CBD

UNEP

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/6/3
19 October 2009

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LIAISON GROUP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR BIOSAFETY
Sixth meeting
San José, Costa Rica, 12-13 March 2009

REPORT OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE LIAISON GROUP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR BIOSAFETY

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The sixth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety was held in San José, Costa Rica on 12 and 13 March 2009. It was attended by 22 participants from 14 countries and 7 organizations. The countries were: Belize, Cambodia, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Germany, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Norway, Serbia, Slovenia and South Africa. The organizations were: Desarrollo Medio Ambiental Sustentable, ECOROPA, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Global Environment Facility (GEF), Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), the Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP/GEF) and Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico (UNAM). The list of participants is contained in annex V to this report.

II. PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

2. The meeting was opened by Mr. Charles Gbedemah on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Mr. Gbedemah welcomed the participants and thanked them for offering their time to provide advice to the Executive Secretary on key issues concerning capacity-building for the implementation of the Protocol. He also thanked the Government of Costa Rica for hosting the meeting and IICA for providing the meeting facilities and organizational support. Mr. Gbedemah noted that the fourth meeting of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to prepare a draft strategic plan for the Protocol on the basis of submissions by Parties and relevant organizations. The draft will be considered at the fifth meeting of the Parties. He hoped that the Liaison Group would provide input into that process, especially with respect to capacity-building.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

3. After the opening session, the participants elected Mr. Desmond Mahon (Canada) to serve as Chair of the meeting and Ms. Darja Stanic Racman (Slovenia) as Rapporteur.

4. The participants adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/6/1) that was proposed by the Executive Secretary.

/…

5. They also adopted the organization of work which was provided as document UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/6/1/Add1. The following substantive agenda items were discussed:

3.1 Review of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on capacity-building and consideration of possible capacity-building elements to be incorporated in the strategic plan for the Protocol and the new medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol;

3.2 Consideration of a revised country capacity-building needs-assessment framework and process;

3.3 Review of the draft web-based reporting format for activities contributing to the implementation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

ITEM 3. ISSUES FOR IN-DEPTH CONSIDERATION

3.1. Review of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on capacity-building and consideration of possible elements of the capacity-building component of the strategic plan for the Protocol and the new medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol

6. Under this agenda item, the participants brainstormed on the possible strategic goals and objectives for the capacity-building component of the strategic plan for the Protocol. Each participant was invited to express his/her views on what should be achieved over the next ten years, with regard to building capacity for the implementation of the Protocol.

7. During the discussions, participants emphasized the need to ensure that by 2020 all Parties would have the requisite capacities to fulfil their obligations under the Protocol. Some of the specific desired goals and achievements over the next years, that were expressed by participants include the following:

(a) More countries become Parties to the Protocol;

(b) Strengthened operational capability of competent national authorities in developing countries;

(c) More Parties have operational national biosafety frameworks (including biosafety policies, laws and systems to handle the requests);

(d) Parties have sustainably developed national regulatory systems;

(e) Parties have the ability to make informed decisions within the timeframes specified in the Protocol or their national regulatory frameworks;

(f) The BCH is fully operational and well populated with validated information;

(g) Information exchange is enhanced;

(h) Parties have mechanisms in place to ensure public access to information and broad public involvement in decision-making regarding LMOs;

(i) The majority or all Parties have public awareness systems on biosafety in place and increased awareness of the Protocol and biosafety issues on both national and global level;

(j) Parties have the ability to enforce their obligations under the Protocol (including enforcement of decisions, prevention of unintentional and illegal movements and improved general compliance with the Protocol's provisions);

(k) Parties have the ability to integrate biosafety issues into their national development plans;

(l) Parties have coordination mechanisms in place at the national level to ensure synergistic implementation of different biosafety initiatives; and

(m) Parties have sufficient resources and sustainable systems to ensure the implementation of the Protocol.

8. A number of participants highlighted the need to ensure the sustainability of capacity-building efforts and the establishment of stable and harmonized administration to ensure their success. It was further noted that many countries have had several short-term biosafety capacity-building initiatives that were never expanded or followed up to ensure a successful impact. It was also noted some countries experience a high turnover of personnel, which calls for establishment of strong institutional systems that ensure continuity.

9. Some participants suggested that, in order to develop effective goals and objectives, a stock-taking exercise would be needed. Such an exercise would help to establish a baseline and to better understand the prevailing circumstances. However, the participants observed that it would not be feasible to conduct a stock-taking exercise before the next meeting of the Parties. In this regard, they agreed that the formulation of strategic goals and objectives should be undertaken on the basis of existing information, knowledge and experience.

