



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/3
22 October 2016

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION
ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE
MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA
PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Eighth meeting

Cancun, Mexico, 4-17 December 2016

Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

**REPORT ON THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FRAMEWORK AND ACTION
PLAN FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY**

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its sixth meeting, in decision BS-VI/3, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and invited Parties, other Governments, and relevant organizations to implement it and share relevant information and experiences through the Biosafety Clearing-House. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties also requested the Executive Secretary to prepare, for consideration at its meetings, reports on the status of implementation of the Framework and Action Plan on the basis of the submissions made by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations.

2. In paragraph 7 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties agreed to review, at its eighth meeting, the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building in conjunction with the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol.

3. Accordingly, the present note contains in section II a summary report on the status of capacity-building under the Protocol, including an overview of capacity-building activities undertaken by Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and the Secretariat relating to the implementation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building and based on the information provided by Parties in their third national reports as well as information made available through the Biosafety Clearing-House. Section III provides an analysis of the status of implementation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building and suggestions for improving its implementation and effectiveness. Section IV provides a brief description of the proposed short-term action plan (2017-2020) to enhance and support

* UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/1.

capacity-building for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols,¹ which brings together all capacity-building activities to be facilitated and supported by the Secretariat in collaboration with relevant organizations during the period 2017 to 2020. Section V provides elements of a possible decision for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties.

II. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF CAPACITY-BUILDING UNDER THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL

4. This section provides an overview of the status of capacity-building under the Protocol, including capacity-building activities undertaken by Parties, relevant organizations and the Secretariat, relating to the implementation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building. The overview is based on information provided by Parties in their third national reports as well as information made available by Parties and relevant organizations through the capacity-building databases in the Biosafety Clearing-House.

A. Capacity-building activities undertaken by Parties

5. According to the information made available in the third national reports, the level of capacity-building for the implementation of the Protocol has declined slightly over the last four years.² In response to Question 147 in the third national report format, 98 Parties (79%) reported that they had undertaken activities for the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety, compared to 119 Parties (83%) that responded to the same question during the second reporting period, representing a decline of -4%. This decline was reported across all the geographical regions, except Latin America and the Caribbean, which had a marked increase (100% vs 90%).³

6. Among the 98 Parties which reported having undertaken capacity-building activities, most noted that the activities related to capacity development and training of human resources (11%), institutional capacity-building (10%), risk assessment (10%), public awareness, participation and education (10%), identification of living modified organisms (LMOs), including their detection (9%), biosafety information exchange and data management including participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House (9%), and risk management (7%).

7. In their third national reports, a number of Parties indicated that they had carried out capacity-building activities relating to various elements of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building. A few Parties and other Governments also provided such information through the Biosafety Clearing-House. Some developed country Parties provided information about the financial and technological support provided to developing country Parties and the Parties with economies in transition for the implementation of the provisions of the Protocol, including support relating to various elements of the capacity-building Framework and Action Plan. A snapshot of the reported activities carried out and the support provided is presented in annex I.

B. Capacity-building activities undertaken by relevant organizations

8. Since the adoption of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building in 2012, a number of organizations have facilitated and supported biosafety capacity-building activities relating to various

¹ The title of the draft action plan recommended by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for consideration by the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/13) is "Short-term action plan (2017-2020) to enhance and support capacity-building for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets". However, in view of the fact that the draft action plan may include activities relating to the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya Protocol, it is proposed that the title of the action plan be changed to "Short-term action plan (2017-2020) to enhance and support capacity-building for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols".

² The Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building under review was adopted in 2012 after the second national reporting cycle.

³ Over 82% Parties in Africa (compared to 84% in 2012); 79% in Asia and the Pacific (vs. 80%) and 76% in Central and Eastern Europe (79%) reported having carried out biosafety capacity-building activities.

components of the Framework and Action Plan. They include: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); Food and Agriculture of Organization of the United Nations (FAO); United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB); Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA); International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI); International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI); New Partnership for Africa's Development/African Biosafety Network of Expertise (NEPAD/ABNE); GenØk – Centre for Biosafety; RAEIN-Africa; Biotechnology Consortium India Limited (BCIL) and others.

9. UNEP assisted a number of countries in executing projects funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to support the implementation of their national biosafety frameworks.⁴ It is supporting the development and implementation of the Multi-Country Regional Project to Strengthen Institutional Capacity on Testing of Living Modified Organisms in Support of National Decision-making in Southern Africa and Phase III of the global UNEP-GEF Project for Sustainable Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH III project). Some 40 other UNEP-supported GEF projects for the implementation of the national biosafety frameworks were also initiated prior to the adoption of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building and have been completed recently or are about to be completed.⁵ Those projects contributed in particular to the implementation of focal areas 1 (national biosafety frameworks), 2 (risk assessment and risk management), 3 (handling, transport, packaging and Identification) and 5 (public awareness, education and participation) of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building (see annex II). In addition, UNEP organized its annual National Project Coordinators workshops focused on regional coordination, status updates including new and emerging biosafety trends, and potential and emerging issues to mainstream into its Biosafety Portfolio to support national biosafety systems.⁶

10. FAO is assisting Sri Lanka with the execution of the GEF-funded project on the implementation of its national biosafety framework, which was approved in June 2016. FAO has also supported other countries through national, regional and global biosafety capacity-building activities. National-level support to countries such as Uruguay⁷ included the development and/or implementation of biosafety policies and regulatory frameworks, training in risk assessment and detection and monitoring of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), upgrading of infrastructure and technical capabilities and development of public awareness and participation strategies in biosafety-related decision-making. The regional and global activities included facilitating the sharing of information and experience, harmonization of tools and procedures for handling GMOs; issue-specific training, development of training materials and training-of-trainers programmes in GMO detection and monitoring and safety assessment of genetically modified (GM) food.

⁴ Countries with ongoing UNEP-GEF biosafety projects include Malaysia, Mauritania and Venezuela.

