



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12
8 September 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 14.2 of the provisional agenda

**ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL
ON BIOSAFETY AND MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE
STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE PROTOCOL**

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Article 35 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety requires the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to undertake, five years after the entry into force of the Protocol and at least every five years thereafter, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Protocol, including an assessment of its procedures and annexes. In accordance with this requirement, the first review was conducted at the fourth meeting of the Parties, in 2008. In that review, it was noted that, due to the limited operational experience gained by Parties in the implementation of the Protocol, there was insufficient basis for an effective assessment and review. The second assessment and review of the effectiveness was conducted at the sixth meeting, in 2012. The third assessment and review is scheduled to be conducted at the eighth meeting of the Parties.

2. The Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020 was adopted in 2010 through [decision BS-V/16](#). The Parties to the Protocol also decided that a midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan would be carried out five years after its adoption in conjunction with the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol.

3. At its seventh meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties, in its [decision BS-VII/14](#), welcomed, with revisions, the third national reporting format proposed by the Secretariat and recognized the intended role of the information contained therein in facilitating the conduct of both the midterm review of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol as well as the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol.

4. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties requested Parties, among others, to use the revised format for the preparation of their third national report and to submit their report to the Secretariat:

(a) Twelve months prior to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties, which would consider the reports;

(b) Through the Biosafety Clearing-House, or in the format made available by the Secretariat for this purpose, duly signed by the national focal point;

5. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties, in its decision [BS-VII/3](#), requested the relevant subsidiary body¹ to undertake the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, taking into account the information gathered and analysed by the Executive Secretary, contribution from the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building and input from the Compliance Committee, as well as the views of representatives of indigenous and local communities by ensuring their participation in the review process, and to submit its findings and recommendations to Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties for its consideration at its eighth meeting. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties also decided that the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol should be combined with the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan at the eighth meeting of the Parties.

6. At its sixth meeting, in decision BS-VI/9, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties decided that, at its eighth meeting, in conjunction with the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan, it would reconsider the need to establish an open-ended subsidiary body for scientific advice under the Protocol. An update of the review of the operations and experience of ad hoc technical expert groups established under the Protocol to date is provided in document UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.2.

7. The present note is aimed at assisting the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties in its task of considering the recommendations of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation adopted at its first meeting after having undertaken the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020. Section II provides a summary of the work carried out towards the third assessment and review of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020. Section III provides a summary of the emerging trends in the implementation of the Protocol. Section IV contains the recommendations of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties.

II. SUMMARY OF THE PROCESS

A. Data collection and analysis

8. In its decision BS-VII/3, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties decided that the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan would draw upon available information from the third national reports as a primary source and the Biosafety Clearing-House; where appropriate, additional data could be collected through dedicated surveys. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary was requested to collect, compile and analyse information on the implementation of the Protocol using the third national reports, with a view to contributing to the third assessment and review of the Protocol in conjunction with the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan.

9. In paragraph 11 of the Strategic Plan,² the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties decided that the midterm evaluation would be carried out using the indicators in the Strategic Plan to assess the extent to which the strategic objectives were being achieved. The evaluation is to capture the effectiveness of the Strategic Plan and allow Parties to adapt to emerging trends in the implementation of the Protocol.

10. Furthermore, in its [decision BS-VI/15](#), the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties noted the information provided in the second national reports and the analysis undertaken on the status of implementation of core elements of the Protocol³ and decided that the data and information

¹ The Subsidiary Body on Implementation was established through decision XII/26 and its mandate includes supporting the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties in keeping under review the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.

² See [decision BS-V/16](#), annex I.

³ [UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/17/Add.1](#).

contained in that analysis would form the baseline for measuring progress in implementing the Protocol, in particular the subsequent evaluation of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Additionally, in the same decision, the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to undertake a dedicated survey⁴ to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan that could not be obtained from the second national reports or through other existing mechanisms (hereinafter the “Survey”) which was conducted in 2013.

