



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/6/2
6 April 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SIXTH COORDINATION MEETING FOR GOVERNMENTS
AND ORGANIZATIONS IMPLEMENTING OR FUNDING
BIOSAFETY CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES
Siem Reap, Cambodia, 1-3 February 2010

REPORT OF THE SIXTH COORDINATION MEETING FOR GOVERNMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONS IMPLEMENTING OR FUNDING BIOSAFETY CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The sixth Coordination Meeting for Governments and Organizations Implementing or Funding Biosafety Capacity-Building Activities was held from 1 to 3 February 2010 in Siem Reap, Cambodia. It was hosted by the Government of Cambodia, through the Ministry of Environment. The Government of Norway provided financial support for some of the participants from developing countries and countries with economies in transition to attend the meeting.

2. The meeting was attended by 35 participants from 17 Governments and 10 organizations. The countries represented were: Austria, Cambodia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Egypt, Germany, India, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico, Moldova, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Serbia, United States of America and Vietnam. The organizations were: Asia-Pacific Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology, Centre for Economic and Social Aspects of Genomics, ECOROPA, Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB), International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), McGill University, United Nations Environment Programme-Global Environment Facility (UNEP/GEF) and Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina. The full list of participants is contained in annex II to this report.

3. The objectives of the meeting were to:

- (a) Share information and experiences regarding biosafety capacity-building initiatives;
- (b) Consider possibilities for cooperation in identifying needs for capacity-building among Parties for research and information exchange on socio economic impacts of living modified organisms, taking into account experiences from different countries.
- (c) Discuss possible actions and guidance to assist Parties and other governments in building their capacities for promoting public awareness, education and participation regarding living modified organisms.

/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a C-Neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

(d) Contribute to the development of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2011-2020) and the framework for the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, including its procedures and annexes.

II. MEETING PROCEEDINGS

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

4. The meeting was opened by H.E. Dr. Mok Mareth, Senior Minister for the Environment of Cambodia. In his remarks, Dr. Mareth welcomed the participants to his country and thanked the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for accepting the Government's offer to host the meeting in Cambodia back-to-back with the seventh meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building in Biosafety. Dr. Mareth noted that the two meetings would be discussing issues that were critical to ensuring the safe use of modern biotechnology. He observed that many countries had expressed concerns about the potential risks of living modified organisms and products on the environment and the health of humans and animals while also recognizing the potential benefits of applying modern biotechnology in different sectors especially in agriculture. In that regard, he highlighted the need to strengthen the capacities of countries to be able to make appropriate decisions.

5. Dr. Mareth reported that the Royal Government of Cambodia had enacted a national biosafety law in February 2008 and had undertaken, with support from UNEP/GEF, capacity-building activities with regard to the detection of living modified organisms, risk assessment, public awareness and participation and enhancement of the national Biosafety Clearing-House node. He noted that additional financial support was needed to build national capacity for taking into account socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding living modified organisms and for handling liability and redress issues at the national level. He further noted that Cambodia wished to learn from other countries about risk assessment and the safe means of using genetically modified animals for the development of its economy while protecting the environment. Dr. Mareth strongly urged the meeting to explore options for strengthening the capacities of developing assist countries to address the above issues. He welcomed the draft Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and urged participants to critically review and provide comments to enhance its quality and effectiveness in guiding the future implementation of the Protocol.

6. Opening remarks were also made by H.E. Sang Riha, Vice Governor of Siem Reap Province, and Mr. Charles Gbedemah on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

7. In his remarks, Mr. Riha welcomed the participants to Siem Reap, the province of tourism, culture and great nature. He noted that after gaining peace and political stability the Kingdom of Cambodia had become a major tourist destination. In that regard, the Royal Government of Cambodia had established an open-sky policy and initiated a number of other measures to promote the contribution of the tourism sector to national socio-economic development. At the same time, the Government had paid serious attention to the environmental issues associated with economic development activities, especially in the agricultural sector. For example, the Government was implementing policies to reduce the use of chemicals, including pesticides and herbicides and persistent organic pollutants, which could adversely affect human health and environment and harm the tourism industry. He expressed the hope that Cambodia would also catch up with other countries to ensure the safe use of living modified organisms.

8. In the statement read on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Gbedemah thanked the Royal Government of Cambodia for co-organizing and hosting the meeting. He also thanked the Government of Norway for providing financial support, which had enabled the participation of some of the developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Mr. Gbedemah noted that more than 10 years since the Protocol had been adopted, many countries still lacked the capacity to effectively implement its provisions. He underlined the need for more concerted efforts to address this challenge. Mr. Gbedemah underscored the important role that the coordination meetings had played to date in facilitating the sharing of knowledge and experiences among stakeholders involved in capacity-building for biosafety and in the development of guidance for enhancing capacity-building efforts on specific issues. He noted that the current meeting would focus on capacity-building for addressing socio-economic considerations in decision-making and for promoting public awareness, education and participation concerning living modified organisms. The meeting would also provide input into the draft Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the framework for the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol. In conclusion, Mr. Gbedemah recognized the contributions made by Dr. Pisey Oum of the Ministry of Environment and his team in organizing the meeting. He also thanked members of the Steering Committee for their guidance and support.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

9. After the opening session of the meeting, participants elected Mr. Hartmut Meyer (Germany) to serve as Chairperson of the meeting and Ms. Francisca Acevedo Gasman (Mexico) to serve as Rapporteur.