⁵ These included Albania (2011-2015), Bangladesh (2012-2016), Bhutan (2010-2014), Cambodia (2012-2016), Cameroon (2011-2016), (Costa Rica (2010-2014), Cuba (2010-2016), Ecuador (2010-2015), Egypt (2007-2016), El Salvador (2010-2015), Ethiopia (2012-2017), Ghana (2012-2015), Guatemala (2010-2015), India-Phase II (2011-2016), Indonesia (2011-2016), Iran (Islamic Republic of) (2011-2014), Jordan (2010-2014), Lao People's Democratic Republic (2009-2014), Lesotho (2011-2015), Liberia (2011-2015), Macedonia (2011-2015), Madagascar (2010-2016), Mauritius (2006-2014), Mongolia (2011-2014), Mozambique (2014-2015), Namibia (2011-2015), Nigeria (2011-2015), Panama (2011-2015), Peru (2010-2016), Rwanda (2012-2017), Swaziland (2012-2016), Syrian Arab Republic (2010-2015), Tajikistan (2011-2015), Tunisia (2006-2014), Turkey (2011-2017), Turkmenistan (2010-2014) and United Republic of Tanzania (2010-2014), as well as the regional Project for Implementing National Biosafety Frameworks in the Caribbean (2011-2016) covering 12 countries (Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines).

⁶ Since the adoption of the Framework and Action Plan, 10 workshops have been held: Madagascar (24-28 March 2013); Guatemala (10-14 June 2013); Mongolia (1-5 July 2013); Jordan (26-30 August 2013); Peru (10-14 March 2014); Ethiopia (12-16 May 2014); Bhutan (9-13 June 2014); Albania (18-22 May 2015); Panama (16-18 May 2016); Tunisia (15-19 June 2015); Bangladesh (19-23 September 2015); Namibia (27 June-1 July 2016); and India (18-22 September 2016).

⁷ FAO project TCP/URU/3403: "Strengthening national capacity in biosafety biotechnology for sustainable agricultural production".

11. UNIDO, through its “South–South Biosafety Networking Programme”, continued to coordinate and support a distant learning biosafety programme involving Gent University in Belgium, Marche Polytechnic University, Ancona, Italy, and Pontifical Catholic University of Minas, in Brazil.⁸ The programme includes international academically accredited courses, at Masters and diploma levels, based on a combination of distance-learning and on-campus training sessions. As part of this programme, UNIDO also coordinated the development of a Biosafety Manual (June 2015) with practical guidance for national authorities that are in the process of developing national biosafety regulations.⁹

12. ICGEB continued to assist its Member States to develop their capacity for identifying, regulating, managing and monitoring products derived from modern biotechnology, including through organising trainings on biosafety and maintaining the biosafety bibliographic database, an open access on-line searchable collection of scientific studies on biosafety and risk assessment.¹⁰ Furthermore, through phase II (2013-2016) of the Biosafety Capacity-Building Project in Sub Saharan Africa (SSA) funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, ICGEB supported the development of biosafety regulatory systems in selected countries, sponsored 18 regulatory officials/scientists to pursue a 2-year Master’s degree in biotechnology, with a special focus on the regulation of GM crops, at the University of Adelaide (Australia), organized four study visits for African regulators and scientific experts to established regulatory offices, and conducted over 10 biosafety training workshops in which over 300 officials participated. ICGEB also collaborated with the Australian-African Universities Network (AAUN), the Australia Office of the Gene Technology Regulator (OGTR), and the universities of Ghana, Melbourne and Nairobi to develop a Master of Biosafety programme in sub-Saharan Africa.

13. IICA contributed to the development of capacity in biotechnology and biosafety in Latin America and the Caribbean.¹¹ In 2013, IICA facilitated the establishment of the Central American Initiative on Biotechnology and Biosafety (ICABB), which aims to bolster national and regional actions to facilitate access to biotechnology, the safe use of its products, and the optimization and harmonization of the legal and policy frameworks for biosafety. In 2015, IICA and the international organization CropLife Latin America also signed a technical cooperation agreement to promote good agricultural practices and responsible use of biotechnology in Latin America and the Caribbean. Through joint actions, the cooperation seeks, among other things, to facilitate the exchange of scientifically validated information on topics such as biotechnology and biosafety, and organize training activities to provide technicians and government authorities with a scientific foundation to allow them to make knowledge-based decisions.

14. IFPRI continued to implement the Program for Biosafety Systems funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).¹² The Program supported a number of activities including: facilitation of the development and implementation of national biosafety policies, laws and regulations in the participating countries. It also supported regional policy research projects and field trials in East, West and Southern Africa. It also supported training-of-trainers courses and risk assessment research in Asia and Africa.¹³

⁸ See the UNIDO e-Biosafety Training Platform at: <http://binas.unido.org/moodle/> and an article in *New Biotechnology* (Volume 31, Issue 1, 25 January 2014) about experiences and challenges of a distance learning approach to biosafety capacity building: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1871678413001076>.

⁹ The manual is available at: <https://institute.unido.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/UNIDO-Biosafety-Manual-2015-06-17.pdf>

¹⁰ Details about ICGEB biosafety activities are available at: <http://biosafety.icgeb.org>. Recent trainings include courses on “Risk Analysis: Role of Science in GMO Decision-making” and on “Scientific and Technical Approaches in GMO Decision-making” held 30 June - 4 July 2014 and 19 - 23 October 2015, respectively, in Trieste, Italy.

¹¹ See details at: <http://www.iica.int/en/topics/biosafety>.

¹² The programme is implemented in Africa (Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria and Uganda,) and Asia (Philippines, Indonesia and Viet Nam).

¹³ Further information about PBS is available at: <http://programs.ifpri.org/pbs/pbs.asp>

15. The ILSI Research Foundation Center for Environmental Risk Assessment (CERA) assisted countries to develop and apply science to the environmental risk assessment of agricultural biotechnologies.¹⁴ In 2012, the Centre implemented a World Bank-funded Partnership for Biosafety Risk Assessment and Regulation, which ended in 2015. The project enhanced environmental risk assessment capacities in eight countries and promoted the harmonization and rationalization of national biosafety regulatory systems. Through the project, an e-learning platform to deliver biosafety training in an easily accessible and interactive format was developed and five e-learning courses were made available.

