



Global Partnership Against the Spread of Materials and Weapons of Mass Destruction: President's Report for 2013

Foreign & Commonwealth Office
London
December 2013

Foreword

The United Kingdom has had the privilege of leading the work of the Global Partnership Against Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction this past year. It is a responsibility that we have taken very seriously, given the vital importance of denying terrorists and would-be proliferators access to chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear (CBRN) materials and expertise.

International co-operation and co-ordination are essential in managing this threat. The UK sees the Global Partnership as the delivery mechanism through which like-minded states, who share our concerns and want to take action against proliferators, can co-ordinate their efforts to best effect. It is also a very useful forum for co-ordinating our work with, and support for, international organisations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and the UN Security Council's 1540 Committee.

Our Presidency addressed four themes. These included delivering more projects and programmes more effectively, responsible science and information security, an expanded membership to reflect the global nature of the threat, and better implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1540. This report shows how we have pursued these themes through the three working group meetings of our Presidency, the main results of those working groups, and, crucially, the lessons learnt, which I hope will be helpful to future Presidencies.

As our Presidency comes to an end this month, I would like to express my thanks that we were able to build on the solid achievements of the United States 2012 Presidency. I wish the Russian Federation all the success with their Presidency in 2014.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H. Robertson', written in a cursive style.

Rt Hon Hugh Robertson MP
Minister of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office

Contents

Introduction.....	Page 4
UK priorities for 2013.....	Page 5
Biological Security sub-Working Group (BSWG).....	Page 7
Nuclear and Radiological sub-Working Group (NRSWG).....	Page 9
Outreach and Expansion sub-Working Group (OEWG).....	Page 12
Centres of Excellence sub-Working Group (CoEWG).....	Page 14
Chemical Security sub-Working Group (CSWG).....	Page 17
Conclusions.....	Page 18
Annex.....	Page 20

INTRODUCTION

The Global Partnership (GP) is a multilateral non-proliferation initiative created by G8 countries at the Kananaskis Summit on 27 June 2002, whereby countries fund and implement projects to prevent terrorists and other proliferators from acquiring Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) weapons and materials of mass destruction. The Global Partnership also provides a means for partners to coordinate their contributions to WMD threat reduction through international organisations.

Since its inception in 2002, the GP has expanded beyond the G8 to include 27 members. From 2002-11, its achievements include: the destruction of some 20,000 tonnes of chemical weapons, the secure dismantling and transport of decommissioned nuclear powered submarines, improved detection of nuclear and radiological materials, the re-employment of former WMD scientists and technicians to civilian programmes and the removal and safe transportation of 775 bombs' worth of nuclear material in Kazakhstan.

In 2011 the renewed Global Partnership agreed four priorities: (i) nuclear security; (ii) biological security; (iii), scientist engagement in the WMD field; and (iv) implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540 (a resolution obliging states to implement a range of domestic measures against WMD terrorism).

There are 27 GP members: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, the United States of America plus the EU.

The chair of the Global Partnership rotates with the Presidency of the G8 and it is the chair's responsibility to organise the Global Partnership Working Group (GPWG) meetings. The GPWG incorporates a range of sub-working groups established to help focus GP partners on specific areas of interest.

The UK held three Global Partnership Working Group (GPWG) meetings in 2013. The first GPWG held at Wilton Park, (6-8 February) which confirmed the structure and workplan of the Global Partnership, including its informal sub working groups. The second GPWG (12-14 June) was held in London, and focused on discussion and collaboration between GP members and international organisations in order to match projects and programmes with possible funding and technical expertise. The third and final GPWG (23-24 October), also held in London, focused on information security culture and responsible science, which included a webcast event at the Royal Society.

The UK continued the Biological Security sub working group, the Centres of Excellence sub working group and the New Members (renamed Outreach and Expansion) sub working group. The UK also established, with the GP's consent, two further sub-working groups to help GP partners focus on specific areas of interest; the Nuclear and Radiological Security sub working group and the Chemical Security sub working group.

The UK also continued to invite international organisations to the GP meetings in order to increase collaboration with GP members.

The Global Partnership depends on the goodwill and active participation of its members, The UK benefited enormously this year from the contributions of all members, and in particular, the chairs of the sub working groups: Canada, the Netherlands, Poland, Ukraine, the US and Italy. The UK is enormously grateful to them.

UK PRIORITIES IN 2013

The UK identified four priorities in support of the core GP objectives in 2013 and set out plans for the 2013 Presidency in the first working group. These priorities were:-

- Increased GP projects and programmes;
- Strengthening responsible science and information security;
- An expanded membership
- Implementation of UNSCR 1540.

Increased GP projects and programmes

In order to match projects and programmes with possible funding and technical expertise, the UK hosted a 'matchmaking' event at the second Working Group meeting in June. This was repeated at the third Working Group in October. These 'matchmaking' sessions provided space and time for GP partners and international organisations to match the supply of expertise and funds with requirements.