10. Participants then adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/6/1), developed by the Secretariat in consultation with the Steering Committee:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - 2.1. Election of officers;
 - 2.2. Adoption of the agenda;
 - 2.3. Organization of work.
3. Standing agenda items:
 - 3.1 Updates on ongoing and planned biosafety capacity building projects/initiatives;
 - 3.2 Progress report on implementation of the recommendations of previous coordination meeting and relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol;
4. Issues for in-depth consideration:
 - 4.1. Capacity-building for addressing socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding living modified organisms;
 - 4.2. Capacity-building for promoting public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms.

- 4.3. Consideration of the draft Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2011-2020) and the draft framework for the second assessment and review of the Protocol.
5. Other matters.
6. Conclusions and recommendations.
7. Closure of the meeting.

11. The meeting also adopted the organization of work for the meeting, as contained in annex I to the present report. Participants agreed to discuss agenda item 3.2 (Progress report on implementation of the recommendations of previous coordination meeting and relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol) and after taking up agenda items 4.1 and 4.2. Under agenda item 4, they agreed to start the discussions with sub-item 4.2 (Capacity-building for promoting public awareness, education and participation) because one of the participants supposed to make a presentation under item 4.1 would be arriving late.

ITEM 3. STANDING AGENDA ITEMS

3.1. Update on ongoing and planned biosafety capacity-building activities

12. Under this agenda item, 25 participants made short presentations on their recent and ongoing biosafety capacity-building activities. Participants who had not yet done so were invited to provide written submissions to the Secretariat about their activities for inclusion in the information document (UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/6/INF/1) which would be posted on the webpage for the meeting (<http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=BSCMCB-06>).

3.2. Progress report on implementation of the recommendations of previous coordination meeting and relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol

13. Under this agenda item, the participants reviewed and adopted the “Interim Guiding Framework for Promoting Synergies and Complementarities Between Biosafety Capacity-Building Initiatives at the Country Level”, and the “Draft Guidance on Promoting Regional and Subregional Initiatives and Approaches to Capacity-Building in Biosafety” contained in the report of the fifth coordination meeting (UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/5/4). It was agreed that these two documents would be published as part of the CBD Secretariat Technical Series on Biosafety.

14. The participants also reviewed the matrices of action points for advancing capacity-building in environmental risk assessment and for post-release monitoring of living modified organisms and agreed to submit them to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties of the Protocol for its consideration. It was also agreed that the action points would be reviewed and further developed, if necessary, after the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on risk assessment and risk management has completed its work.

ITEM 4. ISSUES FOR IN-DEPTH CONSIDERATION

4.1. Capacity-building for addressing socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding living modified organisms

15. Under this agenda item, participants heard two presentations, one by Dr. Paul Thomassin from McGill University and another by Ms. Lucy Naydenova from the Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment.

16. Dr. Thomassin presented a summary of the results of a “Survey on the Application of and Experience in the Use of Socio-Economic Considerations in Decision-Making on Living Modified Organisms” which had been conducted by the Convention Secretariat and UNEP-GEF between 6 October and 13 November 2009. The presentation focused on the aspects relating to capacity-building. Dr. Thomassin reported that a total of 578 respondents from 154 countries completed the survey. A lack of capacity was ranked as the second most important reason why socio-economic considerations were not taken into account when making decisions concerning LMOs, after “lack of mechanisms” for doing so. Sixty-four per cent of the respondents said that they did not have the capacity to undertake socio-economic assessments. The respondents ranked the following as the top ten socio-economic assessment areas in which capacity-building was required: food security; impacts on market access and trade; macroeconomic impacts; impacts on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; coexistence of LMOs with conventional and organic agriculture; compliance with biosafety measures (including institutional costs); health-related impacts; impact on indigenous and local communities; microeconomic impacts; and Farmers’ Rights (e.g. control of seeds). Furthermore, a majority of respondents (84%) indicated that a methodology guide or toolkit would be a useful document to assist countries in taking account socio-economic considerations in their decision-making concerning LMOs. Many respondents mentioned the following as the most important elements that should be included in such a guide: cost effectiveness assessment; macroeconomic impact assessment; cultural and ethical assessment; property rights assessment; community-impact analysis; benefit-cost assessment; and economic risk assessment. In conclusion, Dr. Thomassin noted that the survey results clearly highlighted a need for capacity-building in the area of socio-economic considerations. He suggested that development of a methodological toolkit or guide would be a good starting point to build that capacity.

17. Ms. Naydenova presented a summary of The Netherlands Commission on Genetic Modification (COGEM) report on socio-economic criteria for the application of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in agriculture and the outcomes of the Conference on GMOs in European Agriculture and Food Production, which was held in The Hague on 25-26 November 2009. One of the main objectives of the Conference was to exchange information and build a common knowledge base on the socio-economic aspects of the use of GMOs in European agriculture and food production. Ms. Naydenova reported that COGEM formulated nine criteria which could serve as building blocks in the assessment of the socio-economic and sustainability aspects of GMOs.¹ These include: benefit to society; economics and prosperity; people’s health and welfare; local and general food supply; cultural heritage; freedom of choice; safety of humans and the environment; biodiversity; and environmental quality. She reported that some ministers who attended the ministerial roundtable expressed support for the nine criteria and others had reservations or needed more time to study them. The ministerial roundtable also noted that the need to promote independent impact studies using appropriate and transparent methodologies and the need for further analysis of the benefits and adverse effects of GMOs.

¹ The COGEM study on socio-economic criteria is available at: www.cogem.net.

