  - Include a predesignated authority

- We identified 11 entities that had:
  - Formal standardized RFA forms
  - RFA guidelines and templates

- Key RFA form elements were identified and compared
Identified most elements of previous proposals in existing RFA templates

Identified three additional items for consideration:
1. An estimate of the number of persons affected
2. Prognoses for the coming 24, 48, and 72 hours
3. Information regarding the point of entry for assistance delivery
Governance Recommendations

- Predesignating a center for receiving requests for assistance and coordinating response activities
- Regularly maintaining and updating a database of resources available for the response to a deliberate biological event
- Identifying triggers for shifting responsibilities during a response
Process Recommendations

1. Deliberate Biological Event occurs
2. Initial request (Annex C) is submitted to designated entity
3. International expert consultation (if necessary)
4. Secondary request (Annex D) is submitted to designated entity
Summary

- A multitude of pathways exist for requesting assistance
- There are commonalities for existing RFA processes
- Our findings support previous proposals
- Proposed RFA templates available
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Thank you!

Questions?
deliberatebio@georgetown.edu

@georgetown_ghss