Strengthening responsible science and information security

The UK used its GP chairmanship to highlight the large numbers of scientists, engineers and technicians that hold sensitive CBRN knowledge and information, and the risks of their potential misuse. The third GPWG in October highlighted the importance of security culture

and responsible science in its biological security, nuclear and radiological security and centres of excellence sub working groups, and also at the plenary level, which, included a panel discussion at the Royal Society. Here, speakers with CBRN expertise from academia, industry and government led discussions on codes of conduct, and points of convergence between science and policy. This emphasised the importance of science being part of the solution where issues of dual use research of concern arise.

Expanded membership of GP

In its first decade since inception in 2002, the GP concentrated its threat reduction efforts on large scale projects in Russia and other FSU states. Many of these projects are now largely complete, and the GP decided to refocus towards projects in other regions of the world, in order to address broader WMD and terrorist threats. The GP has already broadened its identity by expanding beyond the core G8 and has moved away from a 'donor and recipient' model towards one characterised by a genuine security partnership. Under the UK's Presidency, steps were taken to expand this further and the Global Partnership now benefits from perspectives from previously underrepresented regions such as South East Asia (the Philippines – joined in June 2013) and Latin America (Mexico the first to join in February 2013). Hungary's membership has also been approved within the UK's Presidency, and Hungary will be able to attend the first meeting of the 2014 Presidency as a full GP member.

Implementation of UNSCR 1540

The G8 summit in Deauville in 2011 adopted the *G8 Global Partnership Assessment and Options for Future Programming* document, which identified priorities for the future of the Partnership, including facilitation of the Implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540 (UNSCR 1540). The document noted that "*By providing equipment, expertise and training, GP partners could enhance WMD non-proliferation and counter-terrorism capacities in countries seeking to meet 1540 obligations and lacking the ability to do so, upon their request.*" UNSCR1540 obliges States to prevent non-State actors from acquiring WMD work to reduce the threat of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear materials and weapons.

The UK invited the coordinator of the 1540 group of experts to brief the GP on the 1540 Committee's work. The UK prioritised the requests for UNSCR1540 assistance and aimed to assist in coordinating and matchmaking donors with recipient countries by hosting matchmaking sessions. The UK also drew attention to the work being led at the UN (1540 Committee) and led by example by preparing an updated report on implementation and a National Implementation Action Plan for the UNSCR 1540 Committee.

As many states lack sufficient capacity and expertise to implement UNSCR1540 effectively, the UK hosted an 'Outreach' event during the June GPWG which encouraged other states to report on how they are fulfilling their UNSCR1540 obligations.

Summary of sub working groups in 2013

Biological Security sub-Working Group (BSWG)

Aim of the sub working group

In 2012, under the US G8 Presidency, GP members decided to focus their efforts toward the achievement of five biosecurity deliverables, which provided the basis for BSWG meetings in 2013. These are:

- 1) Secure and account for materials that represent biological proliferation risks.
- 2) Develop and maintain appropriate and effective measures to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the deliberate misuse of biological agents.
- 3) Strengthen national and global networks to rapidly identify, confirm and respond to biological attacks.
- 4) Reinforce and strengthen biological non proliferation principles, practices and instruments.
- 5) Reduce proliferation risks through the advancement and promotion of safe and responsible conduct in the biological sciences.

The group was chaired by the UK.

Specific objectives for 2013

Our main objective in all of these meetings was to highlight specific gaps in capabilities and capacities and to identify areas where GP members could make specific contributions, whether in kind or through financial donations, that could help fill gaps and, in so doing, make a concrete contribution to improve biological security internationally. Matching resources to projects was one of our key aims, and several GP members were able to make contributions in this area for the first time during 2013. The WHO, OIE, and FAO were active participants in the meetings as were UNODA, UNIDIR, UNICRI and INTERPOL, reporting on their programmes and highlighting areas where they saw compelling capacity and capability shortfalls that need to be addressed. Various academics and NGOs, such as VERTIC and Bradford University, also participated and proposed projects that could help address many of the issues.

Activities undertaken in 2013

Deliverables 1 and 2 were addressed in the first meeting of the BSWG in February; deliverables 3 and 4 were dealt with at the second meeting in June, whilst deliverable 5

was taken up in the third and final meeting in October. Some of the key themes and issue to emerge from discussions held at these three meetings included:

