



Security Council

Distr.: General
20 November 2016

Original: English

Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004)

Summary record of the 74th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 22 June 2016, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Oyarzun Marchesi (Spain)

Contents

Comprehensive review of the status of implementation of resolution 1540 (2004)
(continued)

Adoption of the agenda

Thematic discussion: transparency and media outreach

Closure of the review

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent as soon as possible to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org).

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).

16-10499 (E)



Please recycle A small graphic of a recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Comprehensive review of the status of implementation of resolution 1540 (2004)
(continued)

Adoption of the agenda

1. *The agenda was adopted.*

Thematic discussion: transparency and media outreach

2. **Ms. Sison** (United States of America), speaking as a coordinator of the working group on transparency and media outreach, said that transparency and media outreach were vital tools for raising awareness of resolution 1540 (2004) and pressing for its implementation. The Committee and its Group of Experts reached out to various audiences, including Member States, international and regional organizations, academic institutions, civil society and industry, and had been doing so increasingly since the adoption of the resolution in 2004. In its 2006 report to the Security Council, the Committee had recommended that regional and subregional outreach should be expanded and intensified. Resolution 1673 (2006) had explicitly made outreach a part of the Committee's mandate, while resolutions 1810 (2008) and 1977 (2011) had broadened that mandate, requesting that the Committee conduct outreach at the regional, subregional and national level. In resolution 1977 (2011), the Security Council had encouraged the Committee to draw on relevant expertise, including that of civil society and the private sector.

3. The Committee had a strong public presence, thanks to its open briefings to the Security Council, its website, and the public release of reports and matrices concerning States' implementation of the resolutions. In addition, summaries of Committee meetings were available on its website, the Chair of the Committee issued quarterly messages and the Committee had held informal consultations with experts in New York and elsewhere. The United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs had played an important role in sponsoring events and in supporting *1540 Compass*, a public policy journal; it had also secured a video message of support from the actor Michael Douglas.

4. The Committee and the Group of Experts participated in events at the invitation of States, international and regional organizations, non-governmental organizations and universities. However, States were ultimately responsible for implementing resolution 1540 (2004), and the main aim of transparency and outreach activities should be to support them in that task. The resolution called on States to develop appropriate ways to work with, and inform, industry and the public of their obligations.

5. The present comprehensive review should consider how States could increase transparency and reach out to a wider range of stakeholders in order to advance implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). States were invited to comment on action they had already taken and provide suggestions for improvement, and might also consider whether the Committee should be more proactive in its outreach to States; how the Committee could tailor its activities to States' specific needs; how international, regional and subregional organizations and civil society could play a more active role in events such as the comprehensive review and, possibly, contribute to funding outreach activities; how communications tools such as social media could be used to improve such activities; how the human and financial resources available to the Committee and the Group of Experts could be increased; whether a better balance must be struck between activities designed to raise public awareness and events with a more specific focus, and whether the Committee and the Group of Experts might hold meetings coinciding with meetings of the First Committee of the General Assembly.

6. **Mr. Rosenthal** (Expert), accompanying his statement with a digital slide presentation, said that transparency and media outreach used various channels. The first was the Committee website, which was aimed at a broad audience and was being redesigned to provide a more user-friendly interface. Traffic to the site had been growing steadily and had reached 60,000 individual hits a year. The second was the organization of events, which were aimed at a more restricted audience. During the 2010-2015 period, most had focused on nuclear, biological and chemical weapons as a group; a far smaller number had dealt with only one type of weapon. Efforts had been made to avoid duplication, such as overlap with the nuclear security programmes run by the International Atomic

Energy Agency (IAEA). The third was the organization of visits to States, more frequent since the establishment of the related mandate, contained in resolution 1977 (2011). There was a correlation between the extent of a State's participation in events and its implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). It was also clear that visits to States had spurred the submission of reports and the establishment of voluntary national implementation action plans.

