



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/NP/MOP/3/10
31 January 2019

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE MEETING OF
THE PARTIES TO THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL ON ACCESS
TO GENETIC RESOURCES AND THE FAIR AND
EQUITABLE SHARING OF BENEFITS ARISING FROM
THEIR UTILIZATION

Third meeting
Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, 17-29 November 2018

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL ON ACCESS TO GENETIC RESOURCES AND THE FAIR AND EQUITABLE SHARING OF BENEFITS ARISING FROM THEIR UTILIZATION ON ITS THIRD MEETING

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization held its third meeting in Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, from 17 to 29 November 2018. It adopted 16 decisions, which appear in chapter I of the present report.

The account of the proceedings of the meeting is provided in chapter II of the report.

Contents

I.	DECISIONS	4
	3/1. Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 31)	4
	3/2. Compliance with the Protocol	18
	3/3. The Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House and information sharing (Article 14)	19
	3/4. Monitoring and reporting (Article 29)	22
	3/5. Measures to assist in capacity-building and capacity development (Article 22)	23
	3/6. Measures to raise awareness of the importance of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge (Article 21)	27
	3/7. Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and initiatives	28
	3/8. Financial mechanism	29
	3/9. Enhancing integration under the Convention and its Protocols with respect to provisions related to access and benefit-sharing	30
	3/10. Review of experience in holding concurrently meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol	31
	3/11. Procedure for avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in expert groups	32
	3/12. Digital sequence information on genetic resources	33
	3/13. Global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism (Article 10)	34
	3/14. Specialized international access and benefit sharing instruments in the context of Article 4, paragraph 4, of the Nagoya Protocol	36
	3/15. Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020	38
	3/16. Budget for the integrated programme of work of the Secretariat	39
II.	ACCOUNT OF PROCEEDINGS	46
	Item 1. Opening of the meeting	47
	Item 2. Organizational matters	48
	Item 3. Report on the credentials of representatives to the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol	50
	Item 4. Reports of Subsidiary Bodies	50
	Item 5. Report of the Compliance Committee (Article 30)	51
	Item 6. Administration of the Protocol and Budget for the Trust Funds	52
	Item 7. Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 31)	52
	Item 8. Financial mechanism and resources (Article 25)	53
	Item 9. Measures to assist in capacity-building and capacity development (Article 22)	53
	Item 10. The Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House and information-sharing (Article 14)	54
	Item 11. Monitoring and reporting (Article 29)	55

Item 12.	Measures to raise awareness of the importance of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge (Article 21)	55
Item 13.	Enhancing integration under the Convention and its Protocols with respect to provisions related to access and benefit-sharing	56
Item 14.	Cooperation with other international organizations, conventions and initiatives	56
Item 15.	Review of the effectiveness of structures and processes	57
Item 16.	Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020	58
Item 17.	Digital sequence information on genetic resources	59
Item 18.	Specialized international access and benefit-sharing instruments in the context of Article 4, paragraph 4, of the Nagoya Protocol	60
Item 19.	Global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism (Article 10)	61
Item 20.	Other matters	61
Item 21.	Adoption of the report	61
Item 22.	Closure of the meeting	61

I. DECISIONS

3/1. Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 31)

A. First assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol

1. *Takes note* of the key findings of the first assessment and review of the Protocol contained in annex I, which includes the input provided by the Compliance Committee;

2. *Welcomes* the framework of indicators in annex II, and *agrees* to use the reference points contained therein as a baseline against which progress can be measured in the future;

3. *Decides* to revisit and adapt the framework, as may be deemed appropriate in the light of further progress made with implementation;

4. *Welcomes* the progress made by Parties in making the Protocol operational;

5. *Recognizes* that further work is needed, as a priority:

(a) To develop access and benefit-sharing legislation or regulatory requirements, which provide for legal certainty, clarity and transparency, taking into account special considerations in accordance with Article 8 of the Protocol and the need to ensure that the Nagoya Protocol and other relevant international instruments are implemented in a mutually supportive manner;

(b) To enhance implementation by Parties of the provisions on compliance with domestic legislation and regulatory requirements on access and benefit-sharing (Articles 15 and 16), monitoring the utilization of genetic resources (Article 17), including the designation of checkpoints, as well as the provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities (Article 5, 6, 7 and 12);