18. The participants welcomed the two presentations and noted the need for additional case-studies from both developed and developing countries that have taken into account socio-economic considerations. They also underlined the urgent need to develop methodological guidance, including toolkits or guidance documents, which would assist countries in assessing and taking into account socio-economic considerations in decision-making concerning LMOs. Furthermore, some participants recommended that conferences or workshops should be organised for countries that have actually taken into account socioeconomic considerations in decision-making concerning LMOs to share experiences, best practices and lessons learned. It was also suggested that regional online conferences, preferably in the United Nations languages spoken by most countries in the respective regions, should be organized. It was further recommended to organise a side-event on socio-economic considerations during the fifth meeting of the Parties, in Nagoya, to present the results of the survey conducted by the Secretariat and UNEP/GEF and other relevant initiatives.

19. After the presentations and the general discussions in the plenary, participants agreed to draft their recommendations to the fifth meeting of the Parties with a view to supporting the capacity-building of Parties that have decided to include socio-economic considerations in their decision-making on the import of living modified organisms in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol. Two discussion groups were established to consider possibilities for cooperation in identifying needs for capacity-building among Parties for research and information exchange on socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms as requested by the Parties in paragraph 3 of decision BS-IV/16 and draft recommendations on actions that could be taken towards strengthening the capacities of Parties to implement, as appropriate, Article 26 of the Protocol. The recommendations of the two groups, which were further discussed and agreed upon in the plenary, are presented under item 6 below.

4.2. Capacity-building for promoting public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms

20. Under this item, participants heard two presentations, one from Dr. Mercy Kamara, a Research Associate at the Centre for Economic and Social Aspects of Genomics, Lancaster University entitled: "Public Participation in Biosafety Regulations and Policies: Lessons from forerunning countries in Africa and in the EU", building upon a study for the Biosafety Capacity-Building Project of the African Union Commission and GTZ, and another one by Dr. Francisca Acevedo Gasman from the Mexican National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO).

21. Dr. Kamara gave a brief historical background to public participation in environmental policy and decision-making, observing that it was a central component of the 1987 Brundtland report and the 1992 Rio Declaration and many subsequent international, regional and national instruments and processes. She noted that public participation in environmental policies has both hard and soft dimensions. The hard dimension involves putting in place tangible instruments or resources for furthering public participation, including policy statements and legal directives, establishment of institutional systems and infrastructure and disbursement of the necessary resources. The soft dimension involves: communication of information and knowledge through different means (e.g. websites, publications, radio and TV), elicitation of raw or unrefined opinions (e.g. through surveys, or opinion polls) and elicitation of refined opinion, needs, concerns and interests through institutionalized processes (e.g. public-focus group, citizen juries, etc). Dr. Kamara described some of the practices and approaches that have been effectively used in recruiting and motivating the public. She also highlighted some of the past mistakes which have been influenced by various factors, including the knowledge deficit (e.g. which assumes the public does not understand), attitude deficit (which assumes that the public is opposed or does not appreciate) and dialogue and trust deficit (which assumes that the public is ambivalent due to a lack of dialogue). Furthermore, she outlined some lessons that may be learned from previous experiences,

including the need to listen to and to understand the public, as well as the need for institutional reflection, learning, and acceptance of different forms of knowledge. In terms of capacity-building, she emphasized the need to build and strengthen:

- (a) Legal, institutional, and economic foundations for public participation;
- (b) Science communication skills and mutual learning infrastructures;
- (c) Social intelligence skills (including the ability to listen, respect, understand, & recognize the public, and their diverse forms of knowledge and knowing); and
- (d) Motivational skills and motivating environments.

22. In her presentation, Dr. Gasman made reference to a number of key points and lessons highlighted in the July 2009 edition of the *Biosafety Protocol News* published by the Secretariat, including the need for countries to encourage public debate concerning living modified organisms and to adapt communication methods and participatory approaches to fit their own institutional, cultural, social and economic conditions. She shared experiences from her organization, CONABIO, including the need for:

- (a) Developing tools to make information easily accessible to the public,
- (b) Fostering debate and a common language to facilitate common understanding of biosafety issues by different actors, and
- (c) Fostering information generation for better decision-making.

23. After a brief general discussion in the plenary, three discussion groups were established to address the following issues:

- (a) Public awareness and education;
- (b) Public access to information;
- (c) Public participation.

24. Each group identified specific capacity-building needs and challenges and proposed possible solutions to address the identified needs. The results of the three groups, which were presented and further developed during the plenary session, are contained in annex II below.

25. A small drafting group was established to develop recommendations, which were discussed and agreed upon in the plenary under item 6 on conclusions and recommendations. The participants invited the Liaison Group meeting and the Secretariat to take into account the relevant recommendations in the further development of the draft programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms.

4.3. *Consideration of the draft Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2011-2020) and the draft framework for the second assessment and review of the Protocol*

26. Under this item, participants reviewed and proposed a number of specific improvements to the draft Strategic Plan and the draft framework for the second assessment and review.

27. With regard to the draft Strategic Plan the participants recommended, among other things, that the indicators should be revised to make them more specific and measureable in all cases. They also recommended that the underlying assumptions made while developing the draft Strategic Plan should be made explicit in the introduction section of the document. The Chairperson noted that the suggestions made would be taken up by the Liaison Group meeting, which was to take place on 4-5 February.