7. Universities and industry had organized events that focused on topics connected with the resolution and its implementation. The benefit of those events lay in providing the Committee and its Group of Experts with a better understanding of the issues and challenges faced by Member States. When working with States, the Committee and the Experts had focused on the harmonization of legal and regulatory frameworks, to prevent weak links in counter-proliferation. In the area of counter-terrorism, for example, a terrorist who fled from one jurisdiction to another could be extradited or prosecuted provided that both jurisdictions had the same legal framework. Differentiating between States was crucial when deciding where extra capacity was needed to achieve implementation; States with no nuclear material, for example, needed no capacity-building assistance in that connection.

8. In conclusion, while the value of having the Committee and its Group of Experts become involved in awareness-raising events had diminished, because awareness of resolution 1540 (2004) was already high, direct interaction with Government officials, by contrast, should be actively pursued. Such interaction often helped to spur voluntary national implementation action plans, which enabled Member States to determine their own priorities, and could address problems with the proper formulation of assistance requests. Interaction with the Committee and its Experts could also help in that regard if visits to States involved subject-matter experts engaged by the Committee from Member States or, for example, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). With the exception of points-of-contact training, the Committee itself planned very few events. It would be very valuable if the Committee and its Group of Experts could be empowered and given the resources to initiate, plan and convene events that focused on needs and priorities identified by States;

such events could cover both broad issues, such as legal and trade controls, and specific themes associated with nuclear, biological or chemical weapons.

9. **Mr. Cupitt** (United States of America), moderator, invited contributions from the participants.

10. **Mr. Anton** (Observer for Germany) said that Germany was focusing its outreach efforts on industry, which was the first line of defence in implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). It was necessary, however, to bear the differing interests of States and industry in mind. While the main aim of States was to implement the resolution effectively, companies were focused on running their businesses. Dialogue between industry and the regulators was very important, since companies were required to comply with more than 200 regulations in order to implement the resolution. The Wiesbaden Process, which had brought regulators, federations, industry, think tanks and international organizations together to consider possible improvements, had been launched by Germany in 2012. Within the context of the Process, four conferences had been held and three outcome documents had been produced, the latter submitted to the Committee and published on its website. The recommendations in the first outcome document had been aimed at companies, and had included the suggestion that compliance should be a top priority and should be assigned to a dedicated member of staff. The second outcome document had considered companies' expectations of regulators, including legal certainty, easily accessible information and quick decision-making. The third outcome paper had looked ahead to new technology, such as three-dimensional printing, which would present special challenges.

11. His delegation welcomed the scheduled holding of a conference in the Republic of Korea on 27 and 28 September 2016, focusing on issues specific to the Asia-Pacific region. It hoped that similar events would be organized in other regions. At a side event held on 15 June 2016, an industry representative had suggested establishing an industry network so that companies with large compliance departments could offer support to small- and medium-sized enterprises. It had also been proposed that the subsidiaries of global companies in countries where export controls were less developed could provide advice on sensitive subjects such as biotechnology.

12. **Mr. Eloumni** (Observer for Morocco) said that the event organized by Germany to promote dialogue with industry had been very significant. His delegation agreed that the Committee and the Group of Experts should be able to organize meetings and activities themselves, rather than having to wait for an invitation. Morocco had proposed that regular consultations should be held in New York with representatives of Member States, and that more specialized and thematic activities should be organized. Other Security Council ad hoc committees and their expert groups had successfully pursued that line of action, and improvements in dialogue with different partners had resulted.

