



CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/8
6 March 2002

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE
CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY
The Hague, 22-26 April 2002
Item 4.1.6 of the provisional agenda*

MONITORING AND REPORTING (ARTICLE 33)

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The work plan of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP) adopted by the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties included the item "Monitoring and reporting (Article 33)". In the adopting the work plan (decision V/1, annex), the Conference of the Parties specified that the issue to be considered under this item was "format and timing for reporting".
2. The Executive Secretary prepared a draft format for reporting for consideration of the ICCP at its second meeting (UNEP/CBD/ICCP/2/4, annex). In considering the item, the Intergovernmental Committee supported the general format proposed in the annex of the note by the Executive Secretary, and invited Governments to provide written comments on the draft format to the Executive Secretary before 15 January 2002, with a view to further developing the format (recommendation 2/2).
3. As of 31 January 2002, the Executive Secretary had received comments from the following Governments: Australia, Canada, European Union, Slovenia, Switzerland and Viet Nam.

II. SYNTHESIS OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REPORTING FORMAT

4. The comments submitted by the Governments mentioned above have been compiled in an information document (UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/INF/6). Although it is not possible to make definitive assessments of the draft format from a small sample of submissions, it may be useful to summarize common elements contained in the submissions received to date.
5. In general, the reporting Governments felt that the draft reporting format was a good starting point, which could be further improved in the future. In addition to detailed comments on specific

* UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/1.

questions, two Governments made the following two substantive comments pertaining to the entire structure of the draft format.

(a) First, they felt that some of the questions could be interpreted as going beyond the scope of the requirements of Article 33, which requires Parties to report on measures taken to implement the Protocol. Those Governments therefore believed that the format might be unnecessarily long;

(b) Second, they commented that at least some of the questions seemed to be worded in a way that interpreted how Governments would fulfil their requirements under the Protocol. Questions of this type would need to be re-worded.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6. In the light of the above, and the comments made during the discussion of the issue at the second meeting of the ICCP, the Intergovernmental Committee may wish to consider adopting a recommendation along the following lines:

“The Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Noting the comments received to date from various Governments on the reporting format,

1. *Encourages* Governments, which have not submitted comments to review the reporting format and submit any comments to the Executive Secretary in advance of the first meeting of the Parties;

2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue to compile comments on the draft format, with a view to further developing the format for consideration by the first meeting of the Parties.”