16. NEPAD-ABNE offered biosafety capacity-building services aimed at empowering regulators in Africa.¹⁵ This included providing members of National Biosafety Committees, Institutional Biosafety Committees and Plant Quarantine Officers as well as biosafety policy- and decision makers with science-based information to be able to make informed decisions on biotechnology products. ABNE services include information, training, education, and technical assistance related to the development of biosafety guidelines, standard operating procedures and implementing regulations. The training and resources provided by ABNE are utilized for reviewing biosafety applications, monitoring, and compliance of laboratory and greenhouse trials, confined field trials, general releases, and imports and exports of biotechnology food and feed products. In addition, ABNE facilitates policy dialogue through networking activities that bring together African regulators, policymakers, scientists, and other relevant stakeholders at the national, regional and international levels.

17. GenØk supported capacity-building activities on the safe use of modern biotechnologies.¹⁶ These included further generation and dissemination of scientific and social knowledge regarding biosafety, strengthening of biosafety systems of participating government authorities, strengthening the countries' abilities to perform risk assessments and safety evaluations and development of strong academic research and teaching environments within an institution that can act as a hub for other institutions within selected regions as well as international and regional training courses. Under phase II of the Norad-funded Capacity Building Programme (2013–2014),¹⁷ three regional biosafety courses were held in Brazil (2013), Moldova (2014) and Uruguay (2014). GenØk also collaborated in establishing well-functioning biosafety research programmes at North-West University in South Africa and Federal University of Santa Catarina in Brazil as well as exchange of personnel between GenØk and the two institutions. Furthermore, GenØk published peer-reviewed articles and policy briefs on various biosafety topics and provided advice on risk assessment and risk management of GMOs. With funding from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in collaboration with local partners, GenØk organized regional capacity-building courses on synthetic biology and biosafety for Southern Africa at North-West University in South Africa and for the ASEAN region in Viet Nam.

18. RAEIN-Africa is promoting participatory development of appropriate science and technology for sustainable management of the environment and agricultural production systems in the Southern Africa Region. It does so by facilitating the creation of partnerships between governments, civil society and end-user groups, as well as supporting development-oriented research and all-inclusive policy development processes. Through those partnerships, RAEIN-Africa provides support to countries on the safe use of modern biotechnology and is currently providing support to six countries on LMO detection.¹⁸

19. BCIL is actively involved in capacity-building activities in biosafety related to GMOs. These include preparation of research documents and reports and organizing national and international

¹⁴ <http://www.cera-gmc.org/>

¹⁵ See details at: <http://nepad-abne.net/>

¹⁶ Further information about GenØk's biosafety capacity-building activities is available at: <http://genok.com/>

¹⁷ The End Review of GenØk's Biosafety Capacity Building Program (2008-2014) is available at: http://genok.no/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/FinalReport_130116.pdf

¹⁸ Further information about RAEIN-Africa's biosafety capacity building activities is available at: <http://www.raein-africa.org/sangl>.

conferences, workshops on key policy issues, state and district level events for various stakeholders and farmers welfare. The focus area is South Asia with activities in India and Bangladesh under the USAID-supported South Asia Biosafety Programme, which is managed by ILSI. A key feature is the South Asia Biosafety Conference, which brings together leading scientists representing regulatory agencies, public sector research institutions, and the private sector in South Asia and internationally. The 4th Conference in the series was held in 2016 in Hyderabad, India.¹⁹

C. Capacity-building activities undertaken by the Secretariat

20. Since the adoption of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building, the Secretariat has implemented a number of capacity-building activities to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol with support from various donors, including the European Union, Japan Biodiversity Fund and the Korea Biosafety Capacity-Building Initiative. For example, in collaboration with partner organizations, the Secretariat organized and facilitated the following trainings which relate to different components of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building:

(a) Six regional capacity-building workshops on mainstreaming biosafety into national biodiversity strategies and action plans and resource mobilization for: (a) Central and Eastern Europe in Batumi, Georgia (16-20 December 2013); (b) West Asia and North Africa in Dubai, United Arab Emirates (16-20 November 2014); (c) Asia in Ulaanbaatar, 9-13 February 2015; the Caribbean in Saint John's, Antigua and Barbuda (9-13 March 2015); (d) Latin America in Montevideo, 8-12 December 2014; and (e) Africa in Addis Ababa, 9-12 February 2016. These activities contributed to operational objective 1 of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building;

(b) Two training workshops on the detection and identification of LMOs were held, for Central and Eastern European in Ljubljana, Slovenia (7-11 March 2016), and for Latin America in Mexico City (15-19 August 2016). A series of online discussions were also held on topics relevant to detection and identification (January-April 2015). These activities contributed to operational objective 3;

(c) Two workshops of the Network of Laboratories for the Detection and Identification of Living Modified Organisms in Ispra, Italy (25-27 November 2013 and 9-11 June 2015). These activities contributed to operational objective 3;

(d) A subregional workshop on capacity-building for the effective implementation of the Cartagena Protocol was held for the Caribbean in Saint George's, Grenada (4-8 March 2013), which contributed to operational objective 1;

(e) Two regional training workshops on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs were held for Africa held in Kampala (5-9 November 2012) and for Asia held in Hanoi, 25-29 March 2013. These workshops contributed to operational objective 5.

21. The Secretariat also developed the following capacity-building tools:

(a) Two self-directed e-learning modules on access to biosafety information and on public participation regarding LMOs, which were made available through the Secretariat's E-Learning Platform hosted by the United Nations System Staff College (<https://scbd.unssc.org>), financed by the Japan Biodiversity Fund. This activity contributed to operational objective 5;

(b) A Training manual on risk assessment of living modified organisms in the context of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which contributed to operational objective 2.

¹⁹ Further information about the BCIL capacity building activities and the South Asia Biosafety Conferences is available at: <http://www.bci.nic.in/biosafety.htm> and <http://sabc.biotech.co.in>

22. Furthermore, with support from the Japan Biodiversity Fund, the Secretariat facilitated a pilot project on capacity-building to promote integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the Convention on Biological Diversity at the national level. The project assisted nine Parties (Belarus, Burkina Faso, China, Ecuador, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Republic of Moldova and Uganda) in conducting desk studies to assess the extent to which biosafety is integrated into existing national policies, strategies and activities; organize national round tables to review the study results, organize seminars to increase the awareness of key policy- and decision makers; and develop and test practical actions to promote integrated national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the Convention. The experiences and good practices from the nine pilot countries are to be shared in a global workshop to be held from 31 October to 4 November 2016 in the Republic of Moldova. An e-learning module and toolkit on biosafety mainstreaming are also being developed under the project for dissemination to all Parties.

III. STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FRAMEWORK AND ACTION PLAN FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING AND POSSIBLE WAYS FORWARD FOR IMPROVING ITS IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

23. This section summarizes the status of implementation of the seven focal areas of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building. A detailed analysis of the status and trends in the implementation of those focal areas is presented in UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.1 (under operational objectives 2.1 to 2.7 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol):

(a) *Focal Area 1 - National Biosafety Frameworks:* The analysis of information available suggests that good progress has been made towards the implementation of this focal area. Most of the biosafety capacity-building projects and activities carried out since the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building was adopted have contributed to this focal area, including those funded by GEF (annex 1). However, more needs to be done to fully achieve the expected outputs and outcomes of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol. As recommended by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation,²⁰ for the remaining period of the Strategic Plan and Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building, Parties may wish to prioritize this focal area in view of its critical contribution to the successful implementation of the Protocol;

(b) *Focal Area 2 - Risk Assessment and Risk Management:* A large number of capacity-building projects and activities that were carried out by Parties, relevant organizations and the Secretariat since 2012 have contributed to this focal area (as described in section II above and summarized in annex 1). Overall, some progress has been made under this focal area but more still needs to be done. As recommended by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, Parties may also wish to prioritize this focal area during the remaining period of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol and of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building;

(c) *Focal Area 3 - Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification:* As described in section III, sub-section F of document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.1, there has been some improvement in the implementation of this focal area since the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building was adopted in 2012. Nearly half of the biosafety capacity-building projects implemented since 2012 had components which contributed to this focal area (as described in section II above and summarized in annex I). Overall, this focal area has also been addressed to some extent through more still needs to be done. As recommended by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, Parties may also wish to prioritize this focal area during the remaining period of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol and Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building;

(d) *Focal Area 4 - Liability and Redress:* There has been very limited progress made under this focal area mainly because the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and

²⁰ Recommendation 1/3, para. 7.

Redress has not yet entered into force.²¹ Few biosafety capacity-building projects that were implemented since 2012 had explicit activities aimed at contributing to this focal area, including those in Cambodia, Ghana, Malaysia, Namibia, Rwanda and Swaziland. Nevertheless, it is expected that, following the entry into force of the Supplementary Protocol, demand for capacity-building support in this area will increase;

(e) *Focal Area 5 - Public Awareness, Education and Participation:* Most of the biosafety capacity-building projects carried out since the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building was adopted had a component relating to this focal area (see annex 1). Nevertheless, as noted in UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.1, more work needs to be done to achieve the expected outcomes in the Strategic Plan. As recommended by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, Parties may also wish to further prioritize this focal area during the remaining period;

(f) *Focal Area 6 - Information Sharing:* The analysis presented in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.1 suggests that there has been moderate progress made under this focal area. Many countries now have basic capacity to access and use the Biosafety Clearing-House, thanks to the support provided under the UNEP-GEF Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the as well as other national biosafety projects;

(g) *Focal Area 7 - Biosafety Education and Training:* There has been limited progress under this focal area. In their third national reports, few Parties reported having biosafety education and training courses and programmes.²² Some organizations, such as UNEP, ICGEB, UNIDO and GenØk, also supported the establishment or expansion of academically accredited courses and programmes on biosafety in collaboration with various universities as well as facilitation of academic exchanges and collaboration among universities and academic networks (see section II).²³ Further efforts may be required to increase accessibility to academically accredited training and educational opportunities in biosafety for relevant government officials, researchers and practitioners.

24. The implementation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building has been limited various factors. Some of the main challenges are the following:

(a) *Lack of predictable funding for capacity-building:* In responding to Question 139 in the third national report, only 40 Parties (32%) reported that their country has predictable and reliable funding for building capacity for the effective implementation of the Protocol. 84 Parties (68%) reported that they did not have predictable and reliable funding. The percentages of respondents from the different regions/economic groups reporting the latter are as follows: 82% of the respondents from Africa, 54% in Asia and the Pacific, 47% in Central and Eastern Europe, 86% in Latin America and the Caribbean, 56% in the Western Europe and Others Group, 87% from least developed countries and 80% from small island developing States;

(b) *Lack of adequate human-resource capacity:* Many countries still lack trained and experienced staff in biosafety and have the difficulties in attracting and retaining qualified experts;

(c) *Low priority given to biosafety:* In some countries, due to lack of political will low priority is given to biosafety issues during the national budgeting processes, the national allocation of GEF resources and in the development country strategy papers, which usually highlight the countries' priority areas for development cooperation;

²¹ As of 30 September 2016, 36 instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession have been deposited. Four more instruments are required for the Supplementary Protocol to enter into force.

²² Bulgaria, Cuba, Italy, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Republic of Moldova and Tunisia reported that universities within their territories were offering academically accredited courses and programmes on biosafety at Masters or PhD levels.

²³ For example, the UNEP-GEF Regional Project for Implementing National Biosafety Frameworks in the Caribbean Sub-region supported the establishment of an MSc and a Postgraduate Diploma in Biosafety at the University of West Indies (<http://caribbeanbiosafety.org/centre-for-biosafety/msc-programme>).

(d) *Limited coordination and collaboration between biosafety initiatives:* The effectiveness of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol and Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building is also limited in part by the low level of coordination and collaboration between existing biosafety capacity-building initiatives, especially at the country level. In some cases this has led to duplication of effort, inconsistent approaches and missed opportunities for complementarity.

25. In reviewing the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building at its eighth meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to take note of the status and trends in capacity-building under the Protocol as summarized in the present note and in the analysis presented in UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.1 and provide further guidance on measures to improve its implementation, taking into account:

(a) Paragraph 7 of recommendation 1/3 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, in which the Subsidiary Body urged Parties, for the remaining period of the Strategic Plan, to consider prioritizing and focussing on operational objectives relating to the development of biosafety legislation, risk assessment, detection and identification of living modified organisms, and public awareness, education and training in view of their critical importance in facilitating the implementation of the Protocol;

(b) The need for integration of biosafety into national biodiversity strategies and actions plans and broader national development strategies towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals;²⁴

(c) Opportunities for direct bilateral exchanges of technical experts between countries as a means for building capacities in biosafety and for encouraging bilateral or regional cooperation;

(d) The need to foster partnerships and collaboration with other countries, including through South-South and North-South cooperation.