13. **Ms. Kim Heun Jin** (Observer for the Republic of Korea) said that the Committee had made significant progress in outreach to Member States, but greater attention should be paid to outreach to industry as part of the comprehensive review, since business compliance was key to effective implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). The Republic of Korea had endeavoured to raise awareness within industry of the importance of export controls and to promote voluntary compliance. It had established an electronic system that enabled online licensing and provided guidance on the national export control system. It had also promoted internal compliance programmes by offering incentives to companies that had a good record of compliance with export control regulations. An annual trade and strategy event and an education and training programme helped raise awareness of export control regulations and updated lists of controlled items. One benefit of outreach to industry was that it represented an opportunity to learn about the challenges of implementing resolution 1540 (2004) on the ground. Academia and civil society could also provide valuable input to the comprehensive review process. The Government of Germany had made an important contribution by establishing a forum for dialogue with industry through the Wiesbaden Process, and the industry-outreach conference for the Asia-Pacific region to be hosted by the Republic of Korea in September 2016 would build on that process. Her delegation hoped that the event would heighten awareness of resolution 1540 (2004) within industry, foster better understanding of export and border control regulations among major exporters, and strengthen regional implementation of the resolution.

14. The Republic of Korea also wished to encourage more cooperation on outreach between the Committee and multilateral export control regimes and relevant international and regional organizations, including IAEA and OPCW, in order to avoid duplication of effort, promote synergies and take advantage of technical expertise. As part of the comprehensive review, the Committee and its Group of Experts should take stock of existing assistance and outreach programmes and develop a better mechanism for collaboration with other organizations and regimes, possibly using the points-of-contact channel.

15. **Mr. Borreda** (Spain) said that preventing terrorist groups from gaining access to weapons of mass destruction was a global responsibility that fell principally to States but also to international organizations. However, in present-day globalized societies, full implementation of the resolution would not be possible without also actively involving legislators, the manufacturers of dual-use materials and those working on technological and scientific advances.

16. From its inception, the Committee had made great outreach efforts, and had been particularly successful with outreach to Member States. However, awareness of the risks of proliferation within academia, industry and civil society was notably lower, and greater communication was therefore needed, along with visits to States at their own invitation. Spain had set up a working group composed of academics, industry representatives, parliamentarians and staff of various government departments, which would publish its conclusions on the process of implementing resolution 1540 (2004) in late August 2016. His delegation also agreed that outreach to industry should be increased; while the Wiesbaden Process had been successful, it should perhaps include other key industrial sectors such as logistics and transportation. The different interests of industry and academia should be taken into consideration and the responsible use of science and technology should not depend solely on the criminalization of an activity or behaviour. In addition, more attention should be paid to obligations imposed upon parliaments by resolution 1540 (2004), and the Committee should work more closely with international parliamentary organizations as well as national parliaments. Lastly, Spain welcomed the improvements in the Committee's website. It would

only be possible to fully engage civil society if the website provided easy access to information as well as support and assistance in areas that were critical for implementation of the resolution.

17. **Ms. Syrota** (Ukraine) said that her delegation recognized the importance of cooperation in the area of cybersafety and cybersecurity among all stakeholders at the national and international level, including public authorities, the private sector, industry and civil society. In terms of implementation of the resolution, it was crucial to take into account the latest scientific and technological developments and raise awareness among academics and the general public of the non-proliferation regime and the possible risks associated with rapid developments in science and technology. While oversight was necessary to prevent the appropriation of scientific progress for evil ends, it should not compromise scientists' work in critical areas that benefited mankind.

18. International legal prohibitions held little relevance for terrorists and criminals planning to misuse cybermaterial. Wide awareness of the existing cyberthreats should thus be a matter of concern not only for Governments but also for civil society. The likelihood of harm to human life or health or to the environment through the misuse of cybermaterial was very high. In terms of strategies to address the issue, national legislation and regulatory frameworks should be aligned with international regulations and effective practices. The Wiesbaden Process represented a good example that was being replicated in other regions. There was a need for a systematic approach to cybersafety that included raising public awareness of safe and secure ways to manage such cybermaterial and promoting a comprehensive security culture through programmes focusing on education, local awareness and responsibility, which could also serve as a basis for bilateral, regional and multilateral cooperation. Cooperation between academia, industry, civil society, and Government regulatory and enforcement agencies could be further enhanced, including at the regional level, to prevent the illegal trafficking of materials and technologies that could be used as weapons. Better communication and coordination should be encouraged, with greater assistance from international organizations and donors for implementation of the relevant programmes and voluntary initiatives. The remaining challenges in the

practical implementation of proposals to strengthen the resolution included avoiding duplication of effort and improving coordination and communication. In that regard, Ukraine strongly supported the non-paper presented by the United States for the comprehensive review, which could be considered by all participants and used as guidance for further action.

