CBD

UNEP

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/CB-PAC/1/2
11 April 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

PACIFIC SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY
Nadi, Fiji, 28-30 November 2011

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP

INTRODUCTION

1. The Pacific Subregional Workshop on Capacity-building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was held from 28 to 30 November 2011 in Nadi, Fiji. It was hosted by the Government of Fiji through the Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment and was funded by the Government of Japan. A total of 18 participants from 14 governments and 2 organizations attended the workshop. The governments represented were Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. The organizations represented were the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and Tupou Tertiary Institute. The list of participants may be found in annex IV to this report.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

2. The workshop was opened by Ms. Senivasa Waqairamasi, Senior Environment Officer, Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment. On behalf of the Government of Fiji, Ms. Waqairamasi welcomed the participants to Fiji and thanked the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for offering Fiji the opportunity to host the workshop. Ms. Waqairamasi noted that the workshop was of high importance to all Pacific Island countries. She urged participants to make use of the opportunity provided by the workshop to gain as much knowledge and information as possible in order to be able to fulfil their obligations under the Protocol. She observed that identification of the priority needs of countries and the gaps in ongoing initiatives was an important step in developing successful capacity-building activities. She concluded by wishing participants fruitful deliberations.

3. Mr. Charles Gbedemah, Principal Officer for Biosafety, also made opening remarks, on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. In his remarks, Mr. Gbedemah noted that the governing body of the Protocol had in many of its decisions called for capacity-building in developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States, to assist them in meeting their obligations under the Protocol. In this regard, he noted that the workshop was intended to update participants on major issues and developments under the Protocol and to give them an opportunity to discuss strategies to strengthen the capacity of Parties in the Pacific subregion. He thanked the Government of Fiji for hosting the workshop and the Government of Japan for providing the financial support. He urged participants to freely share their experiences and learn from each other so that they would be in a better position to catalyze and facilitate national processes for the implementation of the

/…

Cartagena Protocol and its Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress when they returned home.

ITEM 2. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES

4. Following the official opening of the workshop, the moderator of the session, Mr. Gbedemah, invited participants to introduce themselves. After the introductions, Mr. Erie Tamale of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity presented the objectives and the expected outcomes of the workshop. He noted that the workshop was organized to contribute to enhancing capacity of Parties in the Pacific subregion for the effective implementation of the Protocol. The specific objectives were to:

(a) Promote awareness of the recent developments under the Protocol, including decisions of the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, and understanding of the major issues and processes underpinning the implementation of the Protocol;

(b) Review the status of implementation of the Protocol in the Pacific subregion and share experiences and lessons learned in the development and implementation of national biosafety frameworks (NBFs);

(c) Identify national and subregional capacity-building needs and priorities and discuss ways to enhance subregional cooperation to address those needs; and

(d) Explore the possibility of developing a Pacific subregional capacity-building programme on implementation of the NBFs for funding by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other donors.

5. Participants were then invited to indicate their expectations from the workshop. Many participants stated that they expected the workshop to enable them learn more about the status of implementation of the Protocol and the existing tools and opportunities for national and subregional cooperation. Many participants also hoped to learn from each other's experiences and establish networks.

ITEM 3. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND MAJOR ISSUES UNDER THE PROTOCOL

6. In the next session, moderated by Mr. Samiuela Fonua (Tupou Tertiary Institute), staff from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity presented updates on the major issues and recent developments under the Protocol. Mr. Gbedemah made the first presentation on the main outcomes of the fifth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, which was held in October 2010 in Nagoya, Japan.

7. In his presentation, Mr. Gbedemah gave a brief history of the Protocol, noting that it was negotiated under the Convention on Biological Diversity and its objective was to contribute to ensuring the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms (LMOs) resulting from modern biotechnology that might have adverse effects on biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health. He reported that the governing body of the Protocol – the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (COP-MOP) – had so far held five meetings and had adopted a number of decisions to guide the implementation of the Protocol. He outlined the decisions adopted at the fifth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and noted that the main outcomes of the meeting included adoption of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020; the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress; the draft "Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms"; the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation; and the common format for the second national reports on the implementation of the Protocol.

8. After the presentation on the general overview of the main decisions taken at the fifth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, Mr. Gbedemah made another presentation on the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol and the multi-year programme of work of the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. He described the vision, mission, and the strategic and operational objectives of the Strategic Plan and demonstrated the relationship among the strategic objectives, expected outcomes and indicators. He

informed participants that the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan would be conducted after five years, in conjunction with the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, scheduled to be done at the eighth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. In this regard, he noted that the second national reports were expected to provide the baseline data and information against which progress with the implementation of the Strategic Plan, and the Protocol in general, would be measured.

9. In another presentation on national reporting, Mr. Gbedemah noted that Parties to the Protocol had an obligation to submit national reports in accordance with Article 33 of the Protocol. He highlighted the key elements of decisions BS-I/9, BS-III/14 and BS-V/14 on national reporting, and stated that Parties were required to submit their national reports every four years and that each report must be submitted 12 months prior to the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at which it would be considered. He informed the participants that the second national reports were due on 30 September 2011. However, the deadline for submission was extended to 31 December 2011 to allow more countries time to respond and have their reports considered in the analysis to be prepared for the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. He noted that the rate of submission had improved with the second national reports (124 of the 161 Parties, or 77%, as of 30 November 2011) compared to the 47% response rate for the first report. He urged Parties in the Pacific that had not yet done so to prepare and submit their reports before the deadline so that they could be taken into account in the analysis. He reminded participants that the primary objectives of national reporting were to assess the overall status of implementation of the Protocol, to review each Party's compliance with Protocol obligations, to identify factors impeding implementation and compliance, and to help devise measures to facilitate implementation. Participants raised a number of questions and sought clarifications on various aspects of the presentation, to which Mr. Gbedemah responded.