10. After the initial brainstorming session, further details were discussed and developed into a set of draft elements for the capacity-building component of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol, which are contained in annex II to this report. The Secretariat was requested to further develop the elements for consideration at the next meeting of the Liaison Group.

11. Under this agenda item, the participants were also invited to review the previous decisions on capacity-building for the implementation of the Protocol taken by the Parties to the Protocol and to advise on whether there is a need to amend, streamline or drop some of the tools, mechanisms and guidance adopted in those decisions, in light the next phase of the Protocol implementation that will follow the adoption of the Strategic Plan. Some of the tools and mechanisms adopted include the action plan, the coordination mechanism (which comprises coordination meetings, the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building in Biosafety and capacity-building databases), the implementation toolkit, indicators for monitoring the implementation of the Action Plan and the roster of experts. The participants were also invited to identify emerging capacity-building issues that may need to be considered in the context of the developing the strategic plan for the Protocol and the new medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and to advise whether there is a need to develop new tools and mechanisms.

12. The participants noted that in general most of the tools and mechanisms established by the Parties to the Protocol were making a useful contribution to facilitating capacity-building under the Protocol. At the same time, it was recognized that the information available was insufficient to allow for a conclusive assessment. However, participants agreed that there was a need to revise and strengthen some of the tools and mechanisms, in particular the following:

(a) *Indicators for monitoring the implementation of the action plan*: It was noted that current indictors need to be revised to make them "SMART" (i.e. Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound) and to ensure that they follow results-based management or logical framework principles. In this regard, it was suggested that a meeting of experts in monitoring and evaluation be convened to carry out a professional revision of the indicators, as part of the process for developing the strategic plan for the Protocol, and that the GEF Secretariat, in light of its experience in developing, monitoring and evaluating various biosafety capacity-building projects, should be closely involved. It was noted that such a meeting might also be of interest to donors funding biosafety activities. Furthermore, it was also suggested that the indicators for capacity-building be incorporated into the broader set of indicators for assessing the implementation of the Protocol in order to increase their use by Parties;

(b) *Implementation toolkit (decision BS-I/5, annex III*): It was noted that current version of the toolkit was designed simply to provide countries with a quick checklist of their main obligations under the Protocol. It was suggested that the toolkit be improved/expanded to include guidance to Parties on how they could implement their obligations;

(c) *Coordination mechanism*: It was noted that in the past there was some overlap between the work of the coordination meetings and that of the Liaison Group. In light of this, some participants suggested that the two elements be merged. However, it was also noted that despite some overlaps, the two elements were established to play distinct roles. The coordination meetings were meant to provide a forum for exchange of information, experiences and lessons learned regarding their capacity-building efforts while the Liaison Group was established to provide expert advice to the Executive Secretary with respect to the overall policy guidance, strategic approaches and conceptual and operational frameworks for capacity-building in biosafety.

13. With regard to emerging capacity-building issues, the participants noted that there is a need to develop a new tool/mechanism to facilitate regional and subregional cooperation on general biosafety issues or specific activities. It was suggested that development of such a tool or mechanism should build on the draft guidance on regional and subregional cooperation developed by the coordination meeting. It should also take into account the experiences, good practices and lessons learned from previous regional biosafety initiatives/projects, such as those funded by GEF, and from examples of collaboration on biosafety under regional and subregional bodies such as the European Union and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). It was emphasized that effective regional and subregional cooperation would require a bottom-up approach involving broad and participatory consultations and joint assessments and planning. It was also noted that countries should build a certain of level of confidence/mutual trust and competence in order to cooperate effectively as equal partners.

14. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Liaison Group would further consider this sub-item to systematically review each of the capacity-building tools and mechanisms and make recommendations on whether they should be proposed for revision, expansion due to their increased importance or phased out. In order to facilitate this process, the Secretariat was requested to prepare, prior to the next meeting, a list of all the tools and mechanisms, the decisions that established them and a brief description of their status of operationalization and use by Parties.

Item 3.2. Consideration of a revised biosafety capacity-building needs-assessment framework and process

15. Under this agenda item, the participants reviewed the common format for registering country capacity-building needs and priorities (questionnaire) and the process through which the information is gathered. It was reported that information is currently gathered through country self-assessments using the common format (questionnaire), which is accessible through the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH). The online needs assessment questionnaire can be completed and submitted by Governments at any time.