IV. BIOSAFETY ACTIVITIES IN THE SHORT-TERM ACTION PLAN (2017-2020) TO ENHANCE AND SUPPORT CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION AND ITS PROTOCOLS

26. In its decision XII/2 B, the Conference of the Parties underlined the importance of a coherent and mutually supportive approach to capacity-building, exchange of information, technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer under the Convention and its Protocols. In this regard, the Executive Secretary was requested to, inter alia, develop a short-term action plan to enhance and support capacity-building, especially for developing countries, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States, and countries with economies in transition.

27. Pursuant to the above decision, the Executive Secretary prepared a draft short-term action plan to enhance and support capacity-building for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols and made it available for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its first meeting which was held 2-6 May 2016 in Montreal, Canada. The short-term action plan was based on previous decisions of the Conference of the Parties and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meetings of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing requesting the Executive Secretary to undertake, coordinate and facilitate capacity-building on various issues and also took into account the results of processes outlined in paragraph 8 of decision XII/2 B.

28. In its recommendation 1/5, paragraphs 1 to 3, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation took note of the draft short-term action plan and requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, to further streamline and focus the action plan, and submit a revised draft for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting. A more

²⁴ General Assembly resolution 70/1 of 25 September 2015 on “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”.

streamlined version of the draft action plan was made available to Parties at the four regional joint preparatory meetings for the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and the meetings of the Parties to the Protocols, which were held for Asia (Bangkok, 1-5 August 2016), Africa (Addis Ababa, 8-12 August 2016), Pacific (Apia, 15-19 August 2016) and Latin America and the Caribbean (Antigua, Guatemala 22-26 August 2016). Country representatives at those meetings reviewed and prioritized the proposed activities.²⁵ The revised draft short-term action plan was sent to all Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations for peer-review and further prioritization, through notification 85976 of 16 September 2016.

29. The final revised draft short-term action plan has been made available as document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/13. For purposes of providing a comprehensive overview of all capacity-building and technical and scientific cooperation activities to be facilitated and supported by the Secretariat in collaboration with partner organizations, the draft short-term action plan includes, in the annex to that document, activities in support of both the Convention and its two Protocols to be implemented in an integrated and coordinated manner.²⁶

30. It is noted that the priority activities relating to the Cartagena Protocol and to the Nagoya Protocol in the short-term action plan are to be decided by respective Conferences of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to those Protocols. In this regard, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol may wish to decide on priority capacity-building activities for supporting the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and their inclusion in the short-term action plan to enhance and support capacity-building for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols, which will bring together capacity-building activities to be facilitated and supported by the Secretariat in collaboration with relevant organizations over the period 2017 to 2020.

V. SUGGESTED ELEMENTS OF A DRAFT DECISION

31. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety may wish to consider adopting a decision along the following lines:

Taking note of the report on the status of implementation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol submitted by the Executive Secretary,²⁷

Noting the progress made in the implementation of the various focal areas of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building, in particular focal areas 1, 2 and 5 on national biosafety frameworks, risk assessment and risk management, and public awareness, education and participation, respectively,

1. *Decides* to maintain the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol as adopted in decision BS-VI/3;

2. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to enhance efforts to implement the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building;

²⁵ It is noted that the majority of the country representatives at the regional meetings were CBD national focal points. Very few Cartagena Protocol focal points or officials familiar with the work of the Protocol were represented.

²⁶ The short-term action plan complements other capacity-building strategic frameworks and action plans developed under the Convention and its Protocols, including: the strategic framework for capacity-building and development to support the effective implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the Capacity-building Strategy for the Global Taxonomy Initiative, and the Bio-Bridge Initiative (BBI) Action Plan 2017-2020.

²⁷ UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/3.

3. *Urges* Parties, for the remaining period until 2020, to prioritize and focus, as appropriate on operational objectives relating to the development of national biosafety legislation, risk assessment, detection and identification of living modified organisms, and public awareness, education and participation;

4. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations in a position to do so, to provide additional financial and technical support to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition in order to further implement the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building;

5. *Urges* Parties and other Governments to integrate biosafety in their national biodiversity strategies and actions plans and broader national development strategies for implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals;²⁸

6. *Adopts* the priority capacity-building activities to be facilitated and supported by the Secretariat in collaboration with relevant organizations for supporting the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the inclusion of these priority activities in the short-term action plan to enhance and support capacity-building for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols over the period from 2017 to 2020.

²⁸ See General Assembly resolution 70/1 of 25 September 2015 on “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”.

*Annex I***SNAPSHOT OF THE BIOSAFETY CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES AND SUPPORT REPORTED BY PARTIES AND OTHER GOVERNMENTS**

1. A number of Parties and other Governments reported having carried out capacity-building activities relating to various elements of the capacity-building Framework and Action Plan. Below is a snapshot of the activities reported:

(a) Bahrain hosted its first national workshop on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in September 2016 to raise awareness and understanding of the Protocol and its requirements;

(b) Barbados organized a biosafety sensitization workshop on 5-6 July 2016 as a follow-up activity to the biosafety policy workshop held from 19-20 May 2016. A workshop was also held in Bridgetown to analyse and draft the basic structure for a national BCH website;

(c) Belarus organized a scientific workshop on LMO Detection in September 2015;

(d) Bulgaria organized various training workshops and seminars for staff in the regional directorates of the Ministry of Environment and Water who are responsible for control of GMOs. The National GMO reference laboratory also organizes an annual training course on biosafety. In addition, biosafety-related topics have been incorporated in the curriculum of several university courses for graduate and undergraduate students;

(e) China organized several training workshops for more than 300 officials on various biosafety issues, including sampling and testing of GMOs, and strengthened national capacity for biosafety research, risk assessment and LMO testing by reinforcing the infrastructure of GMO laboratories, upgrading the capacities of personnel involved, as well as developing technical standards and guidelines for LMO testing and risk assessment;

(f) Cuba, through its UNEP-GEF project for the strengthening of implementation of the national biosafety framework co-sponsored a workshop on lessons learnt from similar projects in the LAC region held 16-18 May 2016 in Panama City. The workshop brought together representatives from Costa Rica, Peru, Cuba and Panama to share information about their NBF implementation projects including the challenges faced and opportunities for collaboration;