11. To initiate the process of gathering data on the implementation of the Protocol, the Executive Secretary issued a notification⁵ reminding Parties and inviting other Governments to complete and submit their third national reports no later than 12 months prior to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol. By 31 December 2015, 105 national reports had been received and were used as the basis for the analysis.

12. To facilitate the compilation, aggregation and analysis of the available data, the Secretariat developed an online national report analyzer tool, which is available on the Biosafety Clearing-House.⁶ The tool allowed for the comparison of data in the third national reports against related data in the second national reports and the Survey, as baseline data. The comparison was done between answers provided by Parties to the same questions in the second national reports or the Survey and the third national reports.

13. The Secretariat undertook an in-depth comparative analysis between the information submitted by Parties through their third national reports and the baseline data as established in the second national reports and the Survey. Additionally, where appropriate, data obtained from the Biosafety-Clearing House was used in the analysis of some indicators and compared with similar data used in the analysis during the second reporting cycle.⁷

14. The in-depth comparative analysis provided by the secretariat was considered by the Compliance Committee and by the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building, whose input and contribution, respectively, were made available to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and are summarized below for ease of reference.

15. At its first meeting, held from 2 to 6 May 2016, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation reviewed the in-depth comparative analysis with an input from the Compliance Committee and a contribution from the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building. The analysis made available to the Subsidiary Body is being made available to the Parties as document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.1.

16. The Liaison Group on Capacity-Building at its eleventh meeting,⁸ highlighted the importance of preparing an updated analysis including the additional reports submitted after the deadline of 31 December 2015 and making the updated document available to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties at its eighth meeting. Accordingly, the Secretariat carried out an analysis of the 124 third national reports that had been received by 31 August 2016. Any significant differences between the analyses used by the Subsidiary Body in its work and the updated analysis as at 31 August 2016 are presented in an information document (UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/8/INF/8).

⁴ Results of the survey are available at <http://bch.cbd.int/database/reports/surveyonindicators.shtml>.

⁵ Notification 2015-001 (Available from <https://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2015/ntf-2015-001-bs-nr-en.pdf>).

⁶ The data used to carry out the analysis can be viewed in the National Report Analyzer, available at <http://bch.cbd.int/database/reports/analyzer>.

⁷ A matrix detailing the source of information based on which each indicator was analysed can be found at https://bch.cbd.int/protocol/issues/mid-term_evaluation.

⁸ Held in Montreal, Canada, from 14 to 16 March 2016. The report of the meeting is available at <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/bs/bslgcb-11/official/bslgcb-11-03-en.pdf>

B. Input from the Compliance Committee

17. At its thirteenth meeting,⁹ the Compliance Committee discussed its input into the third assessment and review of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan in response to the request contained in paragraph 7 of decision BS-VII/3.

18. The Compliance Committee focused the scope of its input on the following:

(a) The progress made with respect to Operational Objective 3.1 of the Strategic Plan that refers to the strengthening of the mechanisms for achieving compliance;

(b) The extent to which information in the Biosafety-Clearing House is reliable and up to date (element 15(c) of the core set of identified information needs for the third assessment and review contained in the annex to decision BS-VII/3);

(c) The experience gained by the Committee in implementing its supportive role as specified in decision BS-V/1.

19. The Compliance Committee prepared its input to the third assessment and review and the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan. The input of the Compliance Committee was made available to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.¹⁰

C. Contributions from the Liaison Group

20. At its eleventh meeting,¹¹ the Liaison Group reviewed the analysis of the status and trends in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol prepared by the Executive Secretary, which was made available in document UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/11/2, and made its recommendations to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

21. In its deliberations, the Liaison Group examined the comparative analysis of the status and trends in the implementation of each of the operational objectives of the Strategic Plan except operational objective 3.1 on compliance. In its evaluation, the Liaison Group used the respective indicators to assess the progress made towards the achievement of the operational objectives. Where applicable, the evaluation of the indicators was carried out, taking into account the core set of information fields corresponding to the “possible elements” contained in the annex to decision BS-VII/3.

