

Ref.: SCBD/BS/CG/jh/71409

6 April 2010

NOTIFICATION

Invitation for further comments on the draft Strategic Plan of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2011-2020)

Madam/Sir,

The Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP), at its meeting held on 20 March 2010 in Cali, Colombia, decided that the updated version of the draft elements of the Strategic Plan, as attached, be circulated to Parties, other stakeholders, and in the Forum on the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) for further comments in April 2010. This was in view of the limited number of comments received from Parties during the consultative process established in November 2009.

The Bureau also directed that the updated draft Strategic Plan, after the integration of the comments received in April, be further discussed by a group of experts at the margins of the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA 14) in May 2010, in Nairobi, Kenya. The experts will be selected in accordance with the *modus operandi* of the liaison group established in decision BS-1/5 annex IV, from among the participants attending the SBSTTA meeting, bearing in mind the need for geographical balance.

The meeting of the group of experts in Nairobi is to be supplemented by an open-ended consultation with interested Parties also at the margins of SBSTTA.

The Bureau noted that the consultations will not be convened for the purpose of negotiating the draft Strategic Plan, but only to broaden the discussions so that the draft Strategic Plan benefits from additional input.

The dates for the meetings at the margins of SBSTTA at UNEP, Gigiri, Nairobi, Kenya, are to be announced later.

I therefore have the pleasure to invite you to submit further comments on the attached updated draft Strategic Plan as soon as possible, but not later than **7 May 2010**.

Please accept, Madam/Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Ahmed Djoghlaif
Executive Secretary

To Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB) National Focal Points
CBD National Focal Points (where CPB Focal Points have not yet been designated)



**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/16
29 March 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

Fifth meeting

Nagoya, Japan, 11-15 October 2010

Item 17 of the provisional agenda*

STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY, 2011 - 2020

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety requires, in Article 35, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (COP-MOP) to undertake an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Protocol at least every five years. The first evaluation of the effectiveness of the Protocol (reported in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/14) was undertaken at the fourth meeting of the Parties in May 2008. In conjunction with this evaluation, Parties to the Protocol decided to initiate a process towards developing a strategic plan for the Protocol. In this regard, Parties were invited to make submissions on a strategic plan for the Protocol and the Executive Secretary was requested to present a draft strategic plan for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its fifth meeting (paragraph 2, decision BS-IV/15).

2. Accordingly, this document presents a draft strategic plan prepared by the Executive Secretary. Section II provides background information on the elements of the current strategic plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Annex, decision VI/26) that relate to the Protocol. Section III highlights the main elements of a strategic plan for the Protocol submitted by Parties to the Protocol in accordance with paragraph 2 of decision BS-IV/15 and describes the consultative process that was established by the Bureau of the COP-MOP 4. Section IV of the document proposes elements of a draft decision for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

3. The Secretariat has prepared a draft strategic plan on the basis of the submissions, elements derived from the report of the evaluation of the Protocol, the first national reports, decisions of the last four meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and comments from the consultative process.

4. As the period covered by the medium-term programme of work (Annex, decision BS-I/12) is due to end at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, the Secretariat has also prepared a draft programme of work for the period that the draft

/...

* UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/1.

strategic plan is proposed to cover. Both the draft strategic plan and the proposed programme of work are made available as annexes to this document.

II. BACKGROUND

5. A strategic plan of an organization is a process that builds commitment from key stakeholders in a particular direction that guides the future allocation of resources. The process and areas that embody such a strategic plan are normally organization-specific. A strategic plan also guides the development processes or implementation of institutional structures and procedures in achieving stakeholder-derived targets.

6. The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted, at its sixth meeting, a strategic plan for the Convention (Annex, decision VI/26). It comprises four goals, each containing several objectives. Some of these objectives specifically relate to the Protocol. The strategic objectives relating to the Protocol are set up as integral parts of the Strategic Plan of the Convention. For example, one of the objectives under the first Goal of the Strategic Plan, i.e. “the Convention fulfilling its leadership role in international biodiversity issues”, is the wide implementation of the Protocol. Similarly, Goals two, three and four include objectives with regard to the Protocol. The following table outlines the objectives in the Strategic Plan of the Convention that specifically relate to the Protocol and provides a preliminary review of progress towards achieving each of the objectives.