10. During the afternoon session, moderated by Mr. Clark Peteru (SPREP), Ms. Kathryn Garforth from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity made a presentation on the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Ms. Garforth gave a brief background to the Supplementary Protocol and an overview of its scope and core requirements. She stated that unlike most other international treaties on liability and redress, which focused on civil liability rules for dealing with damage, the Supplementary Protocol followed an administrative approach for addressing damage from living modified organisms, whereby competent authorities would require operators to take response measures in the event of damage (without adjudication by courts of law). She explained the meaning of "damage" as defined in the Supplementary Protocol. She further described the various response measures that could be taken in the event of damage. Finally, she described the mechanisms for implementation of the Supplementary Protocol requirements and the application of civil liability rules in the context of the Supplementary Protocol. After the presentation, Ms. Garforth responded to a number of questions that were raised and invited participants to consult the website of the Supplementary Protocol for additional information.[1]

11. Following Ms. Garforth's presentation, Mr. Erie Tamale gave a presentation on the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH). In his presentation, Mr. Tamale gave a brief description of the mandate of the BCH as stipulated in Article 20 of the Protocol. He described the main features of the central portal of the BCH and outlined the categories and types of information available through the BCH.[2] He noted that there were two main categories: (a) "National Records" submitted only by Governments as mandated by the Protocol and decisions of the Parties to the Protocol (including national contacts, existing laws and regulations, risk assessment reports, final decisions on LMOs, national reports and information relating to the roster of experts); and (b) "Reference Records", i.e., non-mandatory information submitted by Governments and general BCH users (e.g., information regarding capacity-building activities, resource materials and information in the LMO, gene and organism registries). Mr. Tamale gave practical demonstrations on how to find and retrieve information from the BCH and how to register information.

[1] Website of the Supplementary Protocol: http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/supplementary.

[2] The BCH central portal is accessible at http://bch.cbd.int/.

He concluded his presentation noting that the BCH had undergone tremendous improvement over the last few years in terms of its design and accessibility. For example, the BCH was now available in all six United Nations languages, and a number of new features had been added, including a more flexible way of displaying search results and the ability for users to link records on decisions and risk assessment to the LMO registry. As well, new tools such as platforms for online forums and real-time conferences had been introduced. He noted that the number of visits to the BCH had increased sixfold in the last few years and the number of records registered in the BCH had more than doubled. However, the amount of information from developing countries was still very limited and the potential of the BCH was not fully utilized.

12. During the late afternoon session, which was also moderated by Mr. Peteru, Ms. Garforth gave a presentation on identification and documentation requirements for shipments of living modified organisms under Article 18 of the Protocol. She described the identification and documentation requirements for the different types of LMOs (i.e., LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment; for contained use; and LMOs for direct use as food or feed, or for processing) as set out in paragraph 2 of Article 18 of the Protocol and decisions BS-I/6 and BS-III/10. She illustrated how and where to find information on LMOs in existing shipping documentation. She also provided an overview of the system of unique identifiers for transgenic plants developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and demonstrated how they could be used to search the BCH for further information about specific LMOs. Finally, Ms. Garforth mentioned possible situations that could constitute unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs and also described what constituted an illegal transboundary movement.

13. After a question-and-answer session on Ms. Garforth's presentation, Mr. Tamale gave a presentation on the "Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety"[3] and its role in facilitating national and regional or subregional-level capacity-building efforts. Mr. Tamale began the presentation with an overview of the key capacity-building tools and mechanisms established under the Protocol (including the Action Plan, the Coordination Mechanism, the roster of experts, and the indicators for monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building efforts under the Protocol). He then highlighted some of the capacity-building good practices and lessons that had emerged over the last few years. Mr. Tamale outlined the objective and scope of the Action Plan. He noted that the Action Plan contained six cross-cutting elements and nine thematic elements requiring urgent action.[4] He also outlined the key strategic processes/steps and the national, subregional, regional and international activities identified to foster coherent, focused and synergetic approaches to capacity-building for the effective implementation of the Protocol.

ITEM 4. CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTOCOL IN THE PACIFIC SUBREGION

14. In the morning session of 29 November 2011, moderated by Mr. Tamale, Mr. Samiuela Fonua presented the summary outcomes of the UNEP-GEF regional workshop on the review and closure of the national biosafety framework projects in the Pacific Island countries, which had been held from 27 June to 1 July 2011 in Nadi, Fiji. Mr. Fonua reported that the workshop was attended by 29 representatives from 15 Pacific Island countries. At the workshop, the participants reviewed the status of the NBF development project in the Pacific Island countries and exchanged their experiences with the project. They also received guidance on how to finalize and close the project, including guidance on financial and administrative reporting requirements for UNEP-GEF projects. At the UNEP-GEF workshop it was

[3] The Action Plan is available at http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_art22_actionplan.shtml.

[4] The cross-cutting elements are: institutional capacity-building; human resources capacity development and training; information exchange and data management; scientific, technical and institutional collaboration; access to and transfer of technology and know-how; and scientific biosafety research. The thematic elements are: risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise; risk management; public awareness, participation and education; identification of LMOs; socioeconomic considerations; implementation of documentation requirements (Art. 18.2); handling of confidential information; addressing unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs; and taking into account risks to human health.

reported that nearly all Pacific Island countries, with four exceptions, had completed the project and submitted their reports. Some of the challenges encountered during project implementation included high staff turnover, lack of commitment from executing agencies, and late and/or incomplete reporting by some countries. Participants at the workshop were also briefed on the progress made in advancing GEF's Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (GEF-PAS) Country Support Programme under the fifth replenishment period of GEF (GEF 5). A draft project concept entitled "Biotechnology and Biosafety for Agricultural and Environmental Sustainability in the Pacific Islands" was also presented and discussed. Furthermore, a presentation was made on national reporting under the Cartagena Protocol and on the procedures for accessing GEF support for the preparation of the second national reports.