19. **Ms. MacLoughlin** (Observer for Argentina) said that the comprehensive review process must include aspects of outreach that reflected the importance of education and awareness-raising with regard to the Committee's work and how it related to the world of academia and science. In 2010, Argentina had launched a national project on the safe and responsible use of applied chemical and biological sciences and technologies, which had culminated in 2013 in agreements with the Ministry of Education on the incorporation of a minimum level of course content on those subjects into related university degrees, and similar agreements with the Ministries of Defence and Security in relation to their training courses.

20. **Ms. García Guiza** (Observer for Mexico) said that outreach strategies were essential to implementing resolution [1540 \(2004\)](#) effectively. The Committee and the Group of Experts should play a key role in the development of such strategies, which must be strengthened through dialogue with Member States and other relevant stakeholders in the area of non-proliferation, always bearing in mind that any action undertaken should remain useful for identifying common challenges and aiding in the convergence of assistance and cooperation projects. The information and interactive resources available on the Committee's website were vital tools that should be further improved. The Committee members should also make greater use of social networks to share information on their assistance and cooperation activities and their participation in regional events on non-proliferation and export control measures.

21. **Ms. Skerter** (New Zealand) said that her delegation welcomed the comprehensive review, which sought to improve engagement with international and regional organizations, civil society, industry and academia. Convening an annual informal meeting on the sidelines of the session of the First Committee could be a useful way to increase transparency and dialogue with interested Member States and

international and regional organizations. Her delegation would be interested to explore further the suggestions to exploit South-South cooperation and increase information-sharing at the regional level. It was also in favour of empowering the Group of Experts to be proactive in identifying and approaching Member States that might benefit from a visit.

22. **Mr. Cupitt** (United States of America), speaking in his national capacity, said that his delegation had circulated a non-paper containing concrete outreach proposals, including a proposal to increase the impact and scope of the work of the Committee through the establishment of a mechanism to allow experts in public diplomacy and public relations to offer their advice. Other proposals included appointing to the Group of Experts a specialist in the conduct and evaluation of outreach activities and asking States and the Group of Experts to identify examples of best practice from each region. He encouraged States to provide feedback on their outreach to civil society and industry. More direct input from those sectors could be achieved through the creation of an industry advisory council and a civil society council or the establishment of relationships with existing industry and civil society councils.

23. **Mr. Beenen** (Observer for the Netherlands) said that the Committee should strengthen its engagement with civil society, the financial sector and industry stakeholders to ensure that they acted in accordance with resolution 1540 (2004). Industry involvement through initiatives such as the Wiesbaden Process was essential to raise awareness of the resolution and enhance support for its implementation. Another way to involve stakeholders from industry and the academic sector in the work of the Committee would be to hold an annual meeting on the sidelines of the session of the First Committee.

24. **Mr. Hansen** (Observer for Australia) said that it was crucial to exploit the role of the private sector in the prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. His delegation supported the United States proposal to establish industry and civil society advisory councils. It was also important for Member States to direct their outreach activities at national actors, in order to strengthen implementation of export control measures and other obligations arising from resolution 1540 (2004).

25. **Mr. Mashkov** (Russian Federation) said that transparency and outreach must not be confused: transparency related to the regular work of the Committee, while outreach related to the specific messages that the Committee wished to send to external stakeholders. Although Governments retained primary responsibility for the implementation of the resolution, they must work with a wide group of stakeholders to achieve that aim. Those stakeholders included academia and business. He wished to highlight the distinction between business and industry, as the latter referred to manufacturers, while the former denoted a wider circle, and included those involved in trade rather than manufacture. That was important when talking about the movement of dual-use materials.