16. The participants proposed a number of improvements to the needs-assessment questionnaire and the procedure for submitting information, including the timeframe and periodicity of the assessments. It was suggested that the new questionnaire should use the format (structure) of the revised set of indicators for monitoring the updated Action Plan, contained in the annex to decision BS-IV/3. In this regard, a country completing the questionnaire would, for each need identified, indicate, on a scale of 0 to 4, the extent to which the need has been addressed, (whereby 0 would mean not at all addressed and 4 would mean largely addressed). It was also suggested that the questionnaire should incorporate options for countries to identify their most preferred means for addressing the identified priority needs. The participants emphasized the need to keep the questionnaire relatively simple and concise so as to facilitate its completion by countries, bearing in mind the challenges faced by countries in preparing multiple surveys and responding to reports.

17. With regard to the timeframe and periodicity of the assessment, it was suggested that all developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition be invited to complete the questionnaire periodically (for example every two, four or six years) and within a fixed timeframe, for example within 3 or 6 months, and not on a rolling basis as is currently the case, in order to facilitate meaningful analysis of the information. It was also suggested that the assessment be programmed to coincide with the meetings of the Conferences of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties, and preferably be synchronized with the cycle for submission of national reports. Some participants noted that ongoing submission of needs through the BCH might still be useful to capture the changing priorities of countries, but it was ultimately agreed that periodic assessments are most useful.

18. A number of participants highlighted the need to ensure that the aim of the assessment is clearly made to Parties and other Governments when notifications are sent out requesting them to complete the survey. It was further agreed that the main objectives of the assessment should be to capture the general picture of the priority needs of countries and to identify the major gaps in order for the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties and donors to respond appropriately with interventions/response measures. A second objective could be to establish the baseline or threshold levels and to facilitate subsequent assessments of the progress and effectiveness in addressing the capacity-building needs.

Item 3.3. Web-based reporting format for biosafety capacity-building activities

19. Under this agenda item, the participants reviewed and provided comments on the draft web-based reporting format prepared by the Secretariat in response to the request by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol contained in paragraph 5 of decision BS-IV/3. The reporting format will be used by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to submit information regarding their capacity-building activities in order to facilitate comprehensive analysis of the status of implementation of the Action Plan for Building Capacity for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol.

20. The draft reporting format presented to the meeting had been structured into categories corresponding to the elements of the updated Action Plan. However, participants observed that such categorization would make it difficult to report on capacity-building activities (e.g. workshops) that contribute to more than one element of the Action Plan (e.g., contribute to human-resource development and also promote technical and institutional collaboration). In this regard, it was suggested that the format should be restructured to provide options (e.g., in form of a drop-down menu) that would allow respondents to make multiple choices of the Action Plan elements to which an activity contributed. It was also suggested that the options should be divided into the broad cross-cutting capacity-building elements (e.g. institutional building and human resource development/training) and the substantive thematic elements (e.g. risk assessment, risk management, identification of LMOs, etc) to avoid mixing strategies with substantive thematic areas.

21. The participants also recommended that the format should include a field for reporting the resource inputs or cost of different activities. It was noted that such information would be useful for donors and other countries or organizations wishing to carry out or fund similar activities. Furthermore, the participants agreed that the reporting format should include a drop-down menu to indicate if a given activity is a stand-alone intervention or part of a broader initiative (e.g., project or programme).

22. In order to assist those interested in obtaining further information and/or following-up on different activities as reported, it was suggested that contact details of the institutions or persons responsible for implementing or overseeing the different activities, as well as web links to the detailed activity reports, should be provided in the reporting format.

23. The participants also suggested that it would be useful to provide examples of possible entries under different fields in order to guide respondents on specific information that need to be provided. This, it was noted, would help to limit submission to details and useful information.

24. It was clarified that the purpose of this reporting exercise should be to collect and analyse information from different countries in order to find out the overall status and progress made with regard to capacity-building for the implementation of the Protocol. The exercise would also help to compare and evaluate individual activities. The reporting would further help to identify the number and types of capacity-building activities undertaken under different thematic areas, determine the overall resource investment/costs involved and assist in the mapping out the future trends. It was also noted that the reporting would be applicable to both donor-funded capacity-building activities and those implemented at the national level as part of the regular programmes. Overall, the reporting exercise can capture all available information on biosafety capacity-building activities undertaken in order to capture the global picture so as to assist the meeting of the Parties and donors to assess progress and develop future plans and strategies.

25. The Secretariat informed participants that once the reporting format is finalized, it will be made available online through the Biosafety Clearing-House. A notification will be sent out inviting all Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and donors to report on their different capacity-building activities undertaken since the last meeting of the Parties.

26. The revised format, incorporating the suggestions made the Liaison Group, is contained in annex IV to this report.

ITEM 4. OTHER MATTERS

27. There were no other matters.

ITEM 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

28. The Liaison Group adopted draft elements of the capacity-building component of the strategic plan for the Protocol, as contained in annex II to this report. The Secretariat was requested to further develop the elements for consideration at the next meeting of the Liaison Group.