(c) To support the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of the Protocol, including by raising their awareness and capacity about access and benefit-sharing, and supporting the development by indigenous peoples and local communities of community protocols and procedures, minimum requirements for mutually agreed terms and model contractual clauses for benefit-sharing arising from the utilization of traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources, taking into consideration their customary laws;

(d) Raise awareness among relevant stakeholders and encourage their participation in the implementation of the Protocol;

6. *Urges* Parties that have not yet done so:

(a) To establish institutional structures and legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing, taking into account paragraphs 5 (a) and (b) above;

(b) To take steps to address the priority areas identified in paragraphs 5 (c) and (d) above;

(c) To publish in the Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House all mandatory information available at the national level in accordance with the obligations enshrined in Article 14, paragraph 2, of the Protocol, including information on the permits or their equivalents to constitute internationally recognized certificates of compliance, as soon as possible, with a view to facilitating the monitoring of the utilization of genetic resources and cooperation among Parties;

7. *Encourages* Parties, non-Parties and relevant organizations in a position to do so:

(a) To expand their efforts to build the capacity of developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition to implement the Nagoya Protocol, taking into account the priority areas identified in paragraph 5 above, the need to strengthen institutional capacities, and the key findings in annex I, as well as the needs and priorities of indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant stakeholders;

(b) To support capacity-building initiatives to implement the Protocol, such as the capacity-building programme of the Secretariat and the International Development Law Organization for the establishment of national legal frameworks, including by providing financial resources;

(c) To make available information on capacity-building initiatives and capacity-building resources on the Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House;

(d) To consider regional approaches to support harmonized implementation of the Protocol through, among other things, capacity-building activities among countries that share the same genetic resources or traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources;

(e) To facilitate the sharing of information and experiences in relation to transboundary cooperation in accordance with Article 11 of the Protocol;

(f) To support strategic communication to enhance awareness about the Protocol;

(g) To build the capacity of Parties and indigenous peoples and local communities for the negotiation of mutually agreed terms and to promote partnerships and technology transfer between users and providers of genetic resources and/or associated traditional knowledge;

8. *Invites* Parties, non-Parties, international organizations, regional development banks, other financial institutions and the private sector, as appropriate, to expand their efforts to provide financial resources to support the implementation of the Protocol;

9. *Recommends* that the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to support for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, invite the Global Environment Facility to continue to assist eligible Parties in implementing the Nagoya Protocol, including the establishment of legislative, administrative and policy measures on access and benefit-sharing and related institutional arrangements, and to make funds available to this end;

10. *Encourages* Parties, non-Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations to make use of the wealth of information and experiences available in the interim national reports and the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, as well as existing tools and resources (such as guidelines and capacity-building materials) to support implementation and to promote the exchange of experiences;

11. *Invites* Parties, in view of the cross-cutting nature of the Protocol, to establish appropriate mechanisms to facilitate:

(a) National coordination among different institutions, including national focal points, competent national authorities and ministries of relevance to access and benefit-sharing;

(b) The full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of the provisions of the Protocol related to indigenous peoples and local communities with a view to taking into account their needs as well as national circumstances;

(c) The participation of relevant stakeholders from different sectors with a view to taking into account their needs when developing legislative, administrative and policy measures on access and benefit-sharing;

12. *Also invites* Parties:

(a) To consider implementing interim measures in order to gain experience that can inform the development of legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing;

(b) To take into account, in the implementation of Article 8 of the Protocol, relevant work undertaken by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Health Organization and other relevant organizations, as appropriate and in accordance with national circumstances;

(c) To take note, in the implementation of Article 16 of the Protocol, of relevant work undertaken by the World Intellectual Property Organization, as appropriate, provided that it does not run counter to the objectives of the Convention and the Protocol;

13. *Invites* indigenous peoples and local communities to engage in access and benefit-sharing processes in accordance with their customary practices, including by developing community protocols¹ and procedures for access and benefit-sharing, and to make them available through the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, and *invites* relevant organizations to provide guidance to support indigenous peoples and local communities in developing these community protocols and procedures;

14. *Invites* relevant stakeholders and user organizations and networks to engage in access and benefit-sharing processes, including by developing tools, such as model contractual clauses, codes of conduct, guidelines, best practices and/or standards that address the needs of their constituency and facilitate compliance with access and benefit-sharing requirements, and to make these tools available through the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House;