26. With regard to export control, he wished to point out that the appearance of new technology, and the possibility of transfers of that technology, offered no fundamental challenge to existing systems, whose provisions — including export bans — could still be enforced. However, the issue in that regard was one of division of labour and avoidance of duplication. Resolution 1540 (2004) involved a great deal more than export control, so action by the Committee and action by Governments must be in balance, and avoid overlaps. That would enable optimal use of resources, capacities and knowledge. National authorities dealing with export control could focus on issues such as checklists, while the Committee could focus on the broader issues.

27. While his delegation appreciated the non-paper contributed by the United States, it was very wary of adding layers to the existing structures connected with the resolution. The Committee had come first, followed by the Group of Experts, and there seemed no point in adding advisory councils. The risk would be one of creating a large and unwieldy apparatus which was inefficient and hard to manage. Lastly, his delegation was disappointed that the involvement of the business sector in the preparation of the current comprehensive review had not been paralleled by active participation in the form of attendance, and it therefore urged that the Committee's focus should be on ensuring that Governments acted to prevent proliferation by working with business, including manufacturers of dual-use goods. Excessive focus on outreach and production of

information materials would be a distraction from that task.

28. **Mr. Hashmi** (Observer for Pakistan) said that outreach to industry, civil society and other actors, including through initiatives such as the Wiesbaden Process, would help advance the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). Informal feedback from industry stakeholders indicated that they found it difficult to navigate the layers of regulations established by the resolution, export control regimes and sanctions regimes. He asked whether there had been any assessment of the impact of outreach activities on national implementation, on awareness and on the effectiveness of the technical assistance matchmaking system. The focus on outreach and cooperation should not distract the Committee from the issue of assistance, which was vital for implementation of the resolution in many developing countries. The process for visits to Member States should be streamlined. Moreover, since it would be extremely difficult for the small number of experts to visit every Member State, it might be useful to focus instead on conducting more outreach activities, such as consultations with Member State delegations, in New York. Such informal consultations would fall within the scope of the Committee's existing mandate.

29. **Mr. Rached** (Observer for the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL)) said that his organization supported the proposals to strengthen the capacity and resources available to the Committee and Group of Experts to enable them to conduct outreach activities to Member States more efficiently and to play a matchmaking role in the provision of assistance. INTERPOL was committed to supporting the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) within the scope of its organization's mandate and constitution.

30. **Mr. Cupitt** (United States of America), moderator, urged the participating international organizations to provide the Committee with information, during or after the meeting, on the outreach activities that they had found to be most effective or ineffective.

31. **Ms. Bauer** (Observer for the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute), providing a summary of the conclusions of a side event on science and security held on the previous day, and recalling the

outcome of the event organized by the Committee in New York in April 2016 to promote a dialogue with academia and civil society, said that it was important to bring together academics from the social sciences and the natural sciences, as there was currently little interaction between them. The disciplines had different relationships to resolution 1540 (2004): academics working in the social sciences analysed developments and contributed to capacity-building efforts, while those working in the natural sciences were subject to obligations relating to the transfer of sensitive materials and expertise. One challenge was that academics not directly involved in research on weapons of mass destruction were often unaware that the resolution was relevant to them. There was also a general lack of interest in the resolution on the part of those working in the sector, exacerbated by a lack of resources within professional associations and networks.

32. It was important to involve academics in efforts to implement the resolution, as technology evolved quickly and the knowledge of those developments resided primarily with the scientific community. Successful outreach initiatives conducted by States such as Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation included education on dual-use materials, training and awareness-raising. It was important to give sectors some space for self-regulation and to frame outreach efforts in terms that were familiar to the scientific community, such as ethics, codes of conduct and responsible science. The Committee should also consider finding ways to learn from the good practices and other expertise that the scientific community could share.