15. After a few questions and answers on the above presentation, Mr. Fonua made another presentation on the above-mentioned draft project concept, which he said was developed a few years earlier with the support of the former coordinator for the Pacific subregion of the UNEP-GEF NBF development project. He highlighted the objectives and key subregional and national components of the project, as well as potential partners for the project. He also described two other projects which might provide useful information, i.e., the UNEP-GEF "Regional project for implementing National Biosafety Frameworks in the Caribbean region" and the UNEP-GEF project on "Development and Institution of a National Monitoring and Control System (Framework) for Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and Invasive Alien Species (IAS)" in Cameroon. In conclusion, Mr. Fonua advised the participants to review and discuss options on the best approaches to dealing with biosafety in the Pacific, including (i) whether to develop a subregional biosafety project with specific thematic areas to be implemented across the Pacific Island countries or national projects focused on the implementation of the NBFs; (ii) whether to develop an integrated biosafety and biotechnology project, with the biotechnology component to be funded from external sources; and (iii) whether to adopt a biosecurity approach, which would for example address both LMOs and invasive alien species as in the Cameroonian project.

16. Following the two presentations, participants were divided into three discussion groups based on the size of the countries they represented. Within the discussion groups, each participant was first requested to review and present to the group his/her country's top ten priority capacity-building needs.[5] Each discussion group was then asked to consider the country needs presented and identify those needs that were common to all countries represented in the group, which could be addressed through joint subregional activities, and prioritize them. After the group discussions, the rapporteurs of each group were invited to present the outcomes of the discussions to the plenary. The reports of the three groups are contained in annex I to this report.

17. In the afternoon plenary session, the participants were invited to discuss elements of the proposed subregional biosafety capacity-building project, taking into account the priority national and subregional needs identified during the small group discussions. To facilitate the discussions, Mr. Gbedemah briefed participants on key issues that may be considered in the NBF implementation phase. He noted that possible objectives under this phase could include (1) integration of biosafety and biotechnology into national and development plans (policy); (2) establishment of fully functional and responsive regulatory regimes in line with the Protocol and national needs on biosafety; (3) establishment of fully functional national systems for handling requests and applications for LMO imports or releases; (4) setting up of workable and fully functional systems for monitoring and enforcement; and (5) establishment of fully functional systems for public awareness, education, participation and access to information. He highlighted the urgent need in most countries to develop capacity for scientifically sound risk assessments, sampling and detection of LMOs, and for enforcement of the requirements related to handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs. He also underscored the need to develop comprehensive national capacity-building strategies and action plans and to integrate biosafety into the

[5] Prior to the workshop, participants were requested to complete the capacity-building needs assessment common format, available through the BCH at http://bch.cbd.int/managementcentre/edit/capacityBuildingNeeds.shtml, to facilitate the discussions.

other relevant sectors, in particular agriculture, environment/biological diversity, health, and science and technology sectors.

18. During the initial part of the discussions on the project concept, the participants deliberated on the issue of whether the subregional project should integrate biosafety and biotechnology components. After a lively discussion, they arrived at a consensus that the project should focus on biosafety, and particularly on the implementation of the NBFs. Accordingly, they agreed to change the project title to "*Capacity-Building in Biosafety for a Sustainable Environment in the Pacific Islands*".

19. Subsequently, the participants established a small core group, composed of representatives from five countries led by Fiji, to review and further develop the draft project proposal, taking into account, as appropriate, the national and subregional needs identified by the small discussion group during the previous session. The core group was requested to make the revised draft proposal available for discussion in the plenary session the following day. Members of the core group were Fiji, Micronesia, Niue, Papua New Guinea and Samoa. The representatives of SPREP and UNEP were also invited to join the group.

20. The following day, the participants reviewed the revised draft proposal prepared by the small core group and provided specific input on the project components, the project activities and the expected outcomes and outputs, incorporating relevant national and subregional needs identified earlier. A copy of the proposal as revised by the meeting is contained in annex II below.

ITEM 5. SUBREGIONAL COOPERATION AND COORDINATION OF BIOSAFETY CAPACITY-BUILDING EFFORTS IN THE PACIFIC SUBREGION

21. Under this item, Mr. Peteru gave a presentation on SPREP's activities in supporting Pacific Island countries to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. He explained that SPREP was not a funding agency but provided technical assistance and advisory services to Pacific Island countries to strengthen environmental management and promote sustainable development. He noted that SPREP currently supported a number of regional initiatives under its four strategic priorities for the period 2011-2015, i.e., climate change, biodiversity and ecosystem management, waste management and pollution control, and environmental monitoring and governance. In the field of biosafety, he reported that SPREP had collaborated with UNEP in providing capacity-building assistance and technical support to Pacific Island countries for the development of their NBFs since 2003, when a coordinator for the Pacific subregion was appointed for the UNEP-GEF NBF development project. Among other things, SPREP in collaboration with UNEP had provided support to Pacific Island countries in preparation for the first meeting of the Parties to the Protocol in 2004, had organized several workshops on biosafety in the subregion, and had carried out reviews of the existing laws of various Pacific Island countries and assisted them to develop their biosafety laws. Mr. Peteru noted, however, that since the departure of the coordinator for the Pacific subregion in 2008, the biosafety support activities had slowed down. He expressed hope that SPREP's work on biosafety would be revived soon. However, he said this would depend on the availability of funds.

22. Under this agenda item, Mr. Tamale also made a presentation on experiences and lessons learned from various regional biosafety capacity-building initiatives. He described the goals, activities, main achievements and lessons learned from four regional projects: the FAO Regional Project on Capacity Building in Biosafety of GM Crops in Asia (2002-2006), the Organization of American States (OAS) Project on Biosafety Regulations in Latin America and the Caribbean (2002-2004); the Dutch Matra Project on Implementation of Biosafety Frameworks in Pre-Accession Countries of Central and Eastern Europe (1999-2002); and the project on Capacity Building for an Africa-wide Biosafety System, within the context of the African Union-German Cooperation (2005-2010).