(g) In Ecuador, three workshops were held to assess the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Ecuador were held in Guayaquil, Loja and Quito within the framework of the implementation of the project "Capacity building to promote the full implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Convention on Biological Diversity at the national level";

(h) Egypt developed procedures and guidelines for the risk assessment and risk management of living modified organisms and their products and held a series of national workshops to discuss those guidelines in line with Egypt's obligations as a party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

(i) Iran organized a workshop from 14-18 June 2015 in Tehran Iran to analyse and review gaps in the national biosafety system based on Iran Biosafety Law, review and analyse the status of public awareness and participation in Iran, review and analyse the GM food safety assessment guidelines, and develop a strategic plan and road map for biosafety;

(j) Kazakhstan is scheduled to participate in the regional project "Capacity building for the formation of a network of laboratories for the detection of GMOs and the establishment of a single reference laboratory in the CIS countries;

(k) Kenya, through the National Biosafety Authority, organizes annual biosafety conferences which is used as a platform to bring together regulators, scientists and capacity building institutions to review and share knowledge on new developments in biotechnology and biosafety. The fifth annual

conference was held under the theme “Strengthening global, regional, national collaboration, partnerships and capacity towards meeting International Obligations in Biosafety” in Nairobi from 15 to 18 August 2016. The meeting was held back to back with the First Africa Biosafety Leadership Summit on 15 and 16 August 2016;

(l) The Lao People’s Democratic Republic organized a Risk Assessment and Risk Management Training Workshop from 16 to 27 June 2014 in Vientiane, in which 40 participants attended;

(m) In Lebanon, nine academic institutions offer courses related to biotechnology for PhD students, two of them cover in their courses biosafety issues and one of them provides specific training courses on detection, identification and assessment of LMOs;

(n) Liberia established a state-of the-art laboratory for GMO detection in August 2016 as one of several outcomes under the UNEP-GEF project “Support the Implementation of Liberia’s National Biosafety Framework”. In June 2014, the Environmental Protection Agency also conducted capacity building workshops on the Biosafety Clearing House;

(o) In Malaysia, the Department of Biosafety strengthened its infrastructure and mechanisms to facilitate the coordination, collection and storage of data for the better inter-sectoral information sharing, exchange and data management to ensure effective management of LMOs in the country. The government also promoted the incorporation of biosafety modules into the curriculum of not only tertiary and secondary schools but also university curricula. A national workshop on the establishment of a regulatory framework for liability and redress for damage caused by LMOs was held in March 2015;

(p) Mexico, through its Inter-ministerial Commission on Biosafety of Genetically Modified Organisms (CIBIOGEM), organized three 5-day regional capacity-building courses in biosafety of genetically modified organisms for public servants from Latin America and the Caribbean countries to strengthen technical capacity of CNAs and related institutions to achieve comprehensive biosafety management in the region. The courses were held in Mexico City from 14 to 18 March 2016 and from 23 to 27 March 2015 as well as March 2014;

(q) Peru, through the Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina (UNALM), the Research Center Arid Lands (CIZA-UNALM) and the Coordinator of Science and Technology in the Andes (CCTA) organized a modular course on biosafety of LMOs in productive ecosystems and their environment, from 9 to 13 May 2016 at the UNALM campus in Lima. The course introduced participants to living modified organisms and their use in production systems, their impacts on ecosystems, the socioeconomic and cultural aspects, and the political and legal framework of biosafety in Peru;

(r) The Philippines organized workshops on the testing of the risk assessment guidance on LMOs on 24-25 October 2013 and 24-25 March 2014 for staff of Competent National Authorities (CNAs) engaged in biosafety regulations and risk assessment of LMOs;

(s) The Republic of Moldova reported that the Faculty of Biology and Soil Sciences at the State University of Moldova is offering an academically accredited course on biosafety and sustainable development for Master degree students;

(t) Sri Lanka organized training workshops on risk assessment and risk management, on the use of Biosafety Clearing-House, and on the genetically modified food regulations. Sri Lanka also provided experts to assist in the development of the National Biosafety Framework of Maldives;

(u) Togo, as part of the implementation of the WAEMU Regional Biosafety Program (PRB-UEMOA) organized a capacity-building workshop for customs and boarder control officials on 3 and 4 September 2015 in Lomé to introduce the requirements of the Cartagena Protocol on documentation and identification of genetically modified products and techniques and methodologies that can be used to ensure compliance with those requirements;

(v) Tunisia has organized various biosafety capacity-building activities with funding from the GEF, Germany and the European Union. For example, students and researchers have benefited from scientific and technical training on biosafety in institutions and laboratories abroad. Biosafety courses are also offered by some local academic institutions, including on topics covering legal and technical aspects;

(w) Uruguay organized a workshop on analysis of the safety of genetically modified foods from 21 to 22 October 2015 in Montevideo as part of the FAO project (TCP/URU/3403): "Strengthening national capacity in biosafety biotechnology for sustainable agricultural production. It also held a workshop on coexistence between different production systems (GMO and non-GMO) from 7 to 8 October 2015 in Montevideo which highlighted elements to consider in designing strategies for coexistence, management techniques in small farms to avoid contamination, organic production and coexistence, GMO production and non-GMO soybeans, biosecurity protocols, logistics and traceability chains and comparative legislation.

2. The following developed country Parties reported on their capacity-building activities and the support they provided to other countries relating to the implementation of the capacity-building Framework and Action Plan.