15. *Notes* that the work on one or more international legal instruments relating to intellectual property with a view to ensuring the balanced and effective protection of genetic resources, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions under the World Intellectual Property Organization is ongoing, and that, therefore, it would be premature to assess how the outcomes of this process could contribute to the implementation of the Protocol;

16. *Also notes* that there is insufficient information to measure the effectiveness of Article 18 in accordance with Article 18, paragraph 4, of the Protocol;

17. *Decides* to assess all elements relevant to the implementation of the Protocol, including that identified in paragraph 16, as well as progress on Article 10 on a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism, and Article 23 on technology transfer, collaboration and cooperation, at the second assessment and review of the Protocol;

18. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To carry out a targeted survey of access and benefit-sharing national focal points, competent national authorities, and users and providers of genetic resources and/or associated traditional knowledge on challenges related to the implementation of the Protocol to provide an additional source of information in future processes for the assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol;

(b) To take into account the indicators contained in annex II when preparing the proposed format for the next national report on the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol;

19. *Welcomes* progress made by the Secretariat in the implementation and operation of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, and *emphasizes* the importance of making information available on the procedures to follow in order to access genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge in a country;

20. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To prioritize the translation of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House into the six official languages of the United Nations;

(b) To continue to improve the performance of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House;

(c) To seek feedback from all types of users of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House on its implementation and operation;

21. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to continue providing technical assistance for the submission of information on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, including:

(a) Encouraging the publication by Parties, as well as non-Parties, of all mandatory and other relevant information available at the national level in the Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House and to provide training in the use of the Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House;

¹ These may include community biocultural protocols.

(b) Encouraging the publication of reference records, as appropriate, by relevant stakeholders, indigenous peoples and local communities, and relevant organizations on the Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House;

(c) Increasing understanding of the functioning of the system for monitoring the utilization of genetic resources through the Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House;

(d) Encouraging the use of the interoperability features of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, such as the application programming interface;

B. Second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol

Having considered the note by the Executive Secretary on assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 31),²

Mindful of the linkages between the submission of national reports and the assessment and review process,

1. *Decides* to conduct the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, in 2024;

2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to propose a methodology for conducting the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, taking into account the outcomes and lessons learned from the first assessment and review process, experiences from the assessment and review process under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

3. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation to consider, at its fourth meeting, the proposed methodology referred to in paragraph 2 above and make recommendations for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its fifth meeting;

4. *Decides* to revisit the issue of intervals for subsequent assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol at a subsequent meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

Annex I

KEY FINDINGS

Element (a): Extent of implementation of the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol and related obligations of Parties, including assessment of progress by Parties in establishing institutional structures and access and benefit-sharing measures to implement the Protocol

1. In order to make the Nagoya Protocol operational, Parties need to establish access and benefit-sharing (ABS) legislative, administrative and policy measures and institutional arrangements and many Parties are still in the process of establishing these measures and institutions. For many Parties, this process is time-consuming and challenging.

2. Progress in establishing institutional arrangements, such as competent national authorities and checkpoints, is closely related to progress in adopting ABS measures. Some measures adopted prior to the Nagoya Protocol included the designation of competent national authorities. However, the designation of checkpoints is a new requirement created by the Protocol and still needs to be addressed by many Parties.

3. Although the publication of mandatory information in the ABS Clearing-House is essential for the implementation of the Protocol, a number of Parties have not yet published on the ABS Clearing-House all available national information in accordance with Article 14 of the Nagoya Protocol.

² CBD/NP/MOP/3/3.