ITEM 5. OTHER MATTERS

A. *Study of Biosafety Clearing-House Users and Potential Users*

28. Under this agenda item, Dr. Aleksej Tarasjev made a presentation on the “Study of Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) Users and Potential Users” commissioned by the Secretariat pursuant to paragraph 8 of decision BS-IV/2. The goals of the Study were to: (a) assess what information users and potential users of the Biosafety Clearing-House would find useful; and (b) prioritize the work programme of the Biosafety Clearing-House in order to focus the efforts of the Secretariat on making the Biosafety Clearing-House a useful tool. Dr. Tarasjev noted that the study consisted of an online survey (questionnaire), targeted semi-structured Interview and analysis of existing materials. He described the format and structure of the survey and invited participants to take part in the survey before its completion on 8 February 2010.

B. *Election of Steering Committee members*

29. The participants elected Dr. Ossama Abdel-Kawy (Egypt) to serve on the steering committee as the representative for the African region for one year and Dr. David Duthie (UNEP/GEF) as the representative for United Nations agencies, replacing the late Dr. Fee-Chon Low. The slot for a representative of donors on the steering committee remained unfulfilled due to the fact no participant from donor agencies attended the meeting. The Secretariat was requested to send letters to bilateral and multilateral donor agencies encouraging them to attend future coordination meetings.

C. *Programme of the next coordination meeting*

30. The participants agreed to address the following issues at the next coordination meeting:

(a) Capacity-building for enforcement of national regulatory frameworks;

(b) Capacity-building for handling issues relating to liability and redress issues for damage resulting from transboundary movements of living modified organisms at the national level, if the fifth meeting of the Parties adopts the international rules and procedures, or

(c) Capacity-building in risk assessment of genetically modified animals.

D. Date and venue of the next coordination meeting

31. The participant from the Republic of Moldova expressed her country's interest in hosting the next coordination meeting and offered to make further consultations with the relevant authorities and inform the Secretariat in due course of the final decision. The participants from the Czech Republic and the Netherlands also expressed their interest in hosting the meeting in the event that the Republic of Moldova is unable to do so. The participants welcomed the tentative offers and agreed to hold the next meeting in the first quarter of 2011.

ITEM 6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

32. The recommendations of the meeting focused on the following two substantive issues:

- (a) Capacity-building for addressing socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding living modified organisms; and
- (b) Capacity-building for promoting public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms.

A. Capacity-building for addressing socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding living modified organisms

33. With regard to capacity-building and socio-economic considerations, participants welcomed the results of the survey on the application of and experience in the use of socio-economic considerations in decision-making on living modified organisms (document UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/6/INF/2). It was recommended that:

- (a) The final report of the survey be made available to the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol as an information document;
- (b) Further analysis of the survey data be undertaken to examine, inter alia, the difference in responses between the various regions and also between developed and developing countries, and to identify any region-specific experiences, issues and needs;
- (c) Case studies be developed to document experiences and lessons learned from different regions with regard to the integration of socio-economic considerations in decision-making concerning living modified organisms; and
- (d) A methodological toolkit or guide on socio-economic considerations be developed to assist decision-making authorities and those responsible for conducting and evaluating socio-economic assessments concerning living modified organisms.

34. For the purposes of enhancing cooperation in identifying capacity-building needs among Parties for research and information exchange on socio-economic considerations and to facilitate further consideration of Article 26 of the Protocol, the coordination meeting recommended that the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, at their fifth meeting, decide to:

- (a) Invite Parties to submit to the Executive Secretary and the Biosafety Clearing-House their capacity building needs and priorities regarding socio-economic considerations within six months of the close of fifth meeting of the Parties;

(b) Request the Executive Secretary to establish an online forum, preferably in different United Nations languages, to facilitate exchange views, information and experiences on socio-economic considerations;

(c) Establish an Ad Hoc Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations in accordance with the terms of reference set out below;

(d) Invite Parties, other Governments and relevant international organizations to submit to the Executive Secretary relevant information regarding socio-economic considerations, including guidance material on socio-economic considerations and case studies on, *inter alia*, institutional arrangements and best practices;

(e) Invite Parties, in collaboration with regional bodies and relevant organizations, to organize regional workshops to facilitate sharing of information and experiences regarding socio-economic considerations.

Terms of reference for the Ad Hoc Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations

1. The Ad Hoc Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations shall:

(a) Elaborate possible elements of socioeconomic considerations in the context of Article 26 of the Protocol;

(b) Develop criteria that could assist Parties in determining which socio-economic considerations they wish to include in their decision-making frameworks;

(c) Develop a guidance document on ways in which socio-economic issues could be considered in the decision making process on LMOs with a view to enable the development of training for socio-economic considerations;

(d) Meet twice, pending availability of funds, prior to the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and perform necessary tasks between the two meetings to achieve the proposed outcomes outlined herein;

(e) Include experts selected on the basis of their expertise on the issues relevant for the mandate of the Group, based on a standardized common format for submission of CVs from experts nominated by Parties, respecting geographical representation, in accordance with the consolidated modus operandi of the SBSTTA of the Convention on Biological Diversity (decision VIII/10 of the Conference of the Parties, annex III); and

(f) Include observers in accordance with the rules of procedure for meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

2. The deliberations of the Ad Hoc Expert Group shall take into account:

(a) Submissions from Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations; and

(b) Any other relevant materials made available by the Secretariat.