ITEM 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

23. During the last session, the participants discussed the way forward with regards to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in the Pacific subregion. In particular, they discussed follow-up actions to the discussions on the proposed subregional biosafety project. The small core group was requested to further develop the project proposal in collaboration with SPREP and UNEP, and to send it for comments to the participants and the Protocol national focal points (NFPs) of all Pacific Island countries. The participants also requested the representative from SPREP to convey to the management of SPREP their need for technical assistance in the further development of the project proposal for submission to UNEP-GEF.

24. In terms of timelines, it was agreed that the core group would prepare and send out a new draft proposal by the end of December 2011. SPREP was requested to backstop the core group and to elaborate the subregional components of the project. The NFPs were urged to send their comments on the draft proposal to SPREP by the end of February 2012 to enable it to finalize and submit it to UNEP-GEF by the end of April 2012. It was anticipated that UNEP would prepare a project identification form (PIF) and send it to the GEF Operational Focal Points for endorsement before the June 2012 meeting of the GEF Governing Council with a view to having the project considered for funding before the end of GEF 5.

25. In order to facilitate the finalization of the proposal in a timely manner, it was recommended that NFPs be encouraged to share the first draft proposal with the GEF Operational Focal Points and other relevant stakeholders, in order for the proposed project to receive the needed support and endorsement from the GEF Operational Focal Points when it was finalized.

26. Under this item, the participants also urged all Pacific Island countries that had not yet done so to prepare and submit their second national reports on the implementation of the Protocol before 31 December 2011 so that their information could be taken into account in the analysis to be prepared by the Secretariat for consideration by the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

27. The participants were requested to complete an evaluation of the workshop. The results of the evaluation are summarized in annex III below.

ITEM 7. CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP

28. In closing the workshop, Mr. Charles Gbedemah thanked the participants for their active participation in the workshop. He expressed the hope that they would use the knowledge acquired and the contacts established during the workshop to further advance the implementation of the Protocol in their respective countries. He once again thanked the Government of Fiji for hosting the workshop and the Government of Japan for providing the financial support.

29. The representative of the Government of Fiji thanked the Secretariat for organizing the workshop in Fiji and wished all the participants a safe trip back home.

30. The workshop was closed at 5.30 p.m. on 30 November 2011.

Annex I

REPORTS OF THE SMALL DISCUSSION GROUPS

GROUP 1

(Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Samoa and Tonga)

A: National Priority Needs

Fiji	Papua New Guinea	Samoa	Tonga
Development of the biosafety law and regulations	Implementation of the national biosafety framework (the bill and policy);	Development of the biosafety legal framework	Implementation of the NBF
Systems for management records on LMO import/ release applications and decisions	Administrative systems for handling of applications for import and/or release of LMOs	Training in relevant skills	LMO detection and identification
Training in biosafety regulation issues	Biosafety research facilities	Public awareness and participation	Training in scientific and technical fields relevant to biosafety
Training in documentation and identification of LMOs	Training in risk assessments and risk management	Funding assistance	Training in risk assessments and risk management
Training in biosafety development and practice	System for tracking and dealing with unintentional or illegal transboundary movements	Bilateral and multilateral cooperation	Public awareness and capacity-building
Biosafety data collection	Public educational awareness on biosafety		Establishment of a national biosafety website
Capacity-building in technology transfer	Training in administrative practices for handling of LMO import and release applications		Establishment of a biosafety database
Assessment of risks of LMOs to human health	Development of a national risk management strategy		
	Training in cost-benefit analysis as part of the risk management strategy		
	Development of a national biosafety website		

B: Subregional Priority Needs

1. Subregional laboratories to be established;
2. Training in documentation, sampling, detection and identification of LMOs (target group – customs and quarantine);
3. Development of administrative systems for handling, applications for import and/or release of LMOs);
4. Public awareness activities in biosafety;
5. Multilateral cooperation and collaboration on biosafety issues.

GROUP 2

(*Cook Islands, Palau, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu*)

A: National Priority Needs

Cook Islands	**Palau**	**Solomon Islands**	**Vanuatu**
Development of a national biosafety policy	Development of a national biosafety policy	Development of national biosafety laws and regulations	Development of a national biosafety policy, laws and regulations
Development of national biosafety laws and regulations	Development of national biosafety laws and regulations	Support for implementation of the NBF	Support for implementation of the NBF
Support for implementation of the national biosafety framework	Systems for tracking and dealing with unintentional or illegal transboundary movement	Development of administrative systems for handling applications for import and/or release	Development of administrative systems for handling applications for import and/or release
Development of administrative systems for handling applications for LMO import and/or release	Mechanism for inspections and enforcement of biosafety laws	Systems for management records related to LMO import applications and decisions	Systems for tracking and dealing with unintentional or illegal transboundary movement
Training in risk management	Training in risk management	Office facilities, equipment and supplies for biosafety work	Training in risk management
Biosafety awareness and education programmes	Training in biosafety regulatory issues	Budgeting and financial management skills	Biosafety awareness and education programmes and national systems for information management
Training in risk assessment	National risk management systems/strategy	Mechanism for inspections and enforcement of biosafety laws	Training in the use and management of the BCH central portal
Training in administrative practices for handling LMO import/release applications	System to detect and appropriately responds to unintentional LMO release	Training in biosafety legislation and policy development and practice	Guidance in unique identification systems
Guidance on how to perform risk assessment	Guidance on different risk management measures	Training in risk assessment	National system for taking in account socioeconomic considerations in decision-making regarding LMOs
System to detect and appropriately respond to unintentional LMO releases	Systems for public participation in biosafety	Training in the preparation of LMO export or release applications	National system for inspection and verification of documentation accompanying LMOs

<u>Priority Subregional Capacity-Building Needs</u>

1. Development of a national biosafety policy;
2. Development of national biosafety laws and regulations;
3. Support for implementation of the national biosafety framework;
4. Training in risk management;
5. Guidance on how to perform risk assessment;

6. Systems for tracking and dealing with unintentional or illegal transboundary movement;
7. Development of administrative systems for handling applications for import and/or release;
8. Mechanism for inspections and enforcement of biosafety laws;
9. Training in administrative practices for handling LMO import and release applications;
10. Guidance in unique identification systems.