- National systems for promoting biosecurity are important, and the group discussed models implemented by GP members that could be applied in partnership with others toward the aim of securing dangerous pathogens and minimizing biorisk by maximizing the use of modern diagnostics. The group also continued to make progress toward “flagship” activities of post-rinderpest eradication and building capacity toward the capacities required by the WHO International Health Regulations. Many of the capabilities required for detecting and responding to the whole spectrum of natural, intentional, and man-made events are essentially the same. Systems and networks that might be created for rare events will atrophy through lack of use, whereas systems created for addressing natural, man-made and accidental outbreaks of infectious disease are likely to be used frequently. Relying on tools and systems that are compatible with both rare and common occurrences means that in an instance of a rare event, detection and response will not be delayed by lack of familiarity with the tools or systems of reporting.
- Effective, efficient, and comprehensive infectious disease surveillance is crucial. The early detection and characterisation of an infectious disease outbreak is essential to enable a prompt response to contain the impact of outbreaks irrespective of origins. This helps reduce fatalities, sickness and the economic costs.
- We need to think of security in broader terms rather than narrower more traditional ways and/or focusing only on intentional acts by adversaries. This is important when it comes to funding relevant programmes that fall under biosecurity deliverables one and two. We should think more about focusing on funding measures that meet a broad set of requirements rather than narrowly matching measures with the origins of financial support.
- Speedy, accurate and reliable information communicated early about infectious disease outbreaks enables prompt and effective responses; as part of this process we need to find ways of building trust in sources of information – their reliability and accuracy in particular. We must encourage real-time systems that facilitate the rapid communication of reliable, accurate information within a country and with the international community.
- Enhancing national, regional and international capacities of infectious disease surveillance networks is essential. In this respect the interoperability between information networks was identified as an important measure: we need to be aiming for what was described as ‘holistic surveillance’.
- Effective national implementation of the BTWC faces continuing challenges; with biosecurity remaining one of the weakest areas requiring attention.
- Building security awareness requires time and attention in universities, research institutes, private-sector laboratories and elsewhere and there is still much more to do. The objective here is not to hamper scientific research, but rather to encourage appreciation of potential risks: ‘safeguarding science’ and ‘responsible conduct’ are key phrases, and this should be accomplished through engagement between the law enforcement/security and the scientific communities.

- Long term sustained efforts needed across broad range of scientific and engineering disciplines, including promotion of education and awareness raising on dual use issues, biosecurity, biosafety and importance of the BTWC. There is a need to include social scientists and ethicists here too. Problems will not be resolved, only managed.¹

Conclusion from the year

Our aim at the start of the year was to provide a clear focus on gaps in capacities and capabilities and to address these in a measured and sequential manner as we dealt with each of the biosecurity deliverables in turn. We wanted to engage the key international organisations engaged in these issues – the WHO, OIE and FAO – and to help match resources to projects and programmes that could help bridge, and start to address, critical capability shortfalls in each of the biosecurity deliverables. We believe that we have made some modest progress in this respect and heightened GP members’ awareness of the issues involved. We hope that this has provided a solid foundation for future endeavours. It was also particularly gratifying that additional GP members came forward with new projects and funding ideas – namely Finland, Germany and Sweden. Overall in 2013 well over \$40 million of new funding was provided in support of projects under the various biosecurity deliverables – a creditable achievement in these resource strapped times.

Nuclear and Radiological Security sub-Working Group (NRSWG)

Aim of the sub-Working Group

In 2012, Canada proposed that the Global Partnership create a sub-working group focused on nuclear and radiological security (one of the four priorities of the GP agreed in 2011), and under the US chairmanship, a decision was taken to establish the group. The UK hosted the inaugural meeting of the Nuclear and Radiological Security Sub-Working Group in February 2013, chaired by the UK Department of Energy and Climate Change.

The aim of establishing the NRSWG was to create a forum for discussing priority nuclear and radiological security themes, and coordinating the activity of its members. In our first meeting, we set out some principles of working (Annex A). We also agreed to focus on the seven priority themes set out in the Canadian discussion paper (Annex B).

Objectives for 2013

Our vision for the NRSWG in 2013 included three principles:

1. **Match-making** (*matching supply/expertise and demand/requirements*)

¹ A more detailed review of BSWG highlights appears in a UK Working Paper submitted to the December 2013 Meeting of BTWC States Parties, and this can be accessed via the ISU website at: [http://www.unog.ch/80256EE600585943/\(httpPages\)/92CFF2CB73D4806DC12572BC00319612?OpenDocument](http://www.unog.ch/80256EE600585943/(httpPages)/92CFF2CB73D4806DC12572BC00319612?OpenDocument)

2. **Complementarity** (*drawing on expert assessments of international organisations and avoiding duplication with other existing groups, but instead supporting them*)
3. **Focus** (*aligning our work with the security priorities set out in the 2012 Canadian discussion paper*)

Below we report on the group's activity in line with these priorities.

Activities and Outcomes of 2013

MATCHMAKING

Matching the resources and expertise of NRSWG members with existing demands or requirements for nuclear security collaboration is the primary function of the NRSWG. We held an inaugural matchmaking event in June, which brought together implementers and funders with organisations with project ideas requiring support. Feedback from NRSWG members was positive and there was a call for matchmaking to become a permanent feature of the GP. Over 100 project proposals were submitted. By October, around 15% of these were being actively discussed, covering a wide range of measures including improving the security of sites holding sensitive material, drafting nuclear security legislation and preventing the illicit trafficking of nuclear material, and five were close to being implemented. Nine GP partners were involved in these projects, including four international organisations. The second matchmaking event in October was useful in facilitating the continuation of these discussions, and allowing for the presentation of any new proposals.