4. Considering its cross-cutting nature, the implementation of the Protocol requires the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant stakeholders (e.g. different business sectors and the scientific community) as well as coordination among different institutions and ministries (e.g. science and education, agriculture, trade, intellectual property). To assist in addressing this challenge, appropriate mechanisms could be established to facilitate coordination and participation, and awareness-raising and capacity-building may be required.
5. Other key challenges include developing ABS measures that support benefit-sharing while creating legal certainty, avoiding unnecessary complexity, delays and increased burdens and costs on users and limited human resources working on ABS and the Nagoya Protocol in many Parties.
6. In the light of these challenges, the development of interim measures could be considered as a first step. The needs of users of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, including relevant stakeholders from different sectors, should also be taken into account in developing ABS measures. Regional approaches may also be useful to support harmonized implementation of the Protocol.³
7. Implementing some of the new elements of the Protocol, namely the provisions on compliance, monitoring the utilization of genetic resources, including the designation of checkpoints, and the obligations related to indigenous peoples and local communities, presents a particular challenge.
8. The Nagoya Protocol does not distinguish between countries that are users and countries that are providers of genetic resources, and obligations in the Protocol apply to all Parties, including provisions related to compliance with domestic legislation or regulatory requirements according to Articles 15 and 16.
9. With respect to checkpoints, there is a need for Parties to better understand their functions and options for their designation in the light of their national context. There is also a need to build the capacity of checkpoints to enable them to carry out their functions.
10. With respect to indigenous peoples and local communities, challenges include: determining how the concept of “indigenous peoples and local communities” applies at the national level; clarifying the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities over genetic resources and/or traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources; identifying the different groups of indigenous peoples and local communities; understanding the way they are organized; and linking traditional knowledge with the holder/s of such knowledge. In order to address these challenges, the following could be considered:
 - (a) Building the capacity of Parties to support the implementation of the provisions of the Protocol related to indigenous peoples and local communities as well as the capacity of indigenous peoples and local communities with respect to ABS issues;
 - (b) Relevant work of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions on the concept of indigenous peoples and local communities;⁴
 - (c) National mechanisms for the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of the provisions of the Protocol related to indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account national circumstances;
 - (d) Support for coordination and institution building within and among indigenous peoples and local communities to address ABS issues including through the development of community protocols;
 - (e) Capacity-building to support indigenous peoples and local communities in developing minimum requirements for mutually agreed terms and model contractual clauses for benefit-sharing arising from the utilization of traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources.

³ For example, “African Union Practical Guidelines for the Coordinated Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in Africa” (African Union, 2015).

⁴ For example “Compilation of views received on use of the term ‘indigenous peoples and local communities’” ([UNEP/CBD/WG8J/8/INF/10/Add.1](#)).

11. Parties have different approaches to prior informed consent, mutually agreed terms and the issuance of permits. It is important for Parties to make clear information available on the ABS Clearing-House on the procedures to follow to access genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge.

12. In addition, in the development and implementation of ABS legislation or regulatory requirements it is important that Parties take into account special considerations in accordance with Article 8 of the Protocol. Relevant work undertaken under the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations,⁵ the World Health Organization and other organizations may be useful in this regard.

13. The importance of sharing information and experience in relation to transboundary cooperation (Article 11) was highlighted. In particular, experiences acquired in subregional and bilateral projects could be relevant to assist in the implementation of this article. Regional structures or projects were identified by some as a way to address this issue, while noting that reinforcement of the capacity of regional structures to play that role would be needed.

14. Capacity-building could also support harmonized implementation of the Protocol among countries that share the same genetic resources or traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources.

Element (b) Establishment of a reference point to measure effectiveness

15. Some Parties reported on having received benefits received from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge.

16. With regard to how the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol contributed to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in their country, many considered that it was premature to answer this question as implementation of the Nagoya Protocol was at an early stage.

17. The most common contribution reported is an increase of awareness of the value of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Examples of other contributions highlighted by countries are the following:

(a) Managers of natural resources or authorities are more aware of the potential advantages of the Nagoya Protocol and are developing conservation practices;

(b) Implementing the Nagoya Protocol helped improving the knowledge about species, including through the development of databases or inventories and their population, and supports the valorization of genetic resources and special conservation approaches;

(c) Increased involvement of communities in conservation and sustainable use;

(d) Increased compliance by users of genetic resources;

(e) Recognition of research and development as a key to the country's valorization of genetic resources;

(f) Implementing the Protocol played a key role in factoring elements of biodiversity conservation and use in government development agenda, including the 2030 Agenda.

Element (c): Establishment of a reference point on support available for implementation

18. Although a number of capacity-building and development initiatives are currently supporting ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, many Parties still lack the necessary capacity and financial resources to make the Protocol operational. Capacity-building and development support therefore continue to be essential in order to make progress in the implementation of the Protocol, in particular for developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition.

19. The wealth of information and experiences available in the national reports and in the ABS Clearing-House, as well as the exchange of experiences, may be useful to Parties in the establishment of institutional

⁵ For example, "ABS Elements: Elements to Facilitate Domestic Implementation of Access and Benefit-sharing for Different Subsectors of Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture" (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2016).

structures and the development of ABS measures. This information could also be taken into account in capacity-building projects. In addition, the use of existing tools and resources (e.g. guidelines, capacity-building materials) to support implementation could be encouraged.