29. With regard to capacity-building needs assessment, the Liaison Group recommended that:

(a) The new capacity-building needs assessment questionnaire should use the graphic layout of the revised set of indicators for monitoring the updated Action Plan, contained in the annex to decision BS-IV/3, and should incorporate options for countries to identify their most preferred means for addressing the identified priority needs. The revised capacity-building needs assessment common format is contained in annex III to this report;

(b) The needs assessment should be carried out every four years, coinciding with the meetings of the Parties and should preferably follow the cycle for national reports. All developing countries and countries with economies in transition should be requested to complete the assessment within six months prior to the meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties that would consider the needs assessment synthesis report;

(c) The first needs assessment using the new questionnaire should be carried out as soon as possible so that the needs assessment synthesis report could feed into the Strategic Plan process of the Protocol at the fifth meeting of the Parties.

30. The Liaison Group recommended that the Secretariat should use the web-based reporting format for biosafety capacity-building activities, contained in annex IV to this report. It further recommended that Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and donors be invited to submit their reports using this reporting format prior to the fifth meeting of the Parties in order to provide baseline information to guide the discussions on the Strategic Plan for the Protocol and the medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties.

ITEM 6. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

31. On the last day, participants reviewed and adopted the draft report of the meeting covering the proceedings of the first day and part of the last day. The Secretariat, in collaboration with the Chair and the Rapporteur, was requested to incorporate the proceedings of the last day and any subsequent suggestions from participants and send the draft report to all participants for comments before posting it on the Protocol website. The present report has been finalized on that basis.

32. In his closing remarks, the representative of the Government of Costa Rica, Mr. Alejandro Hernandez from the Ministry of Agriculture, expressed gratitude to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for accepting the offer by the Government of Costa of Costa Rica to host the meeting. He also thanked the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) for offering the conference facilities and for its active collaboration and support in organizing the meeting. The representative of the IICA, Mr. Bryan Munoz Castillo, expressed his organization's pleasure for hosting the meeting and invited participants to collaborate with IICA on activities of mutual interest within its member States.

33. The meeting of the Liaison Group was closed on Friday, 13 March 2009, at 1 p.m.

Annex I

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

	Plenary
Thursday *12 March 2009* 9 a.m. to 9.30 a.m.	*Agenda item*: 1. Opening of the meeting.
9.30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	*Agenda items*: 2. Organizational matters: 2.1. Election of officers 2.2. Adoption of the agenda; 2.3. Organization of work.
10 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.	*Agenda items*: 3. Issues for in-depth consideration: 3.1 Review of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on capacity-building and consideration of possible elements of the capacity-building component of the strategic plan for the Protocol and the new medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol 3.2 Consideration of a revised biosafety capacity-building needs-assessment framework and process 3.3 Review of the draft web-based reporting format for activities contributing to the implementation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol prepared by the Executive Secretary.
2.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m.	Agenda item 3 *(continued)*
Friday *13 March 2009* 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.	Agenda item 3 *(continued)*
2 p.m. to 5 p.m.	*Agenda items*: 4. Other matters 5. Conclusions and recommendations 6. Closure of the meeting

Annex II

DRAFT CAPACITY-BUILDING ELEMENTS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

I- LEVEL: Vision elements (vision is not be developed by this group)

II- LEVEL: Strategic goals for capacity-building

a. All Parties have in place operational national biosafety frameworks (including policy, legal, regulatory and administrative frameworks)
b. All Parties able to make informed decisions
c. All Parties are able to enforce their decisions
d. All Parties have ability to implement their obligations in a sustainable manner
e. All Parties have the ability to promote public awareness and to ensure effective public participation
f. All Parties have mechanisms to mainstream biosafety into national policies and processes
g. All Parties fostering cooperation among themselves at global, regional and sub-regional levels

III- LEVEL: Strategic objectives for capacity-building

a. All Parties have in place operational national biosafety frameworks (including policy, legal, regulatory and administrative frameworks)
    - Develop national biosafety frameworks (NBFs)
    - Develop institutional systems
    - Put in place liability and redress systems, e.g. set up of the administrative procedure, identification of operator, ability to prove damage
    - Establish LMO identification systems

b. All Parties able to make informed decisions
    - Training of regulators and risk assessors
    - Ensuring access to existing information and/or identify gaps in existing information
    - Establishing fully operational national BCH nodes, with mechanisms for validation of information

c. All Parties are able to enforce their decisions
    - Establish monitoring systems
    - Establish enforcement mechanisms

d. All Parties have ability to implement their obligations in a sustainable manner
    - Ensure/build a stable critical mass of trained biosafety personnel
    - Development of coherent national policy/ies on biosafety
    - Develop adequate institutional systems
    - Promote education and training

e. All Parties have the ability to promote public awareness and to ensure effective participation
   - Develop systems for public awareness and participation
   - Develop systems for information and knowledge exchange

f. All Parties have mechanisms to mainstream (integrate/anchor) Biosafety into policies
   - Identify relevant national policies
   - (After the conclusion of the coordination meeting are agreed, the relevant conclusions will be copied here)