(a) Austria provided technical support to various countries including in the fields of risk assessment and the detection and identification of living modified organisms;

(b) Czech Republic organized special workshops for countries requiring technical support on a bilateral basis and its experts assisted in the EU workshops in some EU accession countries. Regional training workshops were also organized in cooperation with FAO and the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of the Environment;

(c) European Union and its Member States contributed to capacity building initiatives for the effective implementation of the Protocol in various developing country Parties as well as in Parties with economies in transition, including through contributions to GEF;

(d) Italy, through its Ministry of the Environment, supported various activities to develop and/or strengthen human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety, including the UNIDO e-Biosafety programme at Marche Polytechnic University in Ancona, including the UNIDO e-Biosafety Master Edition (2012-2013); E-Biosafety Master Edition (2013-2014) and on-campus week (2013-2014); and 8th Edition of the Università Politecnica delle Marche (UNIVPM)/UNIDO E-Biosafety Master Summer Course ON CAMPUS (June 2014). The Ministry also supported training courses organized by the International Centre of Genetics Engineering Biotechnology (ICGEB), including workshops on: "Risk Assessment: Role of Science in GMO Decision-making" (30 June-4 July 2014); "Problem Formulation: A Strategic Approach to Risk Assessment of GMOs" (2012); and on "Strategic Approaches in the Evaluation of Science Underpinning GMO Regulatory Decision-making" (2013);

(e) Japan, through its Japan Biodiversity Fund, provided support to strengthen the capacity of Parties to advance national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and ratification of the Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, including enhancing the capacity for integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Convention on Biological Diversity at the national level. The activities, which were supported through the Secretariat, are described in paragraphs 5 to 7 above;

(f) Norway through its Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Norad provided support for various capacity-building activities which were implemented by GenØk – Centre for Biosafety as described in paragraph 17 above;

(g) The Republic of Korea, through the Korea Biosafety Clearing House, sponsored the forth Asia regional Biosafety Clearing-House workshop in partnership with UNEP, held from 17 to 20 November 2015 in Nanjing, China, which adopted the Asia Biosafety Clearing-House Roadmap 2015-2020 focused on building capacity towards effective participation to the BCH, promoting public

awareness, education and participation, and enhancing regional networking and cooperation. At a follow-up workshop held from 5 to 7 April 2016 in Muntinupa, Philippines, Parties in the regional identified concrete steps to implement the Roadmap, including the establishment of Asia BCH web portal. The Republic of Korea conducted a customized training programme on LMO detection and policymaking for two officials from Bhutan from 5 to 30 October 2015 and another workshop on LMO Biosafety and Safety Management from 21 to 24 April 2015 for 10 government officials from Bhutan as part of the Korea Biosafety Capacity Building Initiative announced at the 7th meeting of the Parties to the Protocol;

(h) Spain organized several seminars on biosafety through the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation and Development and provided information to the Biosafety Clearing-House. Furthermore, Spain provided funding and technical experts for various courses, seminars, workshops and exchange programs on biosafety within the framework of the Technical Assistance and Information Exchange Program of the European Commission Directorate General for Enlargement;

(i) Switzerland, through the Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH), SUVA (an independent, non-profit insurance company under public law) and the Swiss Expert Committee for Biosafety (SECB) developed a Curriculum Biosafety to harmonize the biosafety standards within Switzerland on a high professional level. Under the supervision of these authorities, the study supervision (b-Safe GmbH) organizes every year a series of general biosafety training courses for biosafety officers (BSO), which are designed according to biosafety levels and delivered by renowned biosafety experts.²⁹

²⁹ Further information about meetings and courses for biosafety officers (BSO) is available at: <http://www.bafu.admin.ch/biotechnologie/01744/02964/index.html?lang=en>.

Annex II

CONTRIBUTION OF VARIOUS PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DIFFERENT FOCAL AREAS OF THE CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN

Project/Activities	Focal Areas*						
	NBFs	RA&RM	HTPI	L&R	PAEP	BCH	EDU
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Albania (2011-2015)	X	X			X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Bangladesh (2012-2016)	X		X		X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Bhutan (2010-2014)	X	X			X	X	X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Cambodia (2012-2016)			X	X	X	X	
UNEP-GEF Project on Development of a National Monitoring and Control System (Framework) for LMOs and Invasive Alien Species in Cameroon (2011-2016)	X	X	X		X	X	
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Costa Rica (2010-2014)	X	X			X	X	X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Cuba (2010-2016)	X		X				X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Ecuador (2010-2015)	X				X		X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Egypt (2007-2016)	X	X	X		X	X	
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for El Salvador (2010-2015)	X	X			X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Ethiopia (2012-2017)	X	X	X		X	X	X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Ghana (2012-2015)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Guatemala (2010-2015)	X	X			X		X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for India-Phase II (2011-2016)		X	X		X		X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Indonesia (2011-2016)							
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Iran (2011-2014)	X	X	X		X	X	
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Jordan (2010-2014)	X	X	X		X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Lao PDR (2009-2014)	X	X			X	X	
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Lesotho (2011-2015)	X	X	X		X		X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Liberia (2011-2015)	X	X			X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Macedonia (2011-2015)		X	X		X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Madagascar (2010-2016)	X	X	X		X	X	
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Mauritius (2006-2014)	X	X	X		X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Mongolia (2011-2014)	X		X		X	X	X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Mozambique (2014-2015)	X	X	X		X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Namibia (2011-2015)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Nigeria (2011-2015)	X	X	X		X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Panama (2011-2015)	X	X	X		X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Peru (2010-2016)	X	X			X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Rwanda (2012-2017)	X	X			X		X

Project/Activities	Focal Areas*						
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Swaziland (2012-2016)	X	X	X	X	X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Syria (2010-2015)	X	X			X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Tajikistan (2011-2015)	X				X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Tanzania (2010-2014)	X	X	X		X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Tunisia (2006-2014)	X		X		X	X	X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Turkey (2011-2017)	X	X	X		X		
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Turkmenistan (2010-2014)							
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for the Caribbean (2011-2016)	X	X	X		X	X	X
ONGOING PROJECTS							
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Institutional Support Project for Malaysia (Started, April 2015)		X	X		X		X
UNEP-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Mauritania (Started, December 2015)	X				X		
FAO-GEF NBF Implementation Support Project for Sri Lanka (Started, June 2016)	X	X	X		X		
CAPACITY-BUILDING INITIATIVES OF RELEVANT ORGANIZATIONS							
CBD Secretariat	X	X	X				
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Food and Agriculture of Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	X	X			X		
United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)	X	X					X
International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB)	X	X	X		X	X	X
Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA)		X			X	X	
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)	X	X					
International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI)		X					
New Partnership for Africa's Development/African Biosafety Network of Expertise (NEPAD/ABNE)		X	X		X	X	X
GenØk – Centre for Biosafety		X	X			X	X

* Focal areas: NBF (national biosafety frameworks), RA&RM (risk assessment and risk management), HTPI (handling, transport, packaging and identification), L&R (liability and redress), PAEP (public awareness, education and participation), BCH (information-sharing and Biosafety Clearing-House), EDU (biosafety education and training).