| Goals | Objectives specific to the Protocol | Progress |
|---|--|---|
| 1. The Convention is fulfilling its leadership role in international biodiversity issues | 1.4 The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is widely implemented | The Protocol entered into force in 2003, less than four years after its adoption At the time of finalizing this document 157 Parties to the Convention have ratified or acceded to the Protocol. Many Parties have initiated legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol. |
| 2. Parties have improved financial, human, scientific, technical, and technological capacity to implement the Convention | 2.3 Developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States amongst them, and other Parties with economies in transition, have increased resources and technology transfer available to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety | At least 120 countries have developed draft national biosafety frameworks documents and are in the process of operationalizing them |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | 2.4 All Parties have adequate capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety | <p>More than 100 capacity-building projects have been implemented by Governments with support from different donor agencies and organizations</p> <p>However, most developing countries have limited capacity to undertake risk assessment and to design and implement risk management schemes</p> |
| 3. National biodiversity strategies and action plans and the integration of biodiversity concerns into relevant sectors serve as an effective framework for the implementation of the objectives of the Convention | 3.2 Every Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety has a regulatory framework in place and functioning to implement the Protocol | About 43 developing countries still lack any form or elements of a functional biosafety regulatory framework |
| 4. There is a better understanding of the importance of biodiversity and of the Convention, and this has led to broader engagement across society in implementation | 4.2 Every Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety is promoting and facilitating public awareness, education and participation in support of the Protocol | According to the first national reports submitted to the Secretariat in 2007, 49 per cent of the Parties reported having promoted and facilitated public awareness, education and participation to a large extent and 47 per cent had done so to a limited extent |

7. The mission statement of the current Strategic Plan of the Convention includes a commitment by Parties to a more effective and coherent implementation of the three objectives of the Convention to achieve, by 2010, a significant reduction of the rate of biodiversity loss. As the 2010 biodiversity target is approaching, the Conference of the Parties decided, at its ninth meeting held in May 2008, to initiate a process to revise the current Strategic Plan of the Convention and adopt a new one. Accordingly, the Secretariat is preparing, on the basis of submissions from Parties and observers, a draft updated Strategic Plan with input from the third meeting of the Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention. The draft strategic plan for the Protocol presented as annex I to this document has, therefore, been prepared taking into account the updating of the Strategic Plan of the Convention. Furthermore, the draft strategic plan of the Protocol is as far as possible designed to be coherent and consistent with the revised strategic plan of the Convention.

8. It is noted that whilst the Convention has substantially developed its processes and institutions to support its objectives and is in its enhanced phase of implementation, the processes and institutions under the Biosafety Protocol are still evolving and are being developed both at the international and national levels.

III. SUBMISSIONS BY PARTIES AND COMMENTS FROM THE CONSULTATIVE PROCESS ON THE DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE PROTOCOL

9. In response to the invitation by the fourth meeting of Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, the Secretariat issued a notification in October 2008 inviting Parties to submit their views on a strategic plan for the Protocol by 31 December 2008. The deadline was subsequently extended to 31 March 2009. The Governments of Japan, Norway, Thailand and the European Union submitted views by the end of the second deadline.

10. The submissions vary in structure and details. However, there is a great deal of convergence in terms of the elements identified for inclusion in the strategic plan. For example, all submissions identified the following elements: risk assessment and risk management and handling, transport, packaging and identification. Capacity-building is another item highlighted in most of the submissions. Some submissions also suggest that liability and redress, cooperation with other organizations or processes, and information sharing be addressed in the strategic plan. The full texts of the submissions are available in an information document (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/INF/20).

11. At its meeting on 8 November 2009, the Bureau of COP-MOP/4 requested the Secretariat to initiate a consultative process to enable Parties to submit comments on the draft elements of the Strategic Plan of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2011 to 2020), prepared on the basis of the comments received. The Bureau also directed that the draft elements of the Strategic Plan be submitted to Parties along with the report of the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Protocol (document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/4/14). Accordingly, the Governments of Benin, Botswana, Brazil, China, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, Norway and the European Union submitted comments. The Bureau further established a discussion forum on the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) in which comments were solicited from stakeholders.

12. The draft elements of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol were also submitted to the following meetings for comments as part of the consultative process:

- The fifth meeting of the BCH informal advisory Committee, Montreal, 19-21 October 2009;
- The UNEP/GEF National Project Coordinators meeting, Moldova, 1-4 December 2009;
- The sixth Coordination Meeting for Governments and Organizations Implementing or Funding Biosafety Capacity-building Activities, Siem Reap, Cambodia, 1 -3 February 2010;
- The seventh Meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-building for Biosafety, Siem Reap, Cambodia, 4-5 February 2010; and
- The third International Meeting of Academic Institutions and Organizations involved in Biosafety Education and Training, Tsukuba, Japan, 15-17 February 2010.