GROUP 3

(*Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Niue and Tuvalu*)

Common Priority Needs

1. Training in risk assessment;
2. Access to:
    (a) Information;
    (b) Funding;
3. Systems for:
    (a) Management of biosafety records;
    (b) Decision-making;
    (c) Inspection and verification;
    (d) Management and protection of confidential information;
4. Mainstreaming of biosafety into broader plans, programmes and sectoral processes;
5. Tools and equipments for surveys and data collection on LMOs;
6. Mechanisms for:
    (a) Cooperation on risk management;
    (b) Coordination among national regulatory of authority;
7. Regulatory framework of addressing human health impacts of LMOs;
8. Internet access and telecommunication facilities (high-speed connection, power backup and lines for international calls).

Annex II

DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR THE SUBREGIONAL PROJECT

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: #2967 and # 3735
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:
COUNTRY(IES): 14 Pacific Island countries: Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tonga*
PROJECT TITLE: Capacity-Building in Biosafety for a Sustainable Environment in the Pacific Islands
GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP, (select), (select)
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) with other subregional collaborators and National Executing Agencies
GEF FOCAL AREA(S): Biodiversity
GEF-5 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: BIOSAFETY

Expected Calendar (mm/dd/yy)	
Milestones	**Dates**
Work Program (for FSPs only)	
Agency Approval date	05/15/2012
Implementation Start	01/02/2013
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	06/01/2014
Project Closing Date	12/31/2015

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK (Expand table as necessary)

Project Objective: To implement effective, operable, transparent and sustainable national biosafety frameworks (NBFs) which cater to national and subregional needs, deliver global benefits and are compliant with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, in line with the Strategic Plan of the Protocol in 14 Pacific Island countries.

Project Components	**Inv, TA, or STA[2]**	**Expected Outcomes**	**Expected Outputs**	**GEF financing[1]**		**Co-financing[1]**		**Total ($)** c=a+b
				($) a	%	($) b	%	
1. Establishment of national legal frameworks for biosafety	TA	Biosafety governance regimes are improved and aligned with the Protocol and the Strategic Plan in 14 Pacific Island countries. Development of the national biosafety laws, regulations and policies.	1.1 Enactment of biosafety legislation (or other key element of the regulatory system) to address safety in the field of transboundary movements of the products of modern biotechnology in up to 14 Pacific Island countries; 1.2 Finalization, updating or reform of biosafety policies in up to 14 Pacific Island countries (as relevant); 1.3 Key politicians sensitized over biosafety, and its strategic importance and multiple dimensions (environmental benefits /risks, trade issues, R&D opportunities, ethical and socioeconomic considerations, etc) in up to 14 Pacific Island countries; 1.4 Establishment and effective operation of national biosafety authorities in up to 14 Pacific Island countries; 1.5 Clearly defined institutional responsibilities among national agencies with a responsibility in biosafety management; 1.6 Establishment and effective operation of scientific and technical advisory committees, or equivalent ad hoc or permanent support structures, in up to 14 Pacific Island countries;					

* The four non-Parties to the Cartagena Protocol in the subregion (Cook Islands, Micronesia, Tuvalu and Vanuatu) expect to become Parties to the Protocol soon, and thus would become eligible for GEF support.

Project Components	Inv, TA, or STA[2]	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF financing[1]		Co-financing[1]		Total ($) c=a+b
				($) a	%	($) b	%	
			1.7 Assessments and establishment of financing options, including cost recovery mechanisms, for maintaining operations of NBFs (including BCH functions); 1.8 Key stakeholder groups (users of modern biotechnology) sensitized; 1.9 Consolidation of ties and working relationship with scientific / research /biotech sector, and permeation of science-based criteria into the biosafety debate; 1.10 Coaching on NBF operations provided to directly relevant ("on-the-ground") staff, especially for handling and resolving LMO requests and communicating decisions; 1.11 Manuals and protocols for following administrative procedures produced in up to 14 Pacific Island countries; 1.12 Peer review and scientific validation of criteria and methodology used for LMO risk assessments; 1.13 Develop shared tools and instruments for monitoring and enforcement of biosafety measures including inspection tool kits, emergency response mechanisms; 1.14 Develop mainstreaming measures to facilitate use of existing staff in related government agencies to implement regulations (e.g., field inspectors); 1.15 National review of legislations, regulations and policies which may be used and / or modified to meet country obligations under the international instruments; 1.16 Develop an inventory of potential new legal instruments which may be required to facilitate implementation of the Protocol, in line with the Strategic Plan for the Protocol, and share across the subregion; 1.17 Customize subregional biosafety protocols to individual countries' needs.					
2. Establishment and upgrading of resource base and institutional capacities for biosafety decision-making and management	TA	Well articulated and technically sound risk assessment, risk management and follow-up systems are functioning for biosafety in the Pacific Island countries.	2.1 Technical documents and tools (standards, protocols, guidelines) for risk assessment (validated by peers) and risk management (if relevant, standardized and harmonized across the subregion) including for biosafety inspections/audits, monitoring, enforcement, evaluation and measurement of environmental impacts; 2.2 Capacity/needs assessments (gap analysis) of technical biosafety management capacity, including capacities that could be cost-effectively accessed at the subregional level in order to provide services (to countries) in support of biosafety risk assessment processes and risk management responsibilities, in the Pacific Island subregion (→ coupled to Output 5.1.a); 2.3 Short term attachments for scientists and specialized personnel involved in risk assessment					