33. **Mr. Röser** (Observer for Infineon Technologies) said that an industry network should be established to further the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). In order to achieve that aim, regulators should invite companies to participate, national authorities should be approached on that matter, and the Group of Experts should be tasked with receiving a list of potential participants and making a selection from among them. Industry actors were eager to intensify their dialogue with regulators; it simply remained to establish an appropriate mechanism for them to do so.

34. **Mr. Early** (Observer for the Center for Policy Research, University at Albany, State University of

New York) said that outreach activities should be tailored to each specific context, as different proliferation risks were associated with different industrial sectors and every State had a different portfolio of industries. Effective outreach also involved two-way communication between Governments and the private and academic sectors. The Committee was well placed to play an awareness-raising role at the global level. However, its outreach activities should be accompanied by an increase in the provision of assistance, without which many Governments would not be able to effectively implement policies.

35. **Mr. Boer** (Observer for the Association of the United States Army, European Region) said that industry stakeholders with integrated global supply chains faced difficulties resulting from the multiple legal frameworks and guidelines with which they had to comply. National regulations that went beyond internationally agreed standards were a particular challenge. It was also difficult for companies to know how Governments and other customers intended to use their products. He encouraged the Committee and the Group of Experts to continue their dialogue with industry representatives, with a view to achieving the common objective of implementing the resolution.

36. **Mr. Rosenthal** (Expert) said that, with regard to assessing the impact of outreach and transparency efforts, there was a positive correlation in all regions of the world between participation in events organized by the Committee and the degree of implementation of the resolution as recorded in the Committee's matrices. It should be borne in mind that a positive correlation did not necessarily indicate that the events were encouraging States to implement the resolution; it was possible that States participated in events because they already had a strong interest in implementing the resolution. That was why States with very high implementation rates were generally not taken into account in calculations. One of the likely main benefits of the events was an increase in awareness among officials from the Government ministries and agencies responsible for implementation in States where there was already a good level of engagement at the international level. It could be difficult to measure the relationship between outreach and implementation. For example, the adoption of a new legislative framework a short time after the conclusion of a visit to a Member State was not likely a result of the visit, given the

amount of time that it took to pass new laws. However, the development of a voluntary national implementation action plan following a visit could safely be considered a direct result of outreach.

37. Information from 2010 and 2015 highlighted the existence of two clusters of countries: those with implementation rates below 50 per cent and those with implementation rates above 70 per cent. The cluster of States with a high implementation rate was likely the result of strong regional-level regulation in some parts of the world, such as the European Union. The cluster of States with low implementation rates was much larger. The Committee might wish to focus most of its efforts on those States, as the majority of them had modest resources and low capacity. While that would mean focusing the Committee's attention away from nuclear materials, as few of the States with low implementation rates possessed nuclear facilities, the nuclear sector in any case required less attention from the Committee than the chemical and biological sectors, given the existence of well-funded and extremely effective IAEA capacity-building programmes. Furthermore, the nuclear sector was much better regulated than the biological and chemical sectors, even though there were tens of thousands of chemical and biological facilities in the world compared to around 1,000 nuclear-fuel-cycle facilities.

38. **Mr. Cupitt** (United States of America), speaking in his national capacity, said that, although the Group of Experts might not be aware of it, their visit to the United States had had a positive impact on inter-agency processes and cooperation within his Government.

39. **Mr. Taylor** (Coordinator of the Group of Experts) said that the impact of outreach could be measured by elements such as the number of voluntary national implementation plans established and the number of initial implementation reports received from States to which a visit had been organized. In some cases it was possible to gauge impact by the number of new laws and regulations introduced, but enacting legislation was a long process and would take time to produce effects. Enhancing the Committee's ability to carry out visits would have a direct positive impact on implementation, in particular if it were to focus on certain regions and aspects of implementation, which

was entirely possible within the current mandate of the Committee.