13. Furthermore, the Bureau of COP-MOP/4, at its meeting on 20 March 2010, having noted that few comments had been received from Parties, Governments and other stakeholders on the draft Strategic Plan during the consultative process, mandated Executive Secretary to convene, at the margins of the Fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA 14), in Nairobi, 10-21 May 2010, a meeting of biosafety experts drawn from participants attending SBSTTA. The meeting would follow the modus operandi of the “liaison group” provided in decision BS-1/5, annex IV to provide further inputs to the draft Strategic Plan.

14. The Bureau further directed that the output of the biosafety expert meeting be further subjected to an informal open-ended consultation with interested Parties also at the margins of the SBSTTA to broaden the discussions and receive further inputs to the Strategic Plan. The draft element of the Strategic

Plan of the Protocol as annexed in this document is the output of all the above processes for the consideration and decision of the COP-MOP.

IV. ELEMENTS OF A DRAFT DECISION

*Annex I***DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY****2011 - 2020****I. THE CONTEXT**

1. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was adopted in January 2000 and entered into force on 11 September 2003. The first meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (COP-MOP) adopted, on the basis of recommendations from the Intergovernmental Committee on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, a medium-term programme of work for the period covering the second to the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

2. Over the past six years since the first meeting of the Parties, significant achievements have been made towards the implementation of the Protocol. The number of Parties has increased by more than 100 since the entry into force of the Protocol. The medium-term programme of work has been instrumental in guiding the implementation of the Protocol. Many decisions have been adopted to facilitate the implementation of the Protocol and the Biosafety Clearing-House became fully operational. More than 100 countries received, through the implementing agencies of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), capacity-building assistance in support of their efforts to develop and implement their national biosafety legal and administrative frameworks. The number of bilateral, sub-regional and regional cooperative arrangements to support biosafety capacity-building activities has also increased in the past years.

3. The medium term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol is due to end at the fifth meeting to be held in October 2010. In addition, a process has been established to undertake an assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol in accordance with Article 35 of the Protocol. The initiation of the assessment and review process on the one hand, and the completion of the medium-term programme of work on the other, presented an opportunity for Parties to consider developing a long-term vision for the Protocol in the form of a strategic plan and a corresponding multi-year programme of work. This also coincides with the ongoing process to revise and update the Strategic Plan of the Convention in light of the resolve for action beyond the 2010 biodiversity target.

4. Significant challenges remain as regards the implementation of the Protocol. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol still needs to provide additional guidance and clarify procedures and processes in a number of areas, such as the application of the advance informed agreement procedure, compliance (Article 34), liability and redress (Article 27), risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16), handling, transport, packaging and identification (Article 18) and capacity-building (Article 22). One of the major prerequisites of successful implementation of planned activities is the provision of sufficient financial resources including alternative mechanisms for funding and technical support especially for developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

5. This draft strategic plan and the programme of work accompanying it (annex II) have been prepared on the basis of the submissions from Parties, the analysis of the first national reports, the successive decisions taken by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its last four meetings. The draft strategic plan also takes into account the experience gained through the development, implementation, and the current updating of the Strategic Plan of the Convention.

II. INTERPRETATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

6. The draft Strategic Plan consists of a vision, a mission and five strategic objectives. For each strategic objective there are a number of expected impacts, operational objectives, outcomes and indicators. The strategic objectives have been derived and prioritized according to their contribution to the full implementation of the Protocol, taking into consideration the limited implementation as established by the Assessment and Review process. The focal areas underlying the five strategic objectives are as follows: 1. Enabling full implementation of the Protocol; 2. Capacity building; 3. Protocol reach and cooperation; 4. Compliance; 5. Information sharing.

7. The vision and mission are the overarching statements of the desired future state and the purpose that the Strategic Plan strives to achieve in the long run while the five strategic objectives spell out what will need to be met in order for the vision and the mission to be achieved within the ten year duration of the Plan. In addition, the Strategic Plan has been presented in the form of a logical framework for ease of reference:

- Each strategic objective has a number of expected impacts that will occur if the strategic objective is achieved;
- The operational objectives comprise actions that will need to be undertaken in order to realise the impacts;
- The outcomes are the consequences that would be seen if the operational objectives are achieved, an aggregation of the outcomes will result in the impacts of the strategic goals; and
- The indicators serve as a monitoring and evaluation tool of the Strategic Plan for measuring achievements.