B. Capacity-building for promoting public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms

35. With regard to capacity-building for promoting public awareness, education and participation, the Coordination meeting recommends that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, at its fifth meeting, decides to urge Parties, as part of implementing the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation, to:

General

- (a) Develop legal frameworks to fulfil their obligation under Article 23 on public Awareness and participation;
- (b) Establish responsible administrative bodies for implementing Article 23;
- (c) Earmark reasonable financial, technical and human resources to implement Article 23;

Public awareness

- (d) Carry out public awareness, perception and knowledge baseline surveys and assessments regarding biosafety;
- (e) Develop strategic plans on public awareness and education on the basis of the survey results;
- (f) Identify biosafety communication experts to develop biosafety materials and information for the general public;
- (g) Request national competent authorities to establish systems for communicating biosafety information to the public;
- (h) Develop long-term media strategies on biosafety (e.g. including radio, internet, television and newspapers);
- (i) Integrate social communication strategies, including popular art and culture.

Public education

- (j) Educate trainers in biosafety communication;
- (k) Include biosafety in curricula for different levels of formal education;
- (l) Develop teaching materials on biosafety as part of informal education to the public;
- (m) Encourage and support civil society involvement and collaboration in promoting biosafety public awareness and education;

Public access to information

- (n) Inform the public about the rights to, and procedures of access to, biosafety information according to the national laws and regulations and in accordance with the obligations of the Protocol;

(o) Develop necessary infrastructure to facilitate open public access to biosafety information (e.g. websites including national Biosafety Clearing-House nodes);

(p) Designate information units and/or officers responsible for making information available to the public;

(q) Establish, improve and update biosafety databases;

(r) Develop procedures to make available information in accordance with the obligations of the Protocol, including paragraph 6 of Article 21;

(s) Provide a wide array of objective and balanced biosafety information to the public;

Public participation

(t) Involve the public in the development and review of the legal biosafety frameworks;

(u) Involve the public and civil society organizations in the decision-making process, and ensure that their knowledge, opinions, concerns and interests are taken into account in the final decision;

(v) Establish mechanisms for collaboration and sharing of experiences on public participation between countries and regions;

(w) Develop procedures, methods and mechanisms for public participation in biosafety decision-making processes; and

(x) Provide funding for public involvement in the decision making process.

ITEM 7. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

36. In the afternoon of the last day, the participants reviewed and adopted the draft report of the meeting covering the proceedings of the previous two days. The Secretariat, in collaboration with the Chair and Rapporteur, was requested to incorporate proceedings of the last day and send the final draft to all participants for comments.

37. The meeting ended at 6.10 p.m on Wednesday, 3 March 2010.

Annex I

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1 February 2010	<i>Agenda item:</i>
9 a.m. – 9.30 a.m.	1. Opening of the meeting.
9.30 a.m. – 10 a.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i>
	2. Organizational matters:
	2.1. Election of officers;
	2.2. Adoption of the agenda;
	2.3. Organization of work.
10 a.m. – 10.30 a.m.	Coffee/Tea Break
10.30 a.m. – 1 p.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i>
	3. Standing agenda items:
	3.1. Updates on ongoing and planned biosafety capacity-building projects/initiatives;
1 p.m. – 2 p.m.	Lunch Break
2 p.m. – 3.30 p.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i>
	3. Standing agenda items:
	3.2. Progress report on implementation of the recommendations of previous coordination meeting and relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.
3.30 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Coffee/Tea Break
4 p.m. – 5.30 p.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i>
	4. Issues for in-depth consideration:
	4.1. Capacity-building for addressing socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding living modified organisms.
2 February 2010	<i>Agenda item 4.1 (continued):</i>
9 a.m. – 10.30 a.m.	Group discussions on item 4.1
10.30 a.m. – 11 a.m.	Coffee/Tea Break
11 a.m. – 1 p.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i>
	4.2. Capacity-building in public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms.
1 p.m. – 2 p.m.	Lunch Break
2 p.m. – 3.30 p.m.	<i>Agenda item 4.2 (continued)</i>
	Group discussions on item 4.2
3.30 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Coffee/Tea Break

4 p.m. – 5.30 p.m.	4.3 Consideration of the draft Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2011-2020) and the draft framework for the second assessment and review of the Protocol
3 February 2010	<i>Agenda items:</i>
9 a.m. – 10.30 a.m.	Consideration of group discussion reports
10.30 a.m. – 11 a.m.	Coffee/Tea Break
11 a.m. – 1 p.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i>
	Consideration of group discussion reports (<i>continued</i>)
1 p.m. – 2 p.m.	Lunch Break
2 p.m. – 5 p.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i>
	5. Other matters
	6. Conclusions and recommendations
	7. Closure of the meeting.

Annex II

**RESULTS FROM THE DISCUSSION GROUPS ON PUBLIC AWARENESS,
EDUCATION AND PARTICIPATION**

GROUP 1: PUBLIC AWARENESS AND EDUCATION

PUBLIC AWARENESS

Needs and challenges

- There is a need to decide target groups in order to evaluate their level of awareness.
- Identify what is the level of awareness in the country regarding biosafety?
- Identify specific needs in order to address them (Have a need assessment).
- How that need can be addressed in order to communicate clearly and effectively.
- How to have a credible way to communicate (credibility of the communicator)?
- Issues to consider: language differences in the country, the material, the access to the channel of information, level of education, cultural differences within the country, infrastructure, policy.