Element (d): Assessment of effectiveness of Article 18 (extent of implementation)

20. The provisions of Article 18 on compliance with mutually agreed terms are often implemented at the national level through existing laws (e.g. contractual law, private international law, domestic measures related to access to justice) rather than through specific ABS measures.

21. When one party of a contract resides in a foreign country, the contractual relationship falls in the domain of private international law. Private international law seeks to regulate, first, which jurisdiction applies to a dispute; second, which law applies to the dispute; and third, whether and how eventual decisions or judgments are recognized and may be enforced in another jurisdiction. Each State has its own national rules on these matters, but some of these may have been harmonized through international agreements, guidelines, and model laws.

22. Those developing ABS measures and/or implementing the Protocol may not be aware of all applicable legislation dealing with contractual law, private international law, domestic measures related to access to justice. A mechanism to support national coordination could assist in drawing from the expertise of other institutions dealing with these issues.

23. Information contained in the interim national report, as well as the exchange of experiences may be useful for Parties to understand how the implementation of Article 18 can be supported.

Element (e): Assessment of implementation of Article 16 in light of developments in other relevant international organizations, including, inter alia, the World Intellectual Property Organization

24. Many Parties are still in the process of establishing ABS measures and institutions arrangements to implement the Protocol. Implementation of the provisions on compliance and the obligations related to indigenous peoples and local communities are particularly challenging for Parties.

25. The work on one or more international legal instrument(s) relating to intellectual property with a view to ensuring the balanced and effective protection of genetic resources, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions under the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is still on going, and it is premature to assess how the outcomes of this process could contribute to implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

26. However, there are a number of existing tools and resources that could be used by Parties in advancing the implementation of Article 16 of the Nagoya Protocol, including those developed by WIPO and the CBD Mo'tz Kuxtal voluntary guidelines.⁶

Element (f): Stock-taking of the use of model contractual clauses, codes of conduct, guidelines, best practices and standards as well as indigenous peoples and local communities' customary laws, community protocols and procedures

27. A wide range of model contractual clauses, codes of conduct, guidelines, best practices and standards have been developed both by Governments and organizations. However, there is less information on how these tools are being used. It is unclear how the use of the tools could be measured.

28. User organizations and networks play an important role in addressing the needs of their members by developing tools that can bring clarity on how ABS can be incorporated in their practice and assisting their member organizations in complying with ABS requirements.

⁶ Mo'tz Kuxtal voluntary guidelines for the development of mechanisms, legislation or other appropriate initiatives to ensure the "prior and informed consent", "free, prior and informed consent" or "approval and involvement", depending on national circumstances, of indigenous peoples and local communities for accessing their knowledge, innovations and practices, for fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of their knowledge, innovations and practices relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, and for reporting and preventing unlawful appropriation of traditional knowledge.

29. Implementing the provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities is one of the main challenges identified by Parties. Community protocols on ABS can help to address some of the challenges identified in paragraph 10 above. They can help the indigenous peoples and local communities that develop them to articulate their values, practices and aspirations. They can also help Governments to implement the provisions of the Protocol related to indigenous peoples and local communities, and they provide clarity and certainty to users on how to have access to genetic resources and/or associated traditional knowledge held by indigenous peoples and local communities.

30. Community protocols are being developed and used in a variety of contexts, including but not limited to ABS. Some deal with biotrade or land issues and include some ABS elements as part of a wider context. Incorporating ABS elements in existing community protocols dealing with resource or land management or biotrade may facilitate the process. Supporting indigenous peoples and local communities in developing community protocols is essential, as well as doing so in way that ensures that the outcomes represent community values, practices and aspirations.

Element (g): Review of implementation and operation of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, including number of access and benefit-sharing measures made available; number of countries that have published information on their competent national authorities; number of internationally recognized certificates of compliance that have been constituted and number of checkpoint communiqués published

31. Approximately half of the users of the ABS Clearing-House are users of genetic resources or associated traditional knowledge and consult the ABS Clearing-House to find national information. Feedback received highlights the important need to provide improved and clear information on national ABS requirements and procedures. This information should provide users with simple and easy to understand guidance on the necessary steps to apply for access to genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge.