8. The stakeholders of the Strategic Plan will vary depending on the issues, the actions or activities described in the Plan. Some of the actions will be undertaken by, for example, Parties, other Governments, the Secretariat, other organizations or individuals.

9. The elements of the draft Strategic Plan should also be interpreted in light of the text of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The interpretation and understanding of the Strategic Plan are done within the context and scope of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety only.

III. ASSUMPTIONS

10. A number of assumptions have been made in the development of the Strategic Plan. First, it is assumed that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol will adopt a number of decisions including on: common approaches to risk assessment and risk management; identification and documentation; a supplementary protocol on liability and redress; and socio-economic considerations and decision-making. It is also assumed that:

(a) Parties and sub-regional organizations are incorporating rules and procedures from COP-MOP decisions into their domestic frameworks;

(b) the “Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol” will be regularly updated, agreed upon and implemented;

(c) Parties will submit, in a timely manner, national reports and the required information (such as existing laws and regulations, decisions on LMOs, etc.) to the BCH;

(d) adequate and predictable financial resources will be available and there will be a progressive increase in human resources at the international and national level over the ten-year period. It is also noted that biennial detail budgets presented at each COP-MOP during the duration of the Strategic Plan are essential for the effective implementation of the Strategic Plan.

/...

11. A further assumption is that a baseline (global picture) of the status of implementation of the Protocol and global indicators will be established after second Assessment and Review process of the Protocol at COP-MOP/6 and that the indicators have been drafted in such a way that they will facilitate measurement of progress against this baseline.

IV. HUMAN RESOURCE SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

12. With the envisaged increase in the volume of work that will be undertaken to ensure the successful implementation of the strategic plan, the Secretariat would need to be strengthened in order to fulfil its supporting role and to facilitate consistent delivery of the different components of the plan. The Biosafety Division of the Secretariat would need to be expanded and headed by a Principal Officer with an addition of three programme officers: one each for scientific and technical issues, policy and legal issues and technical/capacity-building support as well as two programme assistants.

V. MONITORING, REVIEW AND EVALUATION

13. This strategic plan will be implemented through a ten-year programme of work for the Protocol, supported by biennial work plans. The medium-term programme of work will, if necessary, be adjusted from time to time on the basis of: (a) experience gained in the implementation of the requirements of the Protocol; and (b) the result of the periodic assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol as provided for in Article 35 of the Protocol. A mid-term evaluation will be undertaken five years after the adoption of the Strategic Plan. This evaluation process will use the indicators in the Strategic Plan to assess the extent to which the strategic objectives are being achieved. Information will be drawn from the national reports amongst other things to generate the data necessary for the analysis. The evaluation will capture the effectiveness of the Strategic Plan and allow Parties to adapt to emerging trends in the implementation of the Protocol. Sufficient resources will need to be allocated to this process.

DRAFT ELEMENTS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN VERSION 010310

CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

VISION

Biological diversity is adequately protected from any adverse effects of living modified organisms

MISSION

To strengthen global action in ensuring an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health and specifically focusing on transboundary movements

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Focal area 1:</p> <p>Further Guidance development</p> <p>To put in place further tools and guidance</p> | <p>Full implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety by Parties</p> | <p>1.1 Risk Assessment and risk management</p> <p>To further develop and support implementation of science-based tools on common approaches to risk assessment and risk management for Parties</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance on risk assessment and risk management including guidance on new developments in modern biotechnology developed and available • Common approaches to risk assessment and risk management established and adopted by Parties and other Governments, as appropriate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties adopting and using guidance documents on risk assessment and risk management • Percentage of Parties adopting common approaches to risk assessment and risk management |