The UK has prepared a paper, based on our experience of running matchmaking events, incorporating feedback from NRSWG members (Annex C).

COMPLEMENTARITY

In our first meeting we surveyed the thematic and geographic areas of interest of NRSWG members, which informed our planning for the year ahead, and our interaction with international organisations. NRSWG focused on three strands of work here:

- Improving the information flow from international organisations (such as the IAEA, UNSCR 1540 Committee and EU) to NRSWG members, to share their needs assessments and knowledge of areas where assistance might be required.
- Improving the way the GP can advertise its priorities and capabilities, to potential partners, international organisations, and fora such as the Nuclear Security Summit.
- Supporting existing cooperation mechanisms

The UK NRSWG secretariat worked with the IAEA to see how we could best use the information held in their Integrated Nuclear Security Support Plans (INSSPs), which could be extremely helpful to GP members identifying needs and prioritising work. One of the

keys to unlocking this information is for countries with INSSPs to give permission for the data held by the IAEA to be shared with potential partners willing to provide resources. To this end, we held a number of outreach activities to publicise the GP's capabilities and offer of assistance: presentations at the IAEA Nuclear Security Conference in July and the IAEA General Conference in September; and a letter to IAEA Members with nuclear programmes inviting them to share data. We were delighted to hear in the October meeting that the IAEA has established a series of regional meetings on INSSPs which will bring together countries with active INSSPs with countries who have resources to help them meet requirements and we recommend that the NRSWG continues to engage closely with this initiative under future Chairs of the Global Partnership.

We were grateful for the work of the UNSCR 1540 Committee in updating their list of assistance requests ahead of the June matchmaking event. The EU was not in a position in June to share the needs assessment work it is developing under its CBRN Centres of Excellence initiative, but this could be a future area for collaboration and data-sharing.

In October, we introduced a paper highlighting how the GP could present its capabilities to the Nuclear Security Summit, to set out what the GP has done, and could do in the future, in support of NSS objectives (building on the useful presentation from Sweden in June). The NRSWG may wish to discuss this further ahead of the Summit in March 2014.

NRSWG has interacted effectively with existing coordination mechanisms in specific nuclear and radiological areas, including the IAEA's Contact Experts Group (CEG) on nuclear legacy projects in Russia, the IAEA's Radioactive Source Security Working Group and the EU-IAEA-US Border Monitoring Working Group (BMWG). It is clear that, given the wide scope and large number of issues covered, the NRSWG cannot and should not duplicate the activities of these existing coordination mechanisms, which are able to focus expertise on very specific issues, but rather that NRSWG should coordinate with these groups to maximise benefit and reduce duplication of effort.

FOCUS

Discussions during the year were structured around the areas highlighted in the Canadian paper. Thematically, nuclear security culture was a priority, as it underpins the sustainability of all of our work. A highlight of our work in this area was a 'Night at the Theatre' event hosted in collaboration with the World Institute for Nuclear Security (WINS). The interactive theatre event played out a nuclear security incident in a nuclear power station, and demonstrated how the personnel involved might react under pressure; from the highest levels of government to the people on the frontline. Facilitated discussion between scenes allowed the audience to reflect on the behaviours they witnessed, and take part in a mock press conference. It was a sobering occasion, but the acting and facilitation brought this serious issue to life in an engaging way.

We also considered a paper from the US on taking an 'integrated approach' – i.e. considering a project holistically, and ensuring it would be sustainable. This was well

received by NRSWG members as a worthwhile approach to maximising the impact and sustainability of projects.

Conclusion from the year

We are grateful to the contributions of NRSWG members this year. It is clear that there is a need for a group dedicated to nuclear and radiological security. Structured discussions in this area, and in particular with a focus on the implementation and coordination of projects will help the GP to deliver a real impact. Looking ahead, a continued focus on matchmaking, and coordination of activity with international organisations will be key.

Outreach and Expansion sub-Working Group (OEWG)

Aim of the sub-Working Group

The sub-working group undertakes outreach activities to prospective members, including the development of an agreed package of background information on the Global Partnership (GP). It is co-chaired by Canada and the Netherlands.

Objectives for 2013

The objectives of the outreach activities are to provide information about the GP to prospective members and to assess whether countries are interested in joining the Global Partnership (including their understanding and commitment to the Kananaskis Principles and the Guidelines for Projects).