IV- LEVEL: Implementing activities to achieve objectives

Annex III

DRAFT REVISED COMMON FORMAT FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1. Country:

2. Broad areas in which capacity is needed:

- Institutional capacity
- Human resources capacity development and training
- Capacity in risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise
- Capacity in risk management
- Public awareness, participation and education in biosafety
- Information exchange and data management including participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House
- Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration at subregional, regional and international levels
- Access to and transfer of technology and know-how
- Identification of LMO shipments as required by the Protocol
- Handling of Socio-economic considerations in decision making regarding LMOs
- Implementation of documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol
- Handling of confidential information
- Taking into account risks to human health

3. Specific needs and priorities:

For each of the broad areas selected identify up to three specific priority needs and to indicate, on a scale of 0 to 4, the extent to which the need has been addressed (whereby 0 means not at all addressed and 4 means largely addressed). For each identified specific priority need, select up to 3 preferred means for assistance to address the need.

Key for the preferred means of assistance:

1. *Education and training*
2. *Funding support*
3. *Guidance/training materials*
4. *Knowledge sharing (e.g. through conferences and other fora)*
5. *Membership with professional bodies/networks*
6. *Exchange programmes, internships, study tours or twinning arrangements*
7. *Scholarships/ fellowships*
8. *Technical assistance and advice*
9. *Other (specify)*

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
A. Institutional capacity							
(i) Legislative and policy frameworks	o Assistance in review of existing laws						
	o Development of a national biosafety policy						
	o Development of biosafety standards						
	o Drafting of the national biosafety laws and regulations						
	o Guidance on mainstreaming of biosafety into other sectors						
	o National biosafety guidelines						
	o National biosafety compliance mechanism						
	o National liability and redress regime						
	o Support for implementation of the national biosafety policy						
	o Streamlining of regulatory systems						
	o Tools for enforcement of biosafety laws and regulations						
	o Other (specify)						
(ii) Administrative frameworks	o Development of administrative systems for handling applications for import and/or release of LMOs						
	o General operational procedures and guidelines						
	o Inter-institutional communication mechanisms						
	o Mechanisms for handling of confidential information						
	o Mechanisms for review of decisions in light of new information						
	o Mechanism to oversee and report on the implementation of the Protocol						
	o National coordination mechanism among regulatory authorities and processes						

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
	o Record management system for applications and decisions						
	o Strengthening of the institutional body(ies) handling biosafety issues						
	o Systems for decision-making (procedures and guidelines)						
	o Other (specify)						
(iii) Technical, scientific, and telecommunications infrastructure	o Access to information communication technologies						
	o Biosafety research facilities (greenhouse, confined field trials, etc)						
	o Border control/inspection facilities						
	o Certified LMO laboratory						
	o Infrastructure for LMO sampling and detection						
	o Internet connectivity						
	o Office facilities, equipment and supplies for biosafety work						
	o Telecommunication facilities (e.g. telephone, fax, e-mail)						
	o Other (specify)						
(iv) Funding and resource management	o Access to information on available funding sources						
	o Budgeting and financial management skills						
	o Funding support						
	o Resource mobilisation skills (including proposal writing)						
	o Resource-recovery techniques (e.g. fees for applications)						
	o Other						

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
(v) Mechanisms for follow-up, monitoring and assessment	o Measures for detecting unintentional or illegal transboundary movements						
	o Mechanisms for inspections and enforcement						
	o Mechanisms for monitoring of compliance						
	o National surveillance guidelines						
	o Post-release monitoring and oversight procedures						
	o Training of customs and boarder control officers						
	o Other						
B. Human resources capacity development and training	o Access to academic training programmes in biosafety						
	o Access to biosafety training materials						
	o Distance learning modules						
	o National roster of biosafety experts						
	o Opportunities for staff exchange/on-the-job-training						
	o Training in biosafety legislation and practice						
	o Training workshops and short courses in scientific and technical fields relevant to biosafety						
	o Training workshops and short courses in legal, social and economic fields relevant to biosafety						
	o Other (specify)						