Project Components	Inv, TA, or STA[2]	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF financing[1]		Co-financing[1]		Total ($) c=a+b
				($) a	%	($) b	%	
			or risk management of LMOs; 2.4 Personnel trained in the Protocol, biosafety risk assessments, LMO detection, BCH use and transboundary issues (→ coupled to Outputs under Component 3); 2.5 Identified detection laboratories for LMO testing and verification, established and operationalized in the subregion; 2.6 Cost-effective (and if relevant, harmonized) institutional arrangements established among national biosafety authorities and subregional biosafety laboratories, including linkages between national and subregional laboratories; 2.7 Laboratory equipment, supplies and reagents procured for LMO testing and verification analyses; 2.8 Capacity strengthened of relevant institutions to provide monitoring services and standards for biosafety management; 2.9 Coordinated subregional/national accreditation scheme established for biosafety laboratories; 2.10 LMO detection protocols adopted and standardized among countries (→ coupled to Outputs under Component 3); 2.11 Establishment of an institutionalized and financially sustainable subregional support mechanism (extensive or case-specific) to aid Pacific Island countries in conducting risk assessment processes and carrying out coordinated and optimize risk management actions; 2.12 Border control procedures for imports /exports of LMOs, including trans-shipments and transit, proposed and if possible agreed to; 2.13 Training in documentation, sampling, detection and identification of LMOs (target group – field inspectors); 2.14 Training and guidance in performing risk assessment and management; 2.15 Development of administrative systems for handling applications for import; 2.16 Training in administrative practices for handling LMO import and release applications; 2.17 Guidance in unique identification system; 2.18 Training in risk assessment and use of cross-sectoral capacity to conduct risk assessments in different sectors (e.g., agriculture, human health, etc.) both at country level and subregional level.					
3. Human resources development in support of	TA	A multi-disciplinary cadre of trained personnel and	3.1 Technical public functionaries, decision makers, scientists and advisors, and customs officers and inspectors trained with regards to their specific functions and responsibilities in biosafety;					

Project Components	Inv, TA, or STA[2]	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF financing[1] ($) a	%	Co-financing[1] ($) b	%	Total ($) c=a+b
biosafety management throughout Pacific Island Member States		technical support mechanisms, that combine both national and subregional capacities, are operational and ensure the future sustainability of biosafety management in Pacific Island countries.	3.2 Knowledge on BCH use across several institutions; 3.3 Range of training materials, new curricula (with practical /hands-on exercises) and training manuals produced; 3.4 Experience gained in recommending biosafety decisions and biosafety measures, based on LMO risk assessments and science-based criteria coupled with socioeconomic considerations; 3.5 Mock or real risk assessment reports and BCH records for communication of decisions; 3.6 Laboratory technicians trained in LMO detection and sampling; 3.7 Teachers and specialists involved in human resources formation coached or trained on the requirements and opportunities of the Protocol in line with the strategic plan; 3.8 Experience in carrying out LMO analyses, with statistically significant test results; 3.9 LMO detection and sampling manuals, reviewed by peers, and if relevant, standardized or incorporated into biotechnology; 3.10 Develop a roster of experts / subregional advisory system to support in-country capacity-building activities including technical support and skills development; 3.11 Range of biosafety specialization (short) courses available to Pacific Island countries, and possibility a post-graduate course; 3.12 Self-financing mechanisms to sustain the training programme beyond the project; 3.13 Knowledge exchange among staff specialized in border control of traded goods to receive feedback, inputs and review of proposed border control procedures for imports /exports of LMOs, including cases of transit and trans-shipments.					
4. Strengthening biosafety information management in the Pacific Island countries	TA	National and subregional mechanisms that provide access to biosafety information in order to promote transparency, raise public awareness and facilitate biosafety decision-making are	4.1 Equipment and software procured to establish effective subregional and national biosafety clearing-house mechanisms and database systems; 4.2 Government personnel trained in BCH use and responsibilities assigned; 4.3 National BCH nodes (nBCH) and data management systems established and operating in each country as a means to facilitate public participation and access to information on biosafety, as well as comply with Protocol obligations; 4.4 Assessment to determine the level of resources (physical, human and financial) required to establish and maintain the subregional clearing-house mechanism and its databases; additionally the potential of the subregional BCH node to become the "gatekeeper" of subregional biosafety applications, electronically tracking					

Project Components	Inv, TA, or STA[2]	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF financing[1]		Co-financing[1]		Total ($) c=a+b
				($) a	%	($) b	%	
		institutionalized throughout the region	applications and permits granted, ensuring adequate public access to information on the processing of such applications, and even facilitating public input into the risk assessment process, will be assessed; 4.5 Subregional BCH node designed (architecture) and hosted by a subregional entity defined and agreed to by all countries, and linked to the BCH Central Portal and other relevant sites; 4.6 Subregional BCH node for facilitating public participation and access to information on biosafety established and populated with a toolkit designed to help users; databases of approved and traded LMOs; risk assessment tools (including standards, protocols, etc); training manuals; outreach material; and project products, among others; 4.7 Databases for LMOs traded within and through the Pacific Island subregion, and LMOs commercially approved or produced by Pacific Island countries' trading partners; 4.8 Agreements with Customs Offices and subregional organizations on information and documentation requirements for LMO imports; 4.9 Collaborative networks and information sharing on LMO management in each country and in partnership with subregional and international institutions /initiatives, which could be scaled up to create a subregional information exchange network to support biosafety decision-making and notification processes; 4.10 Enhanced use of technical and scientific information for biosafety decision-making through access to risk assessment reports; 4.11 Non-government stakeholders sensitized over relevance and uses of BCH, stimulating improved/ well informed stakeholder participation in biosafety processes; 4.12 Politicians and decision makers sensitized over the strategic relevance of biosafety information management; 4.13 Public education and outreach (PEO) strategy to guide the development and sharing of public awareness material regarding biotechnology and access to information on biosafety; 4.14 Awareness raising activities at the national level, covering biosafety, biosecurity and targeted outreach to encourage stakeholder participation in consultations over biosafety policies and regulations; 4.15 Outreach materials such as web applications, brochures, monthly e-newsletter, posters, a public information educational/informational pack (comprising an environmental education series), public service announcements, subregional article					