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| <p>necessary to make the Protocol fully operational</p> | <p>Enhanced performance by Parties towards the attainment of the overarching objectives of conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity</p> | <p>1.2 LMOs or traits that may have adverse effects</p> <p>To develop 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</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modalities developed and put in place • Parties enabled to identify LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects • Guidance on 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, developed and available to Parties | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of reports to the BCH on the identification of LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects |
| | | <p>1.3 Scientific and technical advice</p> <p>To enhance mechanisms for providing scientific and technical advice to the COP-MOP and to the Parties</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved scientific and technical advice to the COP-MOP and the Parties | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of scientific and technical guidance materials produced by such mechanisms and available to Parties |
| | | <p>1.4 Handling, transport, packaging and identification</p> <p>To enable Parties to implement the requirements of the Protocol and COP-MOP decisions on identification and documentation requirements for living modified organisms</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All shipments of living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing, contained use or intentional introduction into the environment are identified through accompanying documentation in accordance with the requirements of the Protocol and COP-MOP decisions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties that put in place documentation requirements for living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing • Percentage of Parties that put in place documentation requirements for living modified organisms for contained use and for intentional introduction into the environment |

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>1.5 Liability and Redress</p> <p>To adopt and implement rules and procedures in the field of liability and redress for damage resulting from transboundary movements of living modified organisms</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each Party takes administrative and legal measures necessary to implement, at the domestic level, the rules and procedures on liability and redress | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entry into force of the international rules and procedures on liability and redress prior to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol • Percentage of Parties to the Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress having in place domestic administrative and legal frameworks incorporating rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage caused by living modified organisms |
| | | <p>1.6 Socio-economic considerations</p> <p>To clarify the socio-economic considerations that may be taken into account in reaching decisions on import of living modified organisms</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines regarding socio-economic considerations of living modified organisms developed and used by Parties • Socio-economic considerations applied, where appropriate, by Parties | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Parties reporting on their approaches to taking socioeconomic considerations into account • Number of Parties reporting on their experiences in taking socio-economic considerations into account in reaching decisions on import of living modified organisms • Number of Parties using the guidelines on socio-economic considerations |

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>1.7 Transit, contained use, unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures</p> <p>To develop tools and guidance that facilitate the implementation of the Protocol's provisions on transit, contained use, unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties enabled to manage LMOs in transit • Guidance developed to assist Parties to detect and take measures to respond to unintentional releases of living modified organisms | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties having in place measures to manage LMOs in transit • Percentage of Parties having in place measures for contained use • Percentage of Parties using the guidance to detect occurrence of unintentional releases of living modified organisms and being able to take appropriate response measures |

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Focal area 2:</p> <p>Capacity building</p> <p>2. To further develop and strengthen the capacity of Parties to implement the Protocol</p> | <p>Effective and efficient regulatory, administrative frameworks established by Parties for the implementation of the Protocol</p> <p>Full use of information exchange systems</p> <p>More transparent and expeditious decision-making</p> <p>Necessary mechanisms put in place to enable Parties to make science-based risk assessments</p> <p>Increased safety in the transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms</p> | <p>2.1 Coordination and support</p> <p>To put in place effective mechanisms for developing, coordinating, financing and monitoring capacity-building</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved understanding of the capacity-building needs of developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition • A cohesive approach and effective mechanisms established for biosafety capacity-building • Parties have adequate and predictable financial and technical resources to enable them to implement their obligations under the Protocol in an integrated and sustainable manner • National biosafety capacity-building strategies and action plans by each Party in place and implemented • Existing resources and opportunities leveraged and more effectively used • Improved coordination and collaboration between Parties and entities implementing or funding biosafety capacity-building efforts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Parties that have assessed their capacity-building needs, including training and institutional needs, and submitted the information to the BCH not more than 3 years after accession to/ratification of the Protocol • Percentage of the Parties that have developed national biosafety capacity-building action plans for implementing the Protocol • Percentage of the Parties that have in place training programmes for personnel dealing with biosafety issues and for long-term training of biosafety professionals • Percentage of Parties that have in place national coordination mechanisms for biosafety capacity-building initiatives • Amount of new and additional financial resources mobilized for the implementation of the Protocol • Number of Parties that have predictable and reliable funding for strengthening their capacity in implementing the Protocol • Number of Parties that use resources effectively and assessing their contribution to the implementation of the Action plan |