Annex III

REVISED DRAFT SHORT-TERM ACTION PLAN (2017-2020) TO ENHANCE AND SUPPORT CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR THE CONVENTION AND ITS PROTOCOLS

D: CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

1. Further develop capacity-building materials and guidelines on mainstreaming biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans	BS-VII/5 para. 10; BS-VII/1, para. 5	2017-2018	An e-learning module and a toolkit on mainstreaming biosafety developed and made available in English, French and Spanish Parties' capacity to integrate biosafety issues into NBSAPs and national development plans and sectoral policies and programmes enhanced	Trends in the number of Parties accessing and using e-learning module and toolkit to promote the integration of biosafety into their NBSAPs	SCBD, Strathclyde University	35,000
2. Organize subregional trainings on mainstreaming biosafety into NBSAP and development plans, making use of the above e-learning module and toolkit (Activity 97), in collaboration with partners	BS-VII/5 para. 10; BS-VII/1, para. 5	2017-2018	Parties' capacity to integrate biosafety issues into NBSAPs and national development plans and programmes enhanced	Number persons participating in the trainings and using materials to promote the integration of biosafety into their NBSAPs; Trends in the number of countries with biosafety integrated in their NBSAPs	SCBD, UNEP, UNDP, FAO	420,000 ³⁰
3. Support selected developing countries to implement pilot projects to develop and apply practical measures and approaches for integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the CBD at the national level and share emerging good practices and lessons learned	XII/29 para 9-11, BS-VII/5 para 12, 18 BS-VI/3 para 9	2017-2020	At least 20 countries develop practical actions to promote integrated national implementation of the CPB and the CBD and prepare case studies on their experiences and lessons learned	Number of country case studies on the integrated implementation of the CPB and the CBD available Number of countries sharing their experiences and lessons learned	SCBD, UNEP, UNDP, FAO	350,000
4. Organize training courses in	BS-VII/12, paras.	2017-2020	Improved capacity of Parties to	Number of regional training courses	SCBD,	300,000

³⁰ Cost for six workshops, including travel and DSA for participants and resource persons from external partners and SCBD staff.

	risk assessment using the latest version of the manual on risk assessment of LMOs	11-14		conduct risk assessment of LMOs in accordance with the Protocol	successfully carried out; Number of people trained in risk assessment	AHTEG on risk assessment	
5.	Develop e-learning modules based on the latest version of the manual on risk assessment of LMOs and the experience learned from activity 104 below	BS-V/12, para. 9 (d)	2017-2020	Interactive e-learning modules made available to Parties as a more cost-effective way of delivering training	Number of e-learning modules available; Number of downloads and use of the e-learning modules	AHTEG on risk assessment	80,000
6.	Organize regional and subregional capacity-building activities to enable Parties to implement the LMO identification requirements of paragraph 2 (a) of Article 18 and related decisions	BS-III/10	2017-2020	Parties are better equipped to take measures to ensure that shipments of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed or processing (LMOs-FFP) are identified through accompanying documentation and to prevent and penalize illegal transboundary movements of LMOs	Number of Parties taking domestic measures to ensure that all LMOs-FFP shipments are identified in accompanying documentation; Number of Parties with domestic measures to prevent and penalize illegal transboundary movements	SCBD	420,000
7.	Organize capacity-building workshops on sampling, detection and identification of LMOs	BS-VII/10, para. 5 (d); [BSCOP-MOP 8/9, para. 29]	2017-2020	Parties are trained and equipped for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs; Parties are assisted in fulfilling the requirements under Article 17 of the Cartagena Protocol	Number of regional capacity-building workshops successfully organized; Number of participants taking part in the workshops	SCBD, EU-JRC, and reference laboratories in each region	300,000
8.	Develop, in collaboration with relevant organizations, training materials on sampling, detection and identification of LMOs	BS-VII/10, para. 5 (d)	2017-2020	Parties are trained in LMO sampling, detection and identification	Number of collaborations established on the development of capacity-building curricula	SCBD, Network of LMO Detection and Identification Laboratories, UNEP	80,000
9.	Organize online discussions and knowledge-sharing sessions through the Network of Laboratories on the detection	BS-V/9, para. 5	2017-2020	Technical tools for the detection of illegal/ unauthorized LMOs are compiled and made available to Parties	Number of Parties using tools for detecting unauthorized LMOs; Number of downloads from BCH	SCBD, Network of LMO Detection and	Staff time

and identification of LMOs					Identification Laboratories, UNEP	
10. Organize subregional workshops on public awareness and education concerning LMOs	BS-V/13	2017-2020	Parties' capacity to promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation concerning LMOs enhanced	Number of workshops successfully conducted; Number of individuals participating in the workshops	SCBD, UNEP, Aarhus Convention	300,000
11. Organize training courses on public participation and public access to information, to advance the implementation of the Programme of Work on public awareness, education, and public participation concerning LMOs	BS COP-MOP 8/15, para. 26 (h) (i)	2017-2020	Parties' capacity to promote and facilitate access to biosafety information and public participation concerning LMOs enhanced	Number of training courses successfully conducted; Number of Parties participating in the training courses and having access to information.	SCBD, the Aarhus Convention	200,000
12. Develop learning materials on public awareness and education concerning LMOs	BS-V/12, BS-V/13	2017-2020	Learning materials readily and widely accessed and used by Parties to improve their capacity to raise public awareness and education concerning LMOs	Number of toolkits and best practices handbooks produced Number of downloads of the materials made through the BCH	SCBD, the Aarhus Convention, UNEP	50,000
13. Support online networks and communities of practice to facilitate exchange of knowledge, experiences and lessons learned on PAEP	BS-V/13	2017-2020	Parties are sharing experience and lessons learned on public awareness, education and participation	Trends in the number of individuals participating in discussion forums and communities of practice	SCBD, the Aarhus Convention, UNEP	Staff time
14. Organize capacity building workshops to raise awareness of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress	BS COP-MOP 8/14, para. 12(d)	2017-2020	Parties' awareness and understanding of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress enhanced	Number of capacity building workshop organized Number of Parties in attendance	SCBD	300,000
TOTAL FUNDING NEEDED FOR BIOSAFETY ACTIVITIES						2,835,000