32. Relevant stakeholders, in particular the business and scientific communities, could benefit from more outreach and awareness-raising both as users of genetic resources and as potential contributors of relevant information (e.g. model clauses, codes of conduct, awareness-raising materials). The implementation of the ABS Clearing-House could also benefit from a greater understanding of their needs in terms of functionality and design of the ABS Clearing-House.

33. Technical assistance for use of the ABS Clearing-House still required. The live chat is a very valued feature by users of the ABS Clearing-House. Capacity-building on the use of the ABS Clearing-House and implementation of the Protocol is closely related. Many questions received through the live chat and during the capacity-building activities for the ABS Clearing-House are about implementation of the Protocol rather than the technical support to use the clearing-house.

Annex II

FRAMEWORK OF INDICATORS AND REFERENCE POINTS TO MEASURE PROGRESS

1. The following table proposes indicators for each of the elements addressed by the first assessment and review. Reference points are included for most of the indicators proposed. These reference points determine a baseline against which progress can be measured in the future for each of the indicators. The indicators proposed are mostly based on existing questions of the interim national report. However, there are instances where no conclusive information could be drawn from the responses to the interim national report, and therefore, a new text is suggested for those indicators. The new or revised indicators are identified in the table.

2. It also includes the source of information used to establish the reference point. For ease of reference, it follows the structure and order of the format of the interim national report and includes reference to the element/s under which the indicator is being considered.

3. The framework is flexible tool that can be adapted as further progress is made with implementation.

Framework of indicators	Element	Reference point (as of 22 February 2018)	Source
1. Number of Parties to the CBD that have ratified the Nagoya Protocol		105 (54%)	United Nations Treaty Collection
Institutional structures for the implementation of the Protocol			
2. Number and percentage of Parties with legislative, administrative and policy measures on ABS	(a)	75 (71%)	Q.4 ABS-CH CBD report NBSAP
3. Number of Parties that have published information on legislative, administrative or policy measures on ABS in the ABS Clearing-House	(g)	45 (43%);	ABS-CH
4. Number and percentage of Parties with national focal points on ABS	(a)	103 (98%)	Q.5 ABS-CH
5. Number and percentage of Parties with one or more competent national authorities	(a)	57 (54%)	Q.6 ABS-CH CBD report NBSAP
6. Number and percentage of Parties that have published information on competent national authorities in the ABS Clearing-House	(g)	45 (43%)	ABS-CH
7. <i>New:</i> Number and percentage of Parties that have issued permits or their equivalents	(a)	19 (18%)	NR format requires revision
8. Number and percentage of Parties that have published internationally recognized certificates of compliance (IRCCs) in the ABS Clearing-House	(b) (g)	12 (11%)	Q.7, 8,16 ABS-CH
9. Number of IRCCs available in the ABS Clearing-House	(g)	146	ABS-CH
10. Number and percentage of Parties with one or more checkpoints	(a)	29 (27%)	Q.9 ABS-CH CBD report NBSAP
11. Number and percentage of Parties that have published information on checkpoints	(g)	20 (19%)	ABS-CH
12. Number and percentage of Parties that have made information available to the ABS Clearing-House (CNA, checkpoint, ABS measures, IRCC)	(a)(g)	54 (51%)	Q.3 ABS-CH
13. Number and percentage of Parties that have information (CNA, checkpoint, ABS measures, permits) that have not yet been made available to the ABS Clearing-House	(a)(g)	46 (44%)	Q.4, 6, 9 ABS- CH CBD report NBSAP
Legislative, administrative or policy measures on ABS: Access to genetic resources (Article 6)			
14. Number and percentage of Parties requiring prior informed consent for access to genetic resources that provide information on how to apply for prior informed consent as provided in Article 6.3 (c)	(a) (b)	27 (73%)	Q.13