In 2013, the sub-working group worked towards the following objectives:

- a) **Membership Expansion:** The group sought to expand the membership of the GP during the year through several demarches.
- b) **Promotion and Outreach of the Global Partnership:** A second objective for the EOWG was to expand global knowledge and awareness of the GP through outreach events where states would be invited to learn more about the GP.
- c) **Ongoing Review of Expansion:** The EOWG undertook an ongoing review to consider broader membership expansion objectives and to identify additional potential members.

Activities and Outcomes of 2013

- a) **Membership Expansion**
 - Several joint and bilateral demarches in potential GP member countries were undertaken throughout the year.

- Mexico attended its first meeting as a full member in February 2013.
- The Philippines joined the GP in June 2013.
- Hungary attended the GPWG as an Observer in October 2013 and joined the Partnership in December 2013. The accession of Hungary brings number of GP members to 27.

Promotion and Outreach of the Global Partnership

- At the IAEA Conference on Nuclear Security in July 2013, the UK promoted the GP in their national statement, speaking on the matchmaking process as a practical way to bring together Partners with project ideas and those with resources and expertise.
- Promotion of the GP was also conducted at three side events:
 - o On the margins of the IAEA International Conference on Nuclear Security, Canada hosted a lunch where the benefits of joining the GP were presented.
 - o At the IAEA General Conference on September 17, a side event on NRS Matchmaking was hosted by the UK.
 - o A meeting, hosted by Poland, on the margins of the Conference of States Parties of the OPCW at the Hague on December 5th, 2013, with a focus on the work of the chemical security sub working group.

Ongoing Review of Expansion

- Progress was made to seek broader geographic representation within the GP. Non-member countries continue to be invited as observers to the meetings and new countries were identified as potential members.
- At the February 2013 meeting, the GPWG agreed on criteria to identify additional potential members.
- At the October 2013 meeting, the GPWG considered proposals to streamline the membership application process for targeted countries.

Conclusion from the year

The current practice of demarching countries that would be an asset to the GP might need adjustment and/or diversification to deliver better results. It is important to continue to conduct targeted outreach and membership expansion activities in order to ensure that the GP continues to be as practical and comprehensive a forum as possible in order to address shared WMD proliferation and terrorism challenges worldwide.

Centres of Excellence (CoE) sub-Working Group (CoEWG)

Aim of the sub working group

In 2013, the COE sub-Working Group (COEWG), chaired by the United States alone in February and with Italy as co-chair in June and October, sought to highlight the fact that COEs can play a critical role in the projects and programmes advanced by the Global Partnership. As such, a key goal of the group was to continue to exchange information on what COEs exist, what is it these centres offer, and how to optimise international collaboration between CBRN centres and governments and international organisations. Such COEs, which include training centres, should be leveraged by the Global Partnership to meet global security objectives. With the wealth of activities available through COEs and COE-type programs, an awareness of these centres and ways to work through such centres should be paramount for the GP.

Specific objectives for 2013

In 2013, the COEWG sought to build upon the work begun in 2012. Objectives in 2013 included:

- a. Enhance GP awareness and understanding of COEs and training centres and their activities, and how training at such centres relate to GP projects
- b. Achieve greater awareness of the role of international organisations (IOs) in carrying out related training centre activities that support GP objectives
- c. Promote an understanding of how GP members and IOs can leverage COEs to promote their programs
- d. Determine and promote potential areas of coordinated, strategic training among CBRN training centres
- e. Promote coordination with the IAEA Nuclear Security Support Centres and the EU CBRN Centres
- f. Increase awareness of existing centres in chemical and biological security

Activities undertaken in 2013

The first two meetings of 2013 focused on continuing to gain an understanding of the COEs and training centres of our own GP members. At the GP February meeting, the COEWG addressed how existing COEs reduce redundancies and address gaps in conducting work with other IOs and COEs. At the June GP meeting, the discussion shifted from what the COEs are doing to what it is GP members and relevant IOs can actually do to collaborate with existing and future training centres based on current activities.

This effort for information exchange and education reflected what was taking place in the area of COEs and training centres generally, outside the GP. More specifically, there was a general lack of understanding of COEs and what is the goal of the centres. Until there was

more of an understanding about these centres, the next step, determining concrete ways that the GP could promote its goals through training centres, was not achievable.

Following the June meeting, the COEWG was able to focus on how it can develop action items for promoting GP objectives through these centres. The topic for the third meeting, information security and security culture, provided a means to see how such implementation could take place.

Prior to the October meeting, a series of actions took place. One was outreach to the GP COEs and training centres to learn what these centres train in the areas of information security and security culture. Similar outreach was made to the IAEA and to the EU CBRN centres. During this exchange, it was determined that some, but not all, offer such training, and those that did not either plan to do so or are interested in such topics. Some noted that it would be advantageous if the COEWG took upon itself to promote these topics within the GP COEs. In addition, several discussions took place with the newly established GP COEWG advisory group, which consists of individuals from Global Partnership member countries, international organisations, and those outside the government who have a focus and interest in Centres of Excellence. The group discussed the importance of security culture and explored some of the more fundamental questions of similarities and differences among the different substantive areas of security culture (nuclear, bio, chemical and rad). The results of all these discussions were presented at the October meeting with the conclusion that the COEWG can focus its attention in 2014 to some of these strategic areas of training (like security culture) that can be promoted amongst the GP COEs.