40. **Mr. Moselle** (United States of America), speaking as a coordinator of the working group on transparency and media outreach, said that the Committee could improve the effectiveness of its action by being proactive in approaching and interacting with stakeholders in New York. Conversely, Member State representatives should be encouraged to be proactive in approaching members of the Committee and the Group of Experts. The Committee could arrange an annual meeting on the sidelines of the session of the First Committee of the General Assembly, as had been suggested, but Member State representatives could play their part by communicating with Security Council members from their regional groups and by checking the Committee's website regularly to read the quarterly message from the Chair and other information published as part of the efforts to increase transparency. It would also be worthwhile to enhance the Committee's relationship with the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, which had done much to support the Committee's outreach and transparency efforts.

41. Inviting representatives from industry and civil society to meetings had helped the Committee better understand how those sectors were working to implement elements of resolution 1540 (2004). However, the Committee still lacked valuable information that would help it to target its efforts and improve its outreach. He therefore encouraged Member States and international and regional organization to provide the Committee with information about what types of efforts had been successful and what types had not. Once the Committee possessed better data, it could look for trends and develop better recommendations.

Closure of the review

42. **Mr. Kim** Won-soo (Under Secretary-General, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs) said that resolution 1540 (2004) had become an important component of the global security architecture. Developments in science and technology, trade and the operation of terrorist groups meant that the context in 2016 was dramatically different from that in which the resolution had been adopted, and several gaps in the non-proliferation regime had been exposed. First, the

investment made in prevention and response did not match the magnitude of the threat posed by the risk of non-State actors obtaining weapons of mass destruction. There had been relatively little investment in the prevention of a biological attack, even though the impact of a biological attack would be far greater than that of a radiological or chemical attack. The Ebola outbreak had demonstrated the threats that an epidemic could pose to international peace and security, and that threat would be magnified many times over if biological agents or pathogens were deliberately put to malicious use. There were increasing reports of attempts by terrorist groups to produce or obtain such agents and pathogens, but the existing non-proliferation architecture was not adequate to respond appropriately. With regard to radiological weapons, the detonation of a radiological dispersal device, or "dirty bomb", by a non-State actor would create widespread panic, yet there was no explicit reference to radiological threats in the operative paragraphs of resolution 1540 (2004). Second, the need for capacity-building in relation to resolution 1540 (2004) was growing, but financing remained stagnant. Third, technological advances such as three-dimensional printing and the ready availability of research on the Internet meant that it would now be much easier and cheaper for non-State actors to produce and use chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear materials. An increasingly networked society also made critical facilities containing sensitive materials vulnerable to cyberattacks.

43. To fill those gaps, resolution 1540 (2004) should be updated and strengthened. The Committee could use its expertise and networks to follow up on information provided by Member States concerning attempts by non-State actors to acquire or use biological agents. The recognition of radioactive material as a sensitive material in the preamble of the resolution should be made explicit in the operative paragraphs. The growing financing gap for capacity-building should be addressed, including through the United Nations Trust Fund for Global and Regional Disarmament Activities. The skills of the Experts and Secretariat staff should be better aligned with the current risks and threats. The Secretary-General would make every effort to recruit the best-qualified experts to address the current risks and threats, and the Secretariat would work to improve coordination with the Committee, the Group of Experts

and all other relevant stakeholders within the United Nations system. The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research could assist in mapping the threats and potential solutions.

44. In the longer term, the international community should consider ways to improve its preparedness in the event of an attack, in particular a biological attack. States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction should use the review conference in November 2016 to consider in greater depth how the Convention could be used to ensure optimal prevention, preparedness and response. More broadly, there was a need for accelerated action on disarmament and ensuring the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

45. **The Chair** said that the participation of Member States and the many other parties in the open formal consultations of the Committee had provided valuable insight into means of achieving the implementation of resolution [1540 \(2004\)](#) and would help the Committee accomplish the objectives of the comprehensive review.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.