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>2.2 National Biosafety Frameworks</p> <p>To enable all Parties to have operational national biosafety frameworks in place for the implementation of the Protocol</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions regarding the safety of a living modified organism are based on established regulatory and administrative rules consistent with the Protocol • Biosafety issues and the implementation of the Biosafety Protocol are integrated into relevant sectors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties that have designated national focal points and competent national authorities • Number of Parties that have in place national biosafety legislation and implementing guidelines not more than 6 years after accession to/ratification of the Protocol • Percentage of the Parties that have in place administrative rules and procedures for handling notifications and requests for approval of imports or release of LMOs |
| | | <p>2.3 Risk assessment and risk management</p> <p>To enable Parties to carry out risk assessments and establish capacities to regulate, manage and control risks of LMOs</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources, including human resources required to assess risks of living modified organisms are available and administrative mechanisms are in place • Training materials and technical guidance on risk assessment and risk management developed and used by Parties • Infrastructure and administrative mechanisms established for the management of risks of living modified organisms at national, subregional or regional level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratio of risk assessment summary reports as against number of decisions on LMOs on the BCH • Number of risk assessment summary reports in the BCH that are in accordance with the Protocol • Number of people trained on risk assessment, as well as in monitoring, management and control of LMOs • Number of Parties that have infrastructure, including laboratories for monitoring, management and control available |

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>2.4 Handling, transport, packaging and identification</p> <p>To develop capacity for handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customs/border officials are able to enforce the implementation of the Protocol's requirements related to handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms • Personnel are trained and equipped for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of customs officers and laboratory personnel trained • Percentage of Parties that have established or have reliable access to detection laboratories |
| | | <p>2.5 Liability and Redress</p> <p>To assist Parties to the Protocol in their efforts to establish and apply the rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage resulting from the transboundary movements of living modified organisms</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An institutional mechanism or process identified or established to facilitate the implementation of the international rules and procedures on liability and redress at the national level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of eligible Parties that received capacity building support in the area of liability and redress involving living modified organisms • Number of domestic administrative or legal instruments identified, amended or newly enacted that fulfill the objective of the international rules and procedures in the field liability and redress |
| | | <p>2.6 Public awareness, education and participation</p> <p>To enhance capacity at the national, regional and international levels that would facilitate efforts to raise public awareness, and promote education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties have access to guidance and training materials on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs • Parties are enabled to promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation in biosafety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties having in place mechanisms for ensuring public participation in decision-making concerning LMOs not later than 6 years after accession to/ratification of the Protocol • Percentage of Parties that inform their public about existing modalities for participation • Number of Parties' authorities with a network of biosafety education and communication experts • Number of Parties having in place national websites and searchable archives, national resource centres or sections in existing |

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | <p>2.7 Information sharing</p> <p>To ensure that the BCH is easily accessed by all established stakeholders, in particular in developing countries and countries with economies in transition</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased access to information in the BCH and sharing of information through the BCH by users in developing countries and countries with economies in transition • Information on the BCH is easily accessible to stakeholders including the general public • Tools to facilitate implementation of the Protocol are easily accessible through the BCH | <p>national libraries dedicated to biosafety educational materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of submissions to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition • Amount of traffic to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition |
| | | <p>2.8 Biosafety education and training</p> <p>To promote education and training of biosafety professionals through greater coordination and collaboration among academic institutions and relevant organizations</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sustainable pool of biosafety professionals with various competencies available at national/international levels • Improved biosafety education and training programmes • Increased exchange of information, training materials and staff and students exchange programmes among academic institutions and relevant organizations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of academic institutions by region offering biosafety education and training courses and programmes • Number of biosafety training materials and online modules available |
| <p>Focal area 3:</p> <p>Outreach and cooperation</p> <p>To expand the</p> | <p>Increased political support for the implementation of the Protocol</p> | <p>3.1 Ratification of the Protocol</p> <p>To achieve global recognition of the Protocol</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity become Parties to the Protocol | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity that become Parties to the Protocol |

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| reach of the Protocol and promote cooperation | Increased support from and collaboration with relevant organizations, conventions and initiatives for the implementation of the Protocol | 3.2 Cooperation To enhance international cooperation and collaboration in biosafety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official relationships established with secretariats of other conventions and organizations • Secretariat of the CBD invited as an observer to WTO SPS Committee | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of established relationships with other conventions • Number of meetings, consultations and joint activities between SCBD and secretariats of other conventions and organizations |
| | | 3.3 Communication and outreach To raise the profile of the Protocol | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach services of the Protocol enhanced among relevant national and international stakeholders • All Parties have designed and implemented education and communication strategies • Biosafety issues and Protocol activities are regularly covered by local as well as international media • Increased understanding of the relationship between the Protocol and the CBD and other biosafety-related agreements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of national awareness and outreach programmes on biosafety • Percentage of Parties that have in place national communication strategies on biosafety not later than 3 year after having adopted national biosafety laws • Percentage of Parties that have in place national biosafety websites, including national BCH nodes that are accessible to and searchable by the public • Number of Parties with awareness and educational materials on biosafety and the Protocol available and accessible to the public, including the diversity of these materials |