The COEWG co-chairs decided that, starting with the October GP meeting, there will be less of a focus on presentations and information exchange at Global Partnership meetings and more of a focus on reporting at the GPWG the work that the group is doing outside the meetings. Now that there is more of an understanding of these centres, there are more activities that the GP COEWG can do as it engages with other relevant initiatives in promoting GP objectives.

In addition, the COEWG hosted a side meeting during the IAEA NSSC meeting with GP COEs and training centres to begin to brainstorm about areas for collaboration. Immediately prior to the October GP meeting, the COEWG also participated in a meeting hosted by the US DOE/NNSA and Pacific Northwest Laboratories on, "Sustaining International CBRN COE with a Focus on Nuclear Security and Safeguards." Finally, following the October meeting, the COEWG representatives gave a presentation at the "Symposium on Centres of Excellence 'Maintaining Momentum: The Global Partnership'" in the United Kingdom, November 2013. All of these activities have raised the profile of the GP COEWG and this engagement with relevant initiatives and organisations will continue in 2014.

Conclusion from the year

Increased the understanding of COEs and training centres in the area of CBRN security.

- While the COEWG meetings in 2014 will focus on reports from work done between meetings, GP members will continue to update the GP on the activities of their centres.
- In 2014, will work to elaborate a rough classification of the different concepts of COEs (such as technical and scientific training centres, educational centres, and centres with a CBRN mandate, and centres with an industry focus)

Increased the interaction of the GP COEWG with other related efforts, particularly the IAEA NSSC, and with COEs and training centres of GP members

- Promoted enhanced coordination between the GP COEWG and the IAEA NSSC, which adopted as one of its Action Plan items to increase coordination with the GP COEWG. In addition, the GP COEWG hosted a side event at the August 2013 IAEA NSSC Working Group meeting with GP member training centres. These side meetings will continue at the IAEA NSSC meetings in 2014.
- In 2013, began a dialogue with the IAEA INSEN network. In 2014, the COEWG will engage, where appropriate, with the INSEN network;

Increased attention and outreach of the COEWG via international exchanges

- GP COEWG participated in a meeting in London in September hosted by the U.S. Pacific Northwest Laboratories and DOE/NNSA titled “Sustaining International CBRN COE with a Focus on Nuclear Security and Safeguards.
- Gave a presentation at the “Symposium on Centres of Excellence ‘Maintaining Momentum: The Global Partnership’” at the United Kingdom, November 2013.
- Such interactions will continue in 2014

Established a GP COE Advisory Group of 12 individuals from COEs, Government, academic institutions, and think tanks and hosted three conference call conversations regarding the GP COEWG. This Advisory Group will continue to have conference calls and discuss next steps for the COEWG.

Provided a platform for promoting strategic training on important international issues such as CBRN security culture amongst GP and other centre of excellence and training centres. In 2014, will strengthen such strategic training.

- Explore ways in which it can promote more across the board thinking (CBRN) amongst the GP countries
- Establish a more focused approach and more strategic thinking regarding human resource development with a view of the sustainability and continuity of the work

Chemical Security sub-Working Group (CSWG)

Aim of the sub working group

As agreed by the GP in 2012, the activities of the Group were aimed at promoting global efforts to prevent the misuse of toxic chemicals for illegal purposes and support efforts to enhance CBRN security. It is co-chaired by Poland and the Ukraine.

Specific objectives for 2013

The CSWG aimed to highlight challenges to chemical security, such as the fast developing chemical industry and globalisation of the access to chemicals. Growing transportation of toxic chemicals, raising the potential for terrorist organisations, violent groups and other malefactors to attack chemical facilities or build their own make-shift labs in which to manufacture chemical weapons, was also identified as a focus for the group.

Activities undertaken in 2013

International organisations and other government and private stakeholders experienced and operating in the chemical security were invited to participate in the CSWG meetings. The CSWG recognised the increasing role of the Organization for Prohibition of Chemicals Weapons (OPCW) to enhance chemical security and promote global chemical security culture. In recent years, the OPCW has been successfully promoted as a platform of support for global cooperation in decreasing the chemical threat and enhancing chemical security, and the group was keen to work with the OPCW and coordinate activity.

Representatives of the OPCW, INTERPOL, 1540 Committee and European Union presented initiatives aimed at strengthening global security culture. Since safety and security of chemical plant sites, products and transportation of toxic chemicals are key challenges for industry, the representatives of the chemical sector were engaged in the work of the CSWG. There were also representatives of academia and centres of excellence invited to the CSWG meetings, which provided the GP with access to potential funding and technical expertise.