How to address them

- Political willingness, national agenda, and commitment of resources for public awareness. Use existing local sources such as teachers, internet and radio.
- Integrate biosafety into the channels the society uses to communicate its information.
- Create capacity among communicators, training the media.
- Train the trainers regarding communication.
- Address population needs with the best channel of information depending on the specific target group (Radio, internet, Television)

PUBLIC EDUCATION

Needs and challenges

- How to include or integrate biosafety in the curricula of different levels of formal education: primary or basic, secondary and university (curricula development).
- People who are not capable of getting into formal education programs. How to facilitate objective information through informal education channels. Seminars, brochures, workshops, papers. Feedback of the programs and identify needs in order to develop effective programs.
- How to collect objective and adequate teaching material and information sources depending on the education level (primary, secondary, university), or informal programmes.
- Considering that education is a process, it should be considering a long term strategy to impact future generations.
- Country with limited sources unable to meet co-financing requirements regarding access to international sources of funding, such as GEF.

How to address them

- Political willingness, national agenda, and commitment of resources. Use the existing local sources to address education.
- Incorporate biosafety into the curricula.
- International cooperation, material and information transfer for teachers.
- Create capacity among teachers (train the trainers).

GROUP 2: PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Challenges	Ways to address them
Information is not always available due to several reasons including: a) Confidential business information (CBI) b) lack of infrastructure c) sorting of information d) lack of clarity of competent authorities e) databases not up to date and/or not fully filled	Work on identifying CBI and sorting out information to make the non CBI accessible Create the necessary infrastructure Capacity building on roads to making information accessible targeted to competent authorities Improvement and updating of existing and relevant databases (including the BCH)
Information readily available in relation to how to access information and the type of information available	Capacity-building on how to access the information and what type is there accessible
Information needs to be of high quality , scientific relevant data	Compile and make available high quality data and scientifically relevant
A legal system in place that takes into account public access and its relation to CBI	Put legal system that includes aspects on public access to information, that identifies clearly what is not CBI information (reference to Article 21, para. 6) and how is CBI information treated with respect to CBI information
Information to be accessed has a complex nature due to the number of disciplines involved in biosafety	Interdisciplinary nature of information can provide room for information management in a simpler and more digested manner
A prerequisite to public access of information is awareness	Making public aware of its rights to information access through capacity-building

The group suggests that the Parties at their fifth meeting decide to develop guidelines for implementing Article 23 of the Protocol. It was noted that The Aarhus Convention has “Guidelines on access to information, public participation and access to justice with respect to genetically modified organisms, which could be studied and utilized, as appropriate, by Parties to the Protocol.

GROUP III: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

<i>Needs</i>	<i>Challenges</i>	<i>How to address those needs</i>
Enacting biosafety acts that provide for public participation, and establishment of administrative institutions	Political/policy cultures and traditions that are undemocratic	Raising the awareness/ acknowledgement that lay public possess distinctive or locally essential knowledge that experts may not have, and that this lay knowledge can improve biosafety decisions.
Involving all stakeholders (civil society, environmental, consumer, farmers, or industrial groups, etc), and the ordinary public, as individual citizens	Getting people interested and activated	Raising awareness through media and civil society. The media and civil society must be accountable and responsible. Looking for existing mechanisms for public participation that works, and getting inspiration from other countries.

<i>Needs</i>	<i>Challenges</i>	<i>How to address those needs</i>
Ensuring that the publics' opinions, concerns, fears, and interests are taken into account in the final decision-making process	Creating mechanism for it to happen	Looking for existing mechanisms for public participation that works, and getting inspiration from other countries.
Facilitate effective public participation	Creating an open and transparent public engagement process; Creating well facilitated, credible, and supported forums for public participation	Information sharing, improving transparency, improving communication mediums that already exist, or developing new mediums Looking for existing mechanisms that works, and getting inspiration from other countries Training or hiring highly qualified and credible facilitators
Balanced and objective information	Finding mechanism for independent review	Funding of independent research/and research review; Seeking knowledge from diverse scientific sources and perspectives
Funding for public participation work	Creating new funding sources, for example, charging fees for application, Introducing biosafety in other sectoral plans and programs of the government, and exploring if Biosafety could be included in the state budget	

Annex III

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. Governments/Parties

Austria

1. Dr. Andreas Heissenberger
Deputy Unit Head
Federal Environment Agency
Spittelauer Lände 5
Vienna A-1090, Austria
Tel.: +43 13 1304 3032
Fax: +43 13 1304 3700
E-Mail: andreas.heissenberger@umweltbundesamt.at

Cambodia

2. H.E. Mr. Om Kimsea
Secretary of State
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
186 Preah Norodom Blvd.
P.O. Box 582
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel.: +855 23 211 351
Fax: +855 23 217 320
E-Mail: info@maff.gov.kh
3. Mr. Sameng Mony
Deputy Director
Camcontrol General Department
Ministry of Commerce
Russian Federation Blvd, Toeuk Thla Village
Sangkat Toeuk Thla, Khan Sen Sok
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
E-Mail: camcontrol@gocambodia.com
4. Mr. Heal Lonh
Director General
Ministry of Environment of Cambodia
No. 48, Samdech Preah Sihanouk
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmorn
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel.: +855 23 213-900
Fax: +855 23 213-900
E-Mail: heal_lonhmoe@yahoo.com, bpamp@online.com.kh
5. Mr. Sam Chamroeun
Director
Department of Planning and Legal Affairs
Ministry of Environment
#48 Samdech Preah Sihanouk Avenue, Tonle Bassac Khan
Chamkarmon
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel.: +855 12 864 903
Fax: +855 23 215 925
E-Mail: chamroeunsam@hotmail.com