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
C. Risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise	o Access to baseline ecological data to support risk assessments						
	o Competence to review/audit risk assessments						
	o Guidance documents on specific aspects of risk assessment						
	o Hands-on training in risk assessment						
	o Handbook on how to perform risk assessment						
	o Methodologies and protocols for generating data to support risk assessment						
	o National operational guidelines on risk assessment						
	o Networks of experts on risk assessment and risk management						
	o Reference materials and databases						
	o Research facilities for risk assessment studies						
	o Other						
D. Risk management	o Development of national risk management systems						
	o Development of emergency measures for unintentional LMO releases						
	o Guidance on different risk management measures						
	o Guidance on how to develop risk management plans						
	o Mechanisms for cooperation in risk management						
	o National framework/system for post-release monitoring of LMOs						
	o Tools and methodologies for environmental monitoring of LMOs						
	o Training of farmers and other users in risk-management strategies and measures						

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
	o Other (specify)						
E. Public awareness, participation and education in biosafety	o Access to biosafety awareness/outreach materials o Biosafety awareness and education programmes o Case-studies on good practices and lessons learned in public awareness and participation o Establishment of biosafety documentation units or sections in existing reference libraries o Facilities for public access to information and means of access to the Biosafety Clearing-House o Guidance on public awareness raising and participation methods and techniques o National biosafety website o Network of biosafety educators and communicators o Outreach strategy and/or communication plan o Risk-communication skills o Surveys to assess public awareness and opinions o Systems for public participation in biosafety o Training in media engagement skills o Training in information packaging and communication						

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
	o Other (specify)						
F. Information exchange and data management including full participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House	o Biosafety information management system (including policy, strategies and procedures)						
	o Common formats for information exchange						
	o Data management standards						
	o Equipment to facilitate national participation in the BCH						
	o Establishment of national biosafety databases						
	o Interoperability with the BCH central portal						
	o National Internet-based biosafety information system						
	o Non-Internet access to the BCH						
	o Systems for data and information security and back-up						
	o Systems for data validation and quality control						
	o Tools for information gathering and analysis (e.g. software)						
	o Trained staff dedicated to handle biosafety information						
	o Training in the use and management of the BCH central portal						

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
	o Training in data/information management and reporting						
	o Other (specify)						
G. Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration at subregional, regional and international levels	o Access to information on available opportunities for collaboration						
	o Establishment of technical working groups						
	o Guidance on networking strategies and approaches						
	o Institutional and operational framework for collaboration						
	o Inter-institutional networks						
	o Mechanisms for information-exchange and communication						
	o Mechanisms for scientific and technical networking						
	o Mechanism for south-south cooperation						
	o Mechanisms for regional and technical cooperation						
	o Research and development cooperation opportunities						
	o Scholarly knowledge-sharing among biosafety experts						
	o Training in collaboration techniques and approaches						

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
	o Training in negotiation skills						
	o Other (specify)						
H. Access to and transfer of technology and know-how	o Access to information on available technologies						
	o Development and implementation of national technology transfer agreements						
	o Development of a national technology road map						
	o Enabling policy/regulatory framework for technology transfer						
	o Establishment of technology information platforms						
	o Joint technology research and development opportunities						
	o National technology transfer framework and action plan						
	o National system for protection of intellectual property						
	o Public–private partnerships for technology development						
	o Technology needs assessment						
	o Other (specify)						
I. Identification of LMO shipments as required by the Protocol	o Accredited reference laboratory for LMO detection and analysis						

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
	o Guidance on validated LMO detection methods and protocols						
	o Guidance on unique identification systems						
	o Guidelines on appropriate sampling methods						
	o National system for LMO sampling and detection						
	o Reference materials on LMO sampling and detection						
	o Training of personnel in LMO sampling and detection						
	o Other (specify)						
J. Handling of socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding LMOs	o Establishment of a system for taking into account socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding LMOs						
	o Guidance on existing approaches and mechanisms for taking into account socio-economic considerations in decision-making concerning LMOs						
	o Mechanisms for cooperation on research on socio-economic impacts of LMOs						
	o Mechanisms for cooperation on information exchange on socio-economic impacts of LMOs						
	o Methodologies for assessing socio-economic impacts of LMOs						
	o Training in methods for assessing socio-economic impacts of LMOs						
	o Other						