22. The deliberations were organized around 12 broad areas: national biosafety frameworks; coordination and support; risk assessment and risk management; living modified organisms or traits that may have adverse effects; liability and redress; handling, transport, packaging and identification; socioeconomic considerations; transit, contained use, unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures; information sharing; compliance and review; public awareness and participation, biosafety education and training; and outreach and cooperation.

23. The contribution of the Liaison Group regarding the third assessment and review and the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan was made available to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.¹²

III. SUMMARY OF THE EMERGING TRENDS IN IMPLEMENTATION

24. A summary of the emerging trends from the comparative analysis of the status of implementation of the broad areas set out in the Strategic Plan is presented below. For the complete results of the comparative analysis, see UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.1.

⁹ Held in Montreal, Canada, from 24 to 26 February 2016. The report of the meeting is available at <http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/meetings/documents.shtml?eventid=5561>.

¹⁰ UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/INF/34.

¹¹ Held in Montreal, Canada, from 14 to 16 March 2016. The report of the meeting is available at <http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/meetings/documents.shtml?eventid=5572>.

¹² UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/INF/35.

A. National Biosafety Framework (operational objectives 1.1 and 2.1)

25. Parties have continued to make progress towards the establishment of national biosafety frameworks for the implementation of the Protocol. However, the rate at which fully functional legal, administrative and other measures are being put in place is slow, and this has continued to be one of the main obstacles to the effective implementation of the Protocol at the national level.

26. Many Parties reported that they have in place rules and mechanisms for decision-making on living modified organisms (LMOs) and almost all Parties that have taken decisions on LMOs reported that they have such rules and mechanisms in place. However, some Parties that have taken decisions on LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing reported having neither mechanisms nor rules that govern such decision-making.

27. Parties reported some progress in terms of having in place functional administrative arrangements, the necessary institutional capacity and the availability of permanent staff. However, there was a decrease in the number of Parties that reported that they have in place a domestic budgetary allocation mechanism for the operationalization of biosafety frameworks.

B. Coordination and support (operational objective 1.2)

28. Parties reported decreases on a number of indicators related to capacity-building. A slight decrease is reported in the availability of training programmes for biosafety personnel and a notable decrease in the percentage of Parties that have in place national coordination mechanisms for biosafety capacity building activities. Many Parties reported that national focal points (NFPs) and competent national authorities (CNAs) are responsible for coordinating biosafety capacity-building initiatives. The number of Parties having carried out a capacity-building needs assessment also decreased. However, there is a marginal increase is reported in the number of Parties having prepared a capacity building action plan.

29. Most developing country Parties reported that they had no predictable or reliable funding for capacity-building and implementation of the Protocol with a decrease of 13 per cent. However, the number of Parties that reported having mobilized new and additional financial resources for the implementation of the Protocol remained stable. The Global Environment Facility continues to be the main source of funding support for biosafety activities.

C. Risk assessment and risk management (operational objectives 1.3 and 2.2)

30. Consistent progress was made in further developing and supporting implementation of scientific tools on common approaches to risk assessment and risk management for Parties. In particular, there were clear increases in the number of Parties that are conducting actual risk assessments of LMOs and those adopting common approaches to risk assessment and risk management.

31. On the other hand, there were no marked changes in the indicators regarding capacity-building on risk assessment, risk management and monitoring of LMOs, as compared to the last reporting cycle. One exception was a large decrease (11.2%) in the number of Parties who have at least one person trained in monitoring of LMOs.

D. Living modified organisms or traits that may have adverse effects (operational objective 1.4)

32. No progress was made towards the development modalities for cooperation and guidance in identifying LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health.

E. Liability and redress (operational objectives 1.5 and 2.4)

33. As of 31 December 2015, a total of 33 new instruments of ratification¹³ of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress had been deposited in the current reporting period.¹⁴ Just over half of the Parties report having administrative or legal instruments that provide for response measures for damage to biodiversity resulting from LMOs. Few Parties reported having received funding for building capacity on the issue of liability and redress.

F. Handling, transport, packaging and identification (operational objectives 1.6 and 2.3)

34. There was an increase in the number of Parties that reported having introduced measures related to documentation requirements for living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing. Increases were also reported regarding the introduction of measures related to documentation requirements for LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment and for contained use of LMOs, with just over half of Parties reporting having done so.