Cambodia

6. Mr. Roath Sith
Deputy Director
Department of Environmental Education and Communication
Ministry of Environment of Cambodia
No. 48, Samdech Preah Sihanouk
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmorn
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
E-Mail: roathsith@gmail.com, eeoffice@gmail.com
7. Dr. Pisey Oum
National Project Coordinator
Dept of Planning and Legal Affair/National Biodiversity
Biosafety
Steering Committee Secretariat
Ministry of Environment of Cambodia
48, Samdech Preah Sihanouk Avenue
Tonle Bassac Khan Chamkarmon
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel.: +855 23 217560/855 12 702239
Fax: +855 23 217560
E-Mail: cambio_coor@online.com.kh,
piseyoum@hotmail.com
8. Ms. Kim Neng
National Project Coordinator-PoWPA
Ministry of Environment of Cambodia
No. 48, Samdech Preah Sihanouk
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmorn
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel.: 855-23 217560
E-Mail: kimmeng04@yahoo.com

Costa Rica

9. Mr. Alejandro Hernandez
Risk Assessment - Evaluator
Biotechnology Program, Phytosanitary Protection Service
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
Apdo. 3006 - Barreal de Heredia
San José, Costa Rica
Tel.: +506 2290 7938
Fax: +506 2290 7938
E-Mail: ahernandez@sfe.go.cr,
alejandro.hernandez.s@gmail.com

Cuba

10. Ms. Lenia Arce Hernández
Head, Safeguard Department and Legal Adviser
Centro Nacional de Seguridad Biológica
Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente
Calle 28 No. 502 e/5ta y 7ma Miranmar
Habana, Cuba
Tel.: +53 7 2031935 - 38 - +537 202 3281
Fax: +53 7 2031664
E-Mail: lenia@orasen.co.cu, leniarce2004@yahoo.es;
leniarce2004@gmail.com

Czech Republic

11. Mrs. Milena Roudná
Expert
Environmental Risks Department
Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic
Vrsovicke 65
100 10 Prague, Czech Republic
Tel.: +420 2 6712 2769
Fax: +420 2 6731 0013
E-Mail: roudna@env.cz

Egypt

12. Dr. Ossama Abdel-Kawy
Scientific Advisor
Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
30 Maadi Zerae Road, 7th Floor
Maadi
Cairo 12551, Egypt
Tel.: +20 11 561 456
E-Mail: elkawyo@gmail.com, abdkawy@yahoo.com
Web: <http://eg.biosafetyclearinghouse.net>

Germany

13. Dr. Hartmut Meyer
German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) -
"Implementing the Biodiversity Convention"
P.O. Box 5180
Eschborn 65726, Germany
E-Mail: hmeyer@ngi.de
Web: <http://www.gtz.de/biodiv>

India

14. Dr. Ranjini Warriar
Director
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Paryavaran Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi 110 003, India
Tel.: +91 11 2436 3964
Fax: +91 11 2436 1613
E-Mail: warrior@nic.in, ranjiniw@yahoo.com

Liberia

15. Mr. Johansen T. Voker
Manager
Planning, Policy, and Legal Affairs Department
Environmental Protection Agency
4th Street Sinkor, Tubman Blvd
PO Box 4024
Monrovia Montserrado County, Liberia
Fax: +231 312 054 07127
E-Mail: vokerj@yahoo.com

Malaysia

16. Dr. Vilasini Pillai
National Project Coordinator
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Level 2, Podium 2, No. 25, Persiaran Perdana, Precinct 4
Wisma Sumber Asli
Putrajaya 62574, Malaysia
Tel.: +6 03 88861740
Fax: +6 03 8888 4473
E-Mail: vila@nre.gov.my
17. Mr. Letchumanan Ramatha
Head Biosafety Core Team
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Level 1, Podium 2, Wisma Samber Asli, Federal Government
Administrative Centre
Putrajaya 62574, Malaysia
Tel.: +60 3 8886 1579
Fax: +60 3 8890 4935
E-Mail: letchu@nre.gov.my

Mexico

18. Dra Francisca Acevedo Gasman
Coordinadora de Analisis de Riesgo y Bioseguridad
Risk Assessment and Biosafety
National Commission for the Knowledge & Use of Biodiversity
(CONABIO)
Liga Periferico - Insurgentes Sur 4903, Tlalpan
Mexico DF 14010, Mexico
Tel.: +52 55 50044975
Fax: +52 55 50044931
E-Mail: facevedo@conabio.gob.mx

Namibia

19. Dr. Martha Kandawa-Schulz
Namibian Biotechnology Alliance (NABA)
Head, Department of Chemistry
University of Namibia
Private Bag 13301
340 Mandume Ndemufayo Ave., Pioneer Park
Windhoek, Namibia
Tel.: +264 61 206 3635
Fax: +264 61 206 3781
E-Mail: kschulz@unam.na, marthaks2001@yahoo.co.uk

Netherlands

20. Ms. Lucy Naydenova
Senior Policy Officer
International Affairs Directorate
Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment
P.O. Box 30945, IPC 645
The Hague 2500 GX, Netherlands
Tel.: +31 70 339 2298
Fax: +31 70 339 1306
E-Mail: lucy.naydenova@minvrom.nl
Web: www.vrom.nl

Norway

21. Mr. Jan Husby
Senior Advisor
GenØk – Centre for Biosafety
Science Park, PO 6418
Tromsø N-9294, Norway
Tel.: +47 48 04 57 33
Fax: +47 77 64 61 00
E-Mail: jan.husby@genok.org