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
K. Implementation of documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol	o Development and implementation of traceability systems						
	o Establishment of national documentation systems for LMOs shipments						
	o Establishment of identity preservation systems						
	o Establishment of systems (operating procedures) for inspection, verification and certification of documentation accompanying LMO shipments						
	o Guidance on the documentation and identification requirements under the Protocol						
	o Training of customs and boarder control officials						
	o Training of exporters, shippers, etc on LMO identification and documentation requirements						
	o Other (specify)						
L. Handling of confidential information	o Elaboration of rules for protecting confidential information						
	o Establishment of systems (facilities and operating procedures) for managing confidential information						
	o Training of regulatory personnel in record keeping and information security						
	o Other (specify)						
K. Taking into account risks to human health	o Establishment of a system for taking into account risks to human health in decision-making regarding LMOs						

Broad areas in which capacity is needed	*Specific capacity priority need*	*Extent to which the need has been addressed*					*Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)*
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
	○ Guidance on methods for assessing risks of LMOs to human health						
	○ Regulatory framework for addressing human health impacts of LMOs						
	○ Other (specify)						

4. Contact details:
(Name, job title/designation, organization, address, phone, fax, email, website)

5. Any other relevant information: <Text entry >

6. Attach document: <Upload copies of relevant documents, e.g. needs assessment reports prepared)

7. Notes <Text entry >
Return the completed form to:

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413 rue Saint-Jacques, suite 800
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
H2Y 1N9
Tel.: 1 514 288-2220
Fax: 1 514 288-6588
Email: secretariat@cbd.int
Website: www.cbd.int
BCH: http://bch.cbd.int

Annex IV

WEB-BASED REPORTING FORMAT FOR INITIATIVES CONTRIBUTING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACTION PLAN FOR BUILDING CAPACITIES FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTOCOL

A. General information	
1. Title of the activity undertaken	
2. Contact person:*	
3. Organization:	

B. General elements of the initiative	
4. Cross-cutting element of the Action Plan to which the activity is contributing	☐ Institutional capacity-building ☐ Human-resources development and training ☐ Awareness, participation and education at all levels ☐ Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration ☐ Information exchange and data management, including participation in the BCH ☐ Technology transfer
5. Thematic element of the Action Plan to which the activity is contributing	☐ Risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise ☐ Risk management ☐ Identification of LMOs, including their detection ☐ Socio-economic considerations ☐ Implementation of the documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol ☐ Handling of confidential information ☐ Measures to address unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs ☐ Scientific biosafety research relating to LMOs

	☐ Taking into account risks to human health
6. Scope of the activity	☐ Standalone ☐ Part of a larger initiative

C. Details of the initiative	
7. Location:	
8. Dates/duration:	
9. Objectives:	
10. Brief description of the activity undertaken:	
11. Specific outputs/ outcomes:	
12. Resource inputs/ Cost (US$):	
13. Remarks (e.g. bottlenecks, lessons learned, etc):	
14. Link to the full activity report:	<URL and website name> <Attachment>*

D. Additional information	
15. Any other relevant information:	*and/or* <URL and website name> *and/or* <Attachment>
16. Notes:	

Annex V

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. Parties/Governments

Belize

1.Dr. Michael DeShield
Director
Food Safety Services
Belize Agricultural Health Authority
P.O Box 181
Belize City, Belize
Tel.: +501 224 4794
Fax: +501 224 5230

Cambodia

2.Mr. Pisey Oum
Regional Programme Manager, Biosafety Unit
Department of Planning and Legal Affair/National Biodiversity Steering
Committee
Ministry of Environment
48, Samdech Preah Sihanouk Avenue
Tonle Bassac Khan Chamkarmon
Phom Penh, Cambodia
Tel.: +855 23 217560/855 12 702239
Fax: +855 23 217560

Canada

3.Dr. Desmond Mahon
Manager
ABS / Biosafety
Environment Canada
Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Blvd, 21st floor
Hull, PQ K1A 0H3, Canada
Tel.: +1 819 997 3181
Fax: +1 819 953 7682

Costa Rica

4.Mr. Alejandro Hernandez
Risk Assessment - Evaluator
Biotechnology Program – Phytosanitary Protection Service
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
Apdo. 3006 - Barreal de Heredia
San Jose, Costa Rica
Tel.: +506 290 7938
Fax: +506 290 7938

Costa Rica

5. Dr. Alex May Montero
Investigador MAG, Coordinador Comsión de Bioseguridad
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
Apdo. 3006 - Barreal de Heredia
San Jose
Costa Rica
Tel.: +506 290-7938
Fax: +506 290-7938

Cuba

6. Ms. Lenia Arce Hernández
Head, Safeguard Department and Legal Adviser
Centro Nacional de Seguridad Biológica
Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnologia y Medio Ambiente
Calle 28 No. 502 e/5ta y 7ma Miranmar
Habana, Cuba
Tel.: +53 7 2031935 - 38
Fax: +53 7 2031664