35. A number of Parties expressed the need for capacity-building to enforce the Protocol's requirements on handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs and the need to train and equip personnel in sampling, detection and identification of LMOs. Parties also reported being actively involved in regional networks to facilitate the sharing of technical knowledge and encourage the harmonization and standardization of sampling, detection, identification and quantification methods for LMOs. This included collaboration with the Secretariat to develop easy-to-use technical tools for the detection of LMOs.

G. Socioeconomic considerations (operational objective 1.7)

36. There was an increase in the number of Parties that have introduced specific requirements or approaches for taking into account socioeconomic considerations in decision-making regarding LMOs. Just under a third of Parties reported having taken socioeconomic considerations into account in their decision-making process related to LMOs, which constitutes a decrease. Some Parties also reported that socioeconomic considerations had been taken into consideration in the approval of field trials. About a third of Parties reported to have used peer-reviewed published materials for the purpose of elaborating or determining national actions with regard to socioeconomic considerations.

H. Transit, contained use, unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (operational objective 1.8)

37. There was an increase in the number of Parties which reported that they regulate LMOs in transit. A slightly higher number of Parties reported that they regulate contained use of LMOs. A smaller number of Parties reported that they have the capacity to take appropriate measures in case of unintentional release of LMOs.

I. Information sharing (operational objectives 2.6, 4.1 and 4.2)

38. Developing countries or countries with economies in transition continued to make submissions to the Biosafety-Clearing House. However, the rate at which those countries are contributing information to the Biosafety-Clearing House slowed down during the last reporting period. As well, there was an increase in the amount of traffic to the Biosafety-Clearing House from developing countries and countries with economies in transition during the reporting period. However, the proportion of users from developing countries and countries with economies in transition decreased in relation to the total number of Biosafety-Clearing House users.

¹³ Or instruments of acceptance, approval or accession.

¹⁴ As of 31 August 2016, two additional instruments have been deposited. The total number of instruments is 36. Because the European Union is not counted for the purpose of entry into force, five more instruments are required to date for the Supplementary Protocol to enter into force.

J. Compliance (operational objectives 3.1 and 3.2)¹⁵

39. There has been modest improvement in matters of compliance, although the number of Parties that have complied with their obligation to submit the third national report has remained lower than that of the second reporting cycle. The Compliance Committee has continued to support Parties to comply with their obligations under the Protocol.

40. While progress has been reported in the introduction of necessary legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol, only half of all Parties reported that they have fully introduced such measures. Modest increases have been reported on the introduction of laws, regulations or administrative measures for decision-making concerning intentional introduction into the environment and concerning living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing. Moderate increases have also been reported on the introduction of monitoring and enforcement systems. Almost full compliance continues to be reported on the designation of national focal points; yet, many Parties failed to make details available to the Biosafety Clearing-House of their point of contact as required under Article 17. Despite increases reported in the submission of certain mandatory items of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House, Parties continue not to fully make available all required information. While noting regional differences, Parties continue to struggle to secure the financial support needed to fulfil their obligations under the Protocol.

K. Public awareness and participation, Biosafety education and Training (operational objectives 2.5, 2.7, and 4.3)

41. There was modest improvement in the Parties' capacity to promote public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs. A larger percentage of Parties reported having in place mechanisms for ensuring public participation and national websites to facilitate public access to information. An increased percentage of Parties also reported having access to biosafety education and training courses and programmes and an increase in the number of biosafety training materials and online modules available.

L. Outreach and cooperation (operational objectives 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3)

42. The number of Parties to the Protocol increased from 3 to 170. A slight increase was reported on the number of national awareness and outreach programmes on biosafety. A slight increase was also reported in having in place national communication strategies on biosafety, with almost half of the Parties reporting to have adopted them not later than three years after having adopted national biosafety laws. A small decrease was reported on having in place national biosafety websites, including national Biosafety Clearing-House nodes that are accessible to and searchable by the public. There was a considerable increase in the number of Parties reported to have made available and accessible public awareness and educational materials on biosafety.