Project Components	Inv, TA, or STA[2]	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF financing[1]		Co-financing[1]		Total ($) c=a+b
				($) a	%	($) b	%	
			blasts, and videos for public education; 4.16 Assessment of effectiveness and usefulness of subregional and national BCH mechanisms and database systems (including considerations over certification requirements and other trade-related issues) and of potential of the subregional BCH node to become the "gatekeeper" of subregional biosafety applications and their public electronic tracking, in order to derive lessons learned and review sustainability factors.					
5. Subregional processes in support of the project and of NBF sustainability in the Pacific								
5.1 Building subregional support mechanisms for biosafety [SPREP to add to this component]	TA	Subregional processes aid to lay the foundations for subregional services and a subregional framework to assist NBF implementation in the Pacific	5.1.a) Viability assessment /analysis of the financial, technical and political implications of establishing sustainable biosafety services and functions at the subregional level; 5.1.b) Analysis of the potential of the subregional BCH node to become the "gatekeeper" of subregional biosafety applications, allow electronic tracking of applications and permits granted, ensure adequate public access to information on the processing of such applications, and facilitate public input into the risk assessment process; 5.1.c) Political decision on biosafety services and responsibilities that can devolved to the subregional level cost-effectively; 5.1.d) Institutional framework for providing subregional biosafety services, including an initial pilot phase for subregional coordination of biosafety tasks, and a self-financing plan for such services; 5.1.e) Action plan to pursue synergies between LMO and IAS / pest management frameworks.					
5.2 Subregional project management [SPREP to add to this component]		Subregional processes support project management	5.2&3.a) Subregional project management unit comprising oversight, coordination and administrative structures; 5.2&3.b) Filing system and accounting system for the project; 5.2&3.c) Feedback and orientation from subregional steering committees, and other invited representatives;					

Project Components	Inv, TA, or STA[2]	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF financing[1]		Co-financing[1]		Total ($) c=a+b
				($) a	%	($) b	%	
5.3 Subregional project monitoring and evaluation [SPREP to add to this component]		Subregional processes support project monitoring and evaluation	5.2&3.d) Appropriate periodic reporting to UNEP, and annual review processes to verify project progress (e.g., project implementation reviews); 5.2&3.e) External independent evaluations at project mid-term and end-of-term that rate project results and impacts; 5.2&3.f) Design of survey questions for measuring outcome indicators; 5.2&3.g) Financial audits to verify project accounting; 5.2&3.h) Lessons learned derived from project implementation and adaptive management.					
Total Project Costs				A		B		

[1] List the $ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.
[2] TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

Annex III

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

1. At the end of the workshop, the participants were requested to complete a workshop evaluation form. They were asked to rate, on a scale of 1 to 6, the usefulness of the different topics and issues covered during the workshop as indicated in the table below. The participants were also invited to provide an overall assessment of the workshop, including how well it was organized and conducted and the extent to which it had met their expectations. The results of the evaluation are summarized below.

Item		Average rating (1-6)	Rating	Level of satisfaction
A.	**Key issues and developments under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the biosafety capacity-building efforts in the Pacific subregion**			
	How useful has the workshop been in improving your awareness and understanding of the following?			
i)	Recent developments under the Protocol, including the main decisions of the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol	4.84	Very useful	81%
ii)	The Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2011-2020) and the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol	4.53	Very useful	76%
iii)	The status of national reporting under the Protocol	4.66	Very useful	78%
iv)	The Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress	4.53	Very useful	76%
v)	The Biosafety Clearing-House	4.78	Very useful	80%
vi)	The LMO identification and documentation requirements under Article 18 of the Protocol	4.59	Very useful	77%
vii)	The Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol and its role in facilitating national/regional initiatives	4.47	Very useful	74%
viii)	The status of implementation of the Protocol in the Pacific and the experiences and lessons learned	4.78	Very useful	80%
ix)	The national and subregional biosafety capacity-building needs and possible strategies to address them	4.84	Very useful	81%
x)	Existing regional and subregional biosafety capacity-building initiatives and good practices	4.66	Very useful	78%
xi)	Potential and existing opportunities for subregional cooperation on biosafety	4.47	Very useful	74%
B.	**Overall assessment of the workshop**			
	Please provide your rating of the following:			
i)	The extent to which the workshop has met your expectations	4.97	Very good	83%
ii)	The extent to which the workshop has improved your understanding of the key Protocol issues and	4.97	Very good	83%

Item		Average rating (1-6)	Rating	Level of satisfaction
	implementation mechanisms			
iii)	How the workshop has been useful in improving your understanding of how your country could more effectively implement the Protocol	5.10	Very useful	85%
iv)	How the workshop has been useful to you as an individual	5.34	Very useful	89%
v)	How well the workshop has been organized	4.16	Well	69%
vi)	The balance between presentations and the discussions	4.59	Very good	77%
vii)	Overall rating of the workshop	4.72	Very good	79%

Most helpful parts of the workshop

2. In the written comments, a number of participants considered the following to have been the most helpful parts of the workshop:

(a) Group exercise on identification of the national and subregional priority needs;

(b) Discussions on the development of the subregional project proposal;

(c) The presentations on the first day, particularly on the background to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and on the Biosafety Clearing-House;

(d) The discussions were informal and very instructive.