Czech Republic

7. Mrs. Milena Roudná
Expert
Global Relations Department
Ministry of Environment
Vrsovicka 65
100 10 Prague, Czech Republic
Tel.: +420 2 671 22 769
Fax: +420 2 673 11 949

Germany

8.Dr. Hartmut Meyer
German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) - "Implementing the Biodiversity Convention"
In den Steinäckern 13
Braunschweig
Goettingen D – 38116, Germany
Tel.: +49 531 5168746
Fax: +49 531 5168747

India

9.Dr. Ranjini Warrier
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

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

10.Dr. Abdulmunem M Abulayha
Researcher
Biotechnology Research Centre
BtRC P.O. Box 82898
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
Tel.: +218925207343 218
Fax: +218215680035

Mexico

11.Dra Francisca Acevedo Gasman
Coordinadora de Analisis de Riesgo y Bioseguridad
Risk Assessment and Biosafety
National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity
Liga Periferico - Insurgentes Sur 4903, Tlalpan
Mexico DF 14010, Mexico
Tel.: +52 55 50044975
Fax: +52 55 50044931

Norway

12. Mr. Jan Husby
Senior Advisor
GenØk – Centre for Biosafety
Science Park, PO 6418
Tromso N-9294, Norway
Tel.: +47 48 04 57 33
Fax: +47 77 64 61 00

Serbia

13. Dr. Aleksej Tarasjev
Regional Advisor
Institute for Biological Research
Despota Stefana 142
Belgrade 11000, Serbia
Tel.: +381 11 207 83 76; +381 11 241 64 37
Fax: +381 112761 433

Slovenia

14. Dr. Darja Stanic Racman
Secretary
Biotechnology Department, Environment Directorate
Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning
Dunajska 48 p.p. 653
Ljubljana SI-1000, Slovenia
Tel.: +3861 478 7338
Fax: +3861 478 7420

South Africa

15. Prof. Chris Viljoen
GMO Testing Facility,
Department of Hematology & Cell Biology, Health Sciences
University of the Free State
P.O. Box 339
Bloemfontein 9300, South Africa
Tel.: +27 51 405 3656
Fax: +27 51 444 1036

B. Organizations

Desarrollo Medio Ambiental Sustentable

16.Dr. Antonietta Gutiérrez-Rosati
Desarrollo Medio Ambiental Sustentable
Avenida de La Universidad s/n
Lima 12, Peru
Tel.: +51 1 479 2866
Fax: +51 1 479 2866

ECOROPA

17.Mrs. Christine von Weizsäcker
President
ECOROPA
Postfach 1547
Emmendingen 79305, Germany
Tel.: +49 7641 9542214
Fax: +49 7641 9542215

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

18.Mr. Andrea Sonnino
Senior Agricultural Research Officer
Research and Technology Development Service, Research, Extension
and Training Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
Rome 00153, Italy
Tel.: +39 06 5705 5499
Fax: +39 06 5705 5731

Global Environment Facility

19.Dr. Jaime Cavelier
Program Manager
Natural Resources
Global Environment Facility
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington DC 20433, United States of America
Tel.: +202 588 1688 ext.16
Fax: +202 588 1698

Instituto Interamericano de Cooperacion para la

20. Mr. Bryan Munoz Castillo
Specialist, Biotechnology and Biosafety
Directorate of Technical Leadership and Knowledge Management
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperacion para la Agricultura
0.5 miles North from the Ipís-Coronado Intersection
P.O. BOX 55-2200, San Isidro de Coronado
San José, Costa Rica
Tel.: +506 2216 0361
Fax: +506 2216 0444

United Nations Environment Programme, Global Environment Facility (UNEP/GEF)

21. Dr. Fee-Chon Low
Regional Coordinator - Asia
United Nations Environment Programme, Global Environment Facility
(UNEP/GEF)
15, chemin des Anémones
CH-1219 Chatelaine
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel.: +41 1178410
Fax: +41 1178070

Universidad Nacional Autonoma de México

22. Dra. Amanda Galvez Mariscal
Professor
Dept. Alimentos y Biotecnologia
Universidad Nacional Autonoma de México
Facultad de Quimica UNAM
Cd. Universitaria
Mexico D.F. 04510, Mexico
Tel.: +52 55 5622 5208
Fax: +52 55 5622 5223

C. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

23. Mr. Charles Gbedemah
Senior Programme Officer
Biosafety Division
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413 St. Jacques Street, Office 800
Montreal Quebec, H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 7032
Fax: +1 514 288 6588

24. Mr. Erie Tamale
Programme Officer
Biosafety Division
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413 St. Jacques Street, Office 800
Montreal Quebec, H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 7050
Fax: +1 514 288 6588