Representatives of global chemical companies (Dow Chemical), chemical associations (European Chemical Industry Council - CEFIC, International Council of Chemical Associations - ICCA), international centres of excellence in chemical security, including the International Centre for Chemical Safety and Security in Poland, shared their experience and methodologies in approaches to chemical security. The Responsible Care program and the implementation of Security Codes of Conduct were presented as visible confirmation of active support from the chemical industry. The multi-stakeholder collaboration within the CSWG underlined that chemical security requires a dedicated global public-private partnership, with a close cooperation between governments and industry.

Global chemical industry associations like CEFIC and ICCA and chemical industry expressed their support for engagement with the Global Partnership in the field of chemical security and readiness to work together with governments and international organizations within the CSWG framework. Academic institutions involved in the work of the CSWG offered knowledge of corporate and security culture in all sorts of institutions and international

centres of excellence in chemical security offered their services to provide trainings, best practices exchanges and cooperation between the professionals.

The CSWG provided a mechanism to match needs and programmes with the relevant national and international capacities within the Global Partnership between the donors and initiators of the projects. The special matrix of current chemical security projects provided transparency in the work of the partners in the area of chemical security.

Twenty two projects proposals were submitted by Kazakhstan, Poland, USA, Ukraine, OPCW, INTERPOL and 1540 Committee. The projects relate to the development of national and regional capacities in chemical security, best practices exchanges and cooperation between the professionals, with two successfully implemented (Program for chemical safety and security in Kenya, coordinated by the International Center for Chemical Safety and Security, and Regional Chemex Training programme has been implemented by INTERPOL).

To promote of GP goals and activities to support chemical security, the CSWG co-chairs also organised a side-event during the 18th Conference of State Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention (The Hague, 2-6 December 2013.).

Conclusion from the year

The CSWG successfully brought together Government, industry and academia to raise and enhance chemical security and chemical security culture at both national and international level, and its relevance within the global efforts to promote CBRN security. Additionally, many chemical security projects have been successfully implemented or are on the path to, as a result of the GP in 2013.

Conclusion

In reviewing the achievements of the 2013 Presidency, the UK would make the following observations and recommendations for future Presidencies:-

Increased GP projects and programmes: GP partners have responded positively to the 'matchmaking' events, with projects and programmes initiated as a result. Given the outcomes, we suggest that matchmaking should be considered as a regular tool in project and programme coordination and collaboration within the GP. And as discussed at the third GP working Group, GP members are already playing a leading role in providing funding in support of the UN and OPCW's work to ensure the verified destruction of Syria's chemical weapons. Further funds will be needed in 2014 if the ambitious deadlines for destruction are to be met.

Strengthening responsible science and information security: An understanding of information security by those in industry and academia should remain a GP priority, and

the GP should continue to encourage dialogue between industry bodies and national and international academic institutions.

Expanded membership of the GP: The Global Partnership is now much more than a G8 initiative and the UK Presidency has seen a successful further expansion of membership of the GP. However, the value of the GP remains in its ability to coordinate; new GP members should be considered on the basis that they bring knowledge, expertise or funding to the forum. A number of key non proliferation players remain unrepresented, and future chairs of the GP may wish to continue to give priority to membership expansion.

Increased implementation of UNSCR 1540: As the only resolution obliging states to implement a range of domestic measures against WMD terrorism, the GP should continue to promote the resolution amongst all states, and work with the UNSCR1540 Committee, including the UNSCR1540 Experts, and use the UNSCR1540 Compendium of Requests for Assistance in future matchmaking events to identify possible projects and programmes for GP partners.

ANNEX A: NRSWG: Working principles

The NRSWG is an informal working group guided by the following principles:

- To be an effective tool for match-making: bringing together resources (the supply) with identified requirements (the demand) and facilitating new partnerships to deliver work in new priority areas;
- To complement the work of other groups working in this field. The NRSWG may discuss similar issues to other groups but could decide to refer programmes / projects to others for further consideration, where they have more appropriate expertise. Such groups include:
 - The Contacts Experts Group (CEG)
 - IAEA Radioactive Sources Working Group (RSWG);
 - IAEA Nuclear Security Support Centres (NSSC);
 - EU CBRN Centres of Excellence;
 - Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism (GICNT).
- To focus on implementation and facilitate partnerships at programme level. It will not be able to consider specific project proposals in detail. Where such projects exist, GP members may meet to discuss coordination and delivery, outside of the sub-working group meetings. Thematically, security projects will be the priority.
- To act as an informal match-making group, and not a formal decision-making body. If the group makes any recommendations for action, they will be referred to the GPWG plenary for discussion and approval;

ANNEX B: Canadian Discussion Paper

Proposal for a Nuclear and Radiological Security Sub-Working Group under the Global Partnership Working Group.