IV. RECOMMENDATION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION TO THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY AFTER HAVING UNDERTAKEN THE THIRD ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW OF THE PROTOCOL AND THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

43. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation, entrusted with the task of undertaking the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020 at its first meeting recommends a decision along the following lines:

¹⁵ The indicators used to measure progress in terms of compliance, are related to several operational objectives, including 1.1, 2.1 (national biosafety frameworks), 4.1 (BCH effectiveness) and 3.2 (assessment and review).

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

1. *Welcomes* the work of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in undertaking the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020;
2. *Notes with concern* the lower rate of submission of the third national reports in comparison with the previous reporting cycle, and *urges* the Parties that have not yet submitted their third national report to do so as soon as possible;
3. *Notes* the absence of clear linkages between some of the outcomes and indicators in the current Strategic Plan, and *agrees* to reflect such linkages in the follow-up to the present Strategic Plan;
4. *Notes also* that, in the follow-up to the current Strategic Plan, indicators should be simplified, streamlined and made easily measurable with a view to ensuring that progress towards achieving operational objectives can be easily tracked and quantified;
5. *Notes further* the slow progress in: (a) the development of modalities for cooperation and guidance in identifying living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health; (b) capacity-building for risk assessment and risk management; (c) socioeconomic considerations; and (d) capacity-building to take appropriate measures in cases of unintentional release of living modified organisms;
6. *Notes with concern* that, to date, only approximately half of the Parties have fully put in place legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol, and *urges* Parties that have not yet fully done so to put in place their national biosafety frameworks, in particular biosafety legislation, as a matter of priority;
7. *Urges* Parties, for the remaining period of the Strategic Plan, to consider prioritizing the 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;
8. *Also urges* Parties to undertake targeted capacity-building activities on biosafety and to share relevant experiences and lessons learned from these activities through the Biosafety Clearing-House in order to facilitate further development and implementation of the Protocol;
9. *Encourages* Parties to make use of Biosafety Clearing-House to share experiences on national processes and best practices related to socioeconomic considerations in decision-making related to living modified organisms, as appropriate, and in accordance with national legislation;
10. *Encourages* those Parties that have not yet done so to become Party to the Nagoya–Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress as soon as possible;
11. *Encourages* Parties to continue to enhance capacity for public awareness, education and participation regarding the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms, including for indigenous and local communities, and to integrate training, public awareness, education and participation into national initiatives for communication, education and public awareness, initiatives for the Sustainable Development Goals, initiatives for climate change [mitigation and] adaptation and other environmental initiatives;
12. *Recommends* that the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, invite the Global Environment Facility to continue to assist eligible Parties that have

not yet done so to put in place a national biosafety framework and to make funding available to this end;

13. *Notes* that a lack of awareness and political support for biosafety issues contributes to limited access to and uptake of funding for biosafety, and *urges* Parties to enhance efforts to raise awareness of key biosafety-related issues among policy- and decision makers;

14. *Urges* Parties to strengthen national consultative mechanisms among relevant government institutions regarding the programming of national Global Environment Facility allocations with a view to ensuring appropriate funding for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol;

15. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To undertake regional and subregional workshops and other relevant activities, subject to the availability of resources, in order to enhance the capacity of Parties to promote the integration of biosafety considerations into national biodiversity strategies and action plans, national development plans and national strategies to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals;

(b) To carry out further capacity-building activities, subject to the availability of resources, on risk assessment, risk management, detection and identification of living modified organisms, liability and redress, and, as appropriate, socioeconomic, cultural and related health considerations, including the possible impact of living modified organisms on indigenous and local communities;

(c) To propose questions for the fourth national reporting format that provide further clarity or explanation and eliminate redundancy observed in the questions used for the third national report with a view to ensuring that complete and accurate information is captured while striving to maintain continuity with past reporting formats;

(d) To further enhance cooperation and collaboration in biosafety with relevant organizations;

(e) To take into account items (a) and (b) above in implementing the 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.