Republic of Moldova

22. Dr. Angela Lozan
Head of the Biosafety Office
Ministry of Environment
Str. Cosmonautilor 9, Bir 526
Chisinau, Republic of Moldova
Tel.: +373 22 22 68 74
Fax: +373 22 22 68 74
E-Mail: angelalozan@yahoo.com

Serbia

23. Dr. Aleksej Tarasjev
Scientist
Evolutionary Biology, Institute for Biological Research
University of Belgrade
Desdota Stefana 142
Belgrade 11, Serbia
Tel.: +381 11 207 83 76; +381 11 241 64 37
Fax: +381 11 2761 433
E-Mail: tarasjev@ibiss.bg.ac.rs, tarasjev@yandex.ru

United States of America

24. Ms. Danielle Wood
Conservation Officer
Office of Ecology and Natural Resources Conservation -
Bureau of
Oceans, Environment and Science
U.S. Department of State
2201 C Street N.W.
Washington DC 20520, United States of America
Tel.: +202 736 7113
Fax: +202 736 7351
E-Mail: wooddk@state.gov

Viet Nam

25. Mrs. Hoang Thi Thanh Nhan
Director of Species
Genetic Resource Conservation and Biosafety, Biodiversity
Conservation Agency
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
99 Le Duan street
Hoan Kiem Dis.
Hanoi, Viet Nam
Tel.: +84 4 942 4557
Fax: +84 4 822 4187
E-Mail: hnhan@nea.gov.vn, hoangnhan1973@gmail.com
Web: www.nea.gov.vn

B. Organizations

United Nations Environment Programme, Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (UNEP/DGEF)

26. Mr. David Duthie
Programme Officer
United Nations Environment Programme, Division of
Global
Environment Facility Coordination (UNEP/DGEF)
15, Chemin des Anémones
Geneva 1219, Switzerland
Tel.: +41 22 917 8741
Fax: +254 20 762 4041/2
E-Mail: david.duthie@unep.ch

Asia-Pacific Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology

27. Dr. J.L. Karihaloo
Asia-Pacific Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology
C/o ICRISAT, NASC Complex
Dev Prakash Shastri Marg, Pusa Campus
New Delhi 110 012, India
E-Mail: j.karihaloo@cgiar.org

Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture

28. Dr. Ramon Lastra
Director Biotechnology and Biosafety
Directorate of Technical Leadership and Knowledge
Management
Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
P.O. BOX 55-2200
San Isidro de Coronado
San José, Costa Rica
Tel.: +506 2216 0326
Fax: +506 2216 0444
E-Mail: ramon.lastra@iica.int
Web: <http://www.iica.int>
29. Mr. Bryan Munoz Castillo
Specialist
Biotechnology and Biosafety Directorate
Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
P.O. BOX 55-2200
San Isidro de Coronado
San José, Costa Rica
Tel.: +506 2216 0361
Fax: +506 2216 0444
E-Mail: bryan.munoz@iica.int
Web: <http://www.iica.int>

International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB)

30. Mr. Decio Ripandelli
Director
Administration & External Relations
International Centre for Genetic Engineering and
Biotechnology
AREA Science Park, Padriciano 99
I-34012
Trieste I-34149, Italy
Tel.: +39 040 375 7345
Fax: +39 040 375 7363
E-Mail: decio@icgeb.org
Web: <http://www.icgeb.org>

International Food Policy Research Institute

31. Mr. John Komen
Assistant Director
Program for Biosafety Systems (PBS)
International Food Policy Research Institute
c/o Duinoordstraat 69
2023 WC Haarlem, Netherlands
Tel.: +31 23 5263125
Fax: +31 84 724 7818
E-Mail: jce.komen@planet.nl

ECOROPA

32. Mrs. Christine von Weizsäcker
President
ECOROPA
Postfach 1547
Emmendingen 79305, Germany
Tel.: +49 7641 9542214
Fax: +49 7641 9542215
E-Mail: cvw@ecoropa.de

ESRC Centre for Social and Economic Aspects of Genomics (Cesagen)

33. Ms. Mercy Kamara
Research Associate
Institute for Advanced Studies
ESRC Centre for Social and Economic Aspects of
Genomics (Cesagen)
CESAGen, Lancaster University
Room D14
Lancaster LA1 4YG
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Tel.: +44 0 1524 510842
E-Mail: mercy@ruc.dk
Web: <http://genomicsnetwork.ac.uk/cesagen>

McGill University - Macdonald Campus

34. Mr. Paul Thomassin
McGill University - Macdonald Campus
21, 111 Lakeshore Rd
St. Anne de Bellevue, QC H9X 3V9
Canada
Tel.: +514 398 7956
Fax: +514 398 8130
E-Mail: paul.thomassin@mcgill.ca

Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina

35. Dr. Antonietta Gutiérrez-Rosati
Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina
Avenida La Molina 2135, Sol de la Molina
Lima 12, Peru
Tel.: +51 1 479 2866
Fax: +51 1 479 2866
E-Mail: antonietta@asdmass.com,
antonietta@terra.com.pe

C. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

36. Ms. Kathryn Garforth
Legal Officer - Biosafety
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques, Suite 800
Montreal, Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 7030
Fax: +1 514 288 6588
E-Mail: kathryn.garforth@cbd.int

38. Mr. Erie Tamale
Programme Officer
Biosafety Division
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques, Suite 800
Montreal, Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 7050
E-Mail: erie.tamale@cbd.int

37. Mr. Charles Gbedemah
Senior Programme Officer
Biosafety Division
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques, Suite 800
Montreal, Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 7032
Fax: +1 514 288 6588
E-Mail: charles.gbedemah@cbd.int