Since 2002, the 25-member Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction (GP) has worked cooperatively to strengthen the security of weapons-usable nuclear and radiological materials. The decision in 2008 to expand the geographic scope of GP activities has increased the need for a more coordinated and strategic approach among partners with bilateral assistance programs to deliver effective and non-duplicative nuclear and radiological security (NRS) programming worldwide.

Currently, there is no dedicated forum for GP members to coordinate their broader NRS bilateral assistance activities. This is all the more relevant given that the G-8 declared NRS as a GP priority at the Muskoka and Deauville Summits in 2010 and 2011. An NRS Sub-Working Group would provide a place where those involved in the engagement of this delivery (e.g. States, key International Organizations such as the IAEA, etc) could coordinate their assistance while avoiding redundancy between efforts. Establishing a forum with a well-defined mission and scope would allow participants to share regional and programming priorities, strategies, current and past activities, as well as emerging opportunities that would benefit from leveraging of resources and burden-sharing. Such a group could also capitalize on the experience of GP members by enabling the sharing of programming lessons learned and best practices in NRS.

Finally, in the context where the international community is focusing on further strengthening the international nuclear security regime, with the IAEA International Conference on Nuclear Security in July 2013, and while the Nuclear Security Summit (NSS) participants are considering the future of the Nuclear Security Summit process after 2014, it is important to keep the momentum gained from the NSS in furthering nuclear security globally through concrete actions on the ground. By developing new partnerships and cooperation, the NRS Sub-Working Group would allow for the development of a more comprehensive strategy for achieving mutual security goals that flow from objectives set out in the context of the Nuclear Security Summits.

Scope: From the Nuclear Security Summits, and in other multilateral forums where nuclear and radiological security is discussed, it is clear that there are several areas of common interest among the GP members. As such, the NRS Sub-Working Group may focus on:

- nuclear security culture enhancement, nuclear information and knowledge security;
- physical protection of nuclear materials;
- nuclear material transport security;
- disposition and conversion of nuclear materials;
- security of radiological sources;
- illicit nuclear trafficking;
- international nuclear legal framework.

The Sub-Working Group will support coordination at the programme-level assistance in those areas agreed upon by the group.

ANNEX C: UK PAPER ON MAKING GPWG MATCHMAKING SUSTAINABLE

The UK presents this discussion paper to the GPWG to outline a proposal for matchmaking to become a regular feature of Global Partnership meetings.

Rationale

The GP continues to be effective because of the significant resource and expertise at its disposal, and the commitment and unparalleled experience of its members. If done regularly, matchmaking could become a key way of achieving the GP's core purpose: to deliver practical security enhancements to prevent the spread of weapons and materials of mass destruction.

Members of the NRSWG trialed a matchmaking event under the UK chairmanship in June 2013. The event received positive feedback and there were calls from NRSWG members to make matchmaking a permanent feature of the GPWG. This paper sets out some suggested principles for incorporating matchmaking into future GPWG meetings.

What is matchmaking?

We have used the term 'matchmaking' to describe bringing together (matching), the resources and capabilities of GP members with priority international requirements aligned with GP priorities. The matchmaking event in June provided valuable space and time for GP members and international organisations to present their on-going and future projects, and hold discussions about collaboration and implementation with other GP members with resources or expertise, and an interest in the project.

Lessons learned drawn from feedback

Following our matchmaking event in June, we received feedback from NRSWG members. This suggested that members would welcome the opportunity to attend at least one matchmaking event per year. Based on the feedback received, we have compiled a list of principles which hosts could consider for future matchmaking events.

- The format of the event can be flexible but it is important to have representation from a wide range of implementers, funders and those with requirements to fill, and to provide sufficient time for discussion.
- Matchmaking will be most successful if GP members can send representatives who are involved in running programmes and implementing projects, and can discuss project finances and implementation in detail.
- The GPWG is keen to see proposals which are aligned with its priorities. As the GPWG does not have a secretariat, it is the responsibility of GP members and international organisations to ensure submitted projects fit within GP (and sub-working group) priority areas. Projects implemented by 'external' organisations (i.e. not a government or international organisation GP member) could be submitted through their government GPWG team for quality control and prioritisation.
- Sharing project ideas in advance would enable more productive discussions at the event itself.
- GP members agree to treat project proposals with discretion. Some projects will be in early stages of development and may not necessarily have been agreed by potential beneficiary countries.
- Matchmaking will be most successful if based on the most up to date information and priority areas. Data held by international organisations could help to prioritise GP matchmaking activity (for example IAEA INSSPs and 1540 assistance requests).
- Themed or regional sessions within the matchmaking could help to facilitate discussion.

- Matchmaking will be more successful if it leads to conversations and side-meetings between interested GPWG members, to take forward projects in more detail. We encourage ad-hoc meetings of this kind.
- GP members agree to inform the group of successful 'matchmakes' and project collaboration.