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Focal area 4:</p> <p>Compliance and review</p> <p>To achieve compliance with and effectiveness of the Protocol</p> | <p>Parties are in compliance with the requirements of the Protocol</p> | <p>4.1 Compliance with the Protocol</p> <p>To strengthen the mechanisms for achieving compliance</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each Party regularly monitors the implementation of its obligations under the Protocol and submits complete and timely national reports • The Compliance Committee is able to thoroughly review the implementation of obligations by Parties and to propose appropriate measures • Supportive role of the Compliance Committee is improved • All Parties able to enforce their regulatory frameworks and decisions • Sufficient financial resources are allocated to compliance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Parties that have identified and addressed their non-compliance issues • Number of Parties having approved and functional national biosafety framework • Percentage of Parties that designated all National Focal points • Number of Parties having in place a system for handling requests • Percentage of Parties that published all mandatory information via BCH • Number of Parties having in place a monitoring and enforcement system |
| | | <p>4.2 Assessment and review</p> <p>To improve the effectiveness of the Protocol, including through regular assessment and review processes</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment and review of the Protocol, including its procedures and annexes, are undertaken on a regular basis • The Protocol, including its procedures and annexes, is adapted by Parties if new challenges are brought about by new developments in the field of modern biotechnology • Improved reporting by Parties | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of assessment reports submitted and reviews published • Number of Parties modifying their national biosafety frameworks with the aim of adapting to new biosafety challenges • Number of national reports received under each reporting cycle • Number of subsidiary bodies established by COP/MOP for the implementation of the Protocol |

| <i>Strategic Objective</i> | <i>Expected Impacts</i> | <i>Operational Objectives</i> | <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| <p>Focal area 5:</p> <p>Information sharing</p> <p>To enhance the availability and exchange of relevant information through the Biosafety Clearing-House</p> | <p>Transparency in the development and use of LMOs</p> <p>Informed decision making</p> <p>Enhanced public awareness of biosafety</p> <p>Increased compliance with national and international requirements</p> | <p>5.1 BCH effectiveness</p> <p>To increase the amount and quality of information submitted to and retrieved from the BCH</p> <p>5.2 BCH as a tool for online discussions and conferences</p> <p>To establish the BCH as a fully functional and effective platform for assisting countries in the implementation of the Protocol</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BCH is recognized as the most authoritative repository of information on biosafety • Information submitted to the BCH is accurate, complete and timely • A larger number of countries submit and retrieve information • Risk assessment reports are shared in a timely manner through the BCH • Facilitated access to resources and experiences related to biosafety • Countries are better equipped with tools made available through the BCH • The BCH principles of inclusiveness, transparency and equity are applied consistently • Protocol discussions and negotiating processes facilitated through the BCH • Increased awareness of the BCH in different stakeholder groups and regions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratio of risk assessment summary reports as against number of decisions on LMOs • Number of publications contained in the Biosafety Information Resource Centre (BIRC) • Amount of traffic to the BCH • Number of references to the BCH • Number of Parties with focal points registered on the BCH • Number of non-Parties having published biosafety laws and/or regulations on the BCH • Number of AIA/domestic decisions available through BCH • Number of online discussions and real-time conferences carried out through the BCH platform • Number of participants and percentage of Parties participating in online discussions and real-time conferences on the BCH • Number of capacity building activities aimed to increase the transparency, inclusiveness and equity of participation in the BCH |

Annex II

**MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMME OF WORK OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON
BIOSAFETY UP TO 2020**

1. Standing Items:
 - (a) Matters relating to the financial mechanism and resources;
 - (b) Report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Protocol;
 - (c) Programme of work and budget for the Secretariat as regards its costs of distinct secretariat services for the Protocol;
 - (d) Report of the Compliance Committee.
2. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may consider, *inter alia*, the following items:
 - 2.1 Sixth meeting:
 - (a)
 - 2.2 Seventh meeting
 - (a)
 - 2.3 Eighth meeting
 - (a)
 - 2.4 Ninth meeting
 - (a)
 - 2.5 Tenth meeting
 - (a)