Least helpful parts of the workshop

3. The following are comments made by some participants regarding what were considered to be the least helpful aspects of the workshop:

(a) Perhaps too many presentations;

(b) All the presentations should have been made first before embarking on the development of the project proposal.

Suggestions for improvement

4. The following are some of the suggestions made for improving future workshops:

(a) All relevant organizations should be invited to make presentations and contribute to the workshop discussions as necessary;

(b) The presentations should be kept short, about 30 minutes;

(c) The participants should be allowed to choose the hotel where to stay;

(d) It would be useful to organize a workshop for customs and other border control officials in the Pacific subregion;

(e) Countries should be more involved in terms of sharing their experiences and lessons learned;

(f) Effort should be made to stick to time and schedule;

(g) Training should not be combined with making policy decisions or recommendations, e.g., decisions made during the workshop with regards to the project proposal.

Annex IV

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Governments

Cook Islands

1. Mr. Pavai Taramai
Deputy Director
Biosecurity Service
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 96
Rarotonga, Cook Islands
Tel.: +682 28 711
Fax: +682 21 881
E-Mail: biosafe@oyster.net.ck, biosecurity@agriculture.gov.ck

Fiji

2. Mr. Semesa Bulikiobo
Fiji Revenue and Customs Authority
Private Mail Bag
Suva, Fiji
Tel.: +332 4300
E-Mail: sbulikiobo@frca.org.fj

3. Mr. Rahul Chand
Coordinator, Biosafety
Department of Environment
P.O. Box 2109, Govt Buildings
Suva, Fiji
Tel.: +33 11 699
Fax: +33 12 879
E-Mail: rahul.chand@environment.gov.fj, rahul.chand@govnet.fj

4. Mr. Kalivati Vesilevu
Customs Officer
Fiji Revenue and Customs Authority
Private Mail Bag
Suva, Fiji
Tel.: +673 4329
E-Mail: kvesilevu@frca.org.fj

Kiribati

5. Mr. Katareti Taabu
Assistant Wildlife Officer
Wildlife Conservation Unit, Environment and Conservation Division
Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development
London
Kiritimati Island, Kiribati
Tel.: +686 81217
E-Mail: teeirak@gmail.com

Marshall Islands

6. Mr. Ricky Jr. Alik
Project Assistant
Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination
Majuro, Marshall Islands
Tel.: +692 625 7944
Fax: +692 625 7918
E-Mail: ralik86@gmail.com

Micronesia (Federated States of)

7. Mr. John Wichep
Plant and Animal Quarantine Specialist
Division of Resource Management and Development
Department of Resources and Development
Micronesia (Federated States of)
Tel.: +691 320 2620/2646/5133
Fax: +691 320 5854
E-Mail: jwichep@fsmrd.fm

Nauru

8. Mr. Tyrone Deiye
NBSAP National Project Coordinator
Department of Commerce, Industry and Resources
Government Offices
Yaren District, Central Pacific, Nauru
Tel.: +674 556 6433
E-Mail: tdeiye@gmail.com

Niue

9. Mr. New Testament Aue
Quarantine Manager
Head of the Niue Quarantine Service
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
PO Box 74
Alofi, Niue
Tel.: 683 3620
E-Mail: new.que@mail.gov.nu

Palau

10. Mr. Fernando "Fred" Sengebau
Director, Bureau of Agriculture
Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism
P.O. Box 460
Koror PW 96940, Palau
Tel.: +680 622 -5804
Fax: +680 622 5090
E-Mail: ffms@palaunet.com, boagri@palaunet.com

Papua New Guinea

11. Mr. Elias Taia
Program Manager,
Agro-Food Safety and Codex Program
Department of Agriculture and Livestock
P.O. Box 2141
Boroko NCD, Papua New Guinea
E-Mail: eliastaia@yahoo.com, codexcontactpoint.png@gmail.com

Samoa

12. Mr. Niualuga Evaimalo Tavita
Principal Terrestrial Biodiversity Officer
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Private bag
Apia, Samoa
Tel.: +685 23800
Fax: +685 23176
E-Mail: niualuga.evaimalo@mnre.gov.ws
Web: www.mnre.gov.ws

Solomon Islands

13. Mr. Joe Horokou
Director
Environment and Conservation Division
Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology
P.O. Box 21
Honiara, Solomon Islands
Tel.: +677 23 031, +677 88 481
Fax: +677 28 054
E-Mail: horokoujoe@gmail.com

Tonga

14. Ms. Seini Fotu
Ministry of Environment & Climate Change
Vuna Road
Nuku'alofa, Tonga
Tel.: 0067625050
Fax: 0067625051
E-Mail: sfotu09@gmail.com

Tuvalu

15. Mr. Solomona Lotoala
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Environment, Trade, Labour and Tourism
Private Mail Bag, Vaiaku
Funafuti, Tuvalu
Tel.: +688 20 179
Fax: +688 20 167
E-Mail: mlotoala@gmail.com, smetia@gov.tv

Vanuatu

16. Mr. Trinison Tarivonda
Senior Education and Information Officer
Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation
Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
PMB 063
Port Vila, Vanuatu
Tel.: +678 25 302
Fax: +678 222 27
E-Mail: taritrinison@gmail.com

Intergovernmental Organizations

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)

17. Mr. Clark Peteru
Legal Adviser
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
P.O. Box 240
Apia, Samoa
Tel.: +685 26262
Fax: +685 20231
E-Mail: clarkp@sprep.org
Web: http://www.sprep.org

Education/University

Tupou Tertiary Institute

18. Mr. Samiuela Fonua
Tupou Tertiary Institute
P.O. Box 117, Fasi mo e Afi
Nuku'alofa, Tonga
Tel.: +676 28890
E-Mail: samiu.fonua@tti.to, fonua.sam@gmail.com
Web: www.tti.to

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

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

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

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