Framework of indicators	Element	Reference point (as of 22 February 2018)	Source
15. Number and percentage of Parties requiring prior informed consent providing for the issuance at the time of access of a permit or its equivalent as provided in Article 6.3 (e)	(a) (b)	32 (86%)	Q.15
16. Number and percentage of Parties requiring prior informed consent for access to genetic resources that have rules and procedures for requiring and establishing mutually agreed terms as provided in Article 6.3 (g)	(a)	28 (76%)	Q.17
17. <i>Revised:</i> Number and percentage of Parties requiring prior informed consent for access to genetic resources for their utilization which received monetary benefits from granting access to genetic resources since entry into force of the Protocol	(b)	Not conclusive data	Q.18 requires revision
18. <i>New:</i> Amount of monetary benefits (in USD) received from granting access to genetic resources for their utilization since entry into force of the Protocol	(b)	Not conclusive data	Q.18 requires revision
19. <i>Revised:</i> Number and percentage of Parties requiring prior informed consent for access to genetic resources that received non-monetary benefits from granting access to genetic resources since entry into force of the Protocol	(b)	Not conclusive data	Q.18 requires revision
20. <i>Revised:</i> Number and percentage of Parties with indigenous peoples and local communities in their country that received monetary benefits from granting access to traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources since entry into force of the Protocol	(b)	Not conclusive data	Q.18 requires revision
21. <i>New:</i> Amount of monetary benefits (in USD) received from granting access to traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources for its utilization since entry into force of the Protocol	(b)	Not conclusive data	Q.18 requires revision
22. <i>Revised:</i> Number and percentage of Parties with indigenous peoples and local communities in their country that received non-monetary benefits from granting access to traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources	(b)	Not conclusive data	Q.18 requires revision
Legislative, administrative or policy measures on ABS: Fair and equitable-sharing (Article 5)			
23. Number and percentage of Parties with legislative, administrative or policy measures to implement Article 5.1 (genetic resources)	(a)	46 (44%)	Q.20
24. Number and percentage of Parties with legislative, administrative or policy measures to implement Article 5.2 (genetic resources held by indigenous peoples and local communities)	(a)	42 (40%)	Q.21

Framework of indicators	Element	Reference point (as of 22 February 2018)	Source
25. Number and percentage of Parties with legislative, administrative or policy measures to implement Article 5.5 (traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources)	(a)	41(39%)	Q.22
Legislative, administrative or policy measures on ABS: Compliance with domestic legislation or regulatory requirements on ABS (Article 15 and 16) and monitoring the utilization of genetic resources (Article 17)			
26. Number and percentage of Parties that have taken appropriate, effective and proportionate legislative, administrative or policy measures to implement Article 15.1 (genetic resources)	(b)	36 (34%)	Q.24
27. Number and percentage of Parties that have taken appropriate, effective and proportionate legislative, administrative or policy measures to implement Article 16.1 (traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources)	(e)	33 (31%)	Q.25
28. Number and percentage of Parties that require users of genetic resources to provide the information identified in Article 17.1 (a)(i), as appropriate, at a designated checkpoint	(a)	41 (39%)	Q.26
29. Number and percentage of Parties that provide the information collected or received at a designated checkpoint to relevant national authorities, to the Party providing prior informed consent and to the ABS Clearing-House	(a)	9 (9%)	Q.27
30. Number of checkpoint communiques published in the ABS Clearing-House	(g)	0	ABS-CH
Legislative, administrative or policy measures on ABS: compliance with mutually agreed terms (Article 18)			
31. Number and percentage of Parties that encourage the inclusion of dispute resolution provisions in mutually agreed terms as provided in Article 18.1	(d)	36 (34%)	Q.31
32. Number and percentage of Parties with opportunity to seek recourse available under their legal systems in cases of disputes arising from mutually agreed terms as provided in Article 18.2	(d)	51 (49%)	Q.32
33. Number and percentage of Parties with measures regarding access to justice	(d)	47 (45%)	Q.33
34. Number and percentage of Parties with measures regarding utilization of mechanisms regarding mutual recognition and enforcement of foreign judgements and arbitral awards	(d)	38 (36%)	Q.33

Framework of indicators	Element	Reference point (as of 22 February 2018)	Source
Special considerations (Article 8)			
35. Number and percentage of Parties that created conditions to promote and encourage research which contributes to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as provided in Article 8(a)	(b)	48 (46%)	Q.35
36. Number and percentage of Parties that paid due regard to cases of present or imminent emergencies that threaten or damage human, animal or plant health as provided in Article 8(b)	(b)	39 (37%)	Q.35
37. Number and percentage of Parties that have taken into consideration the need for expeditious access to genetic resources and expeditious fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of such genetic resources as provided in Article 8(b)	(b)	26 (25%)	Q.35
38. Number and percentage of Parties that have taken into consideration the importance of genetic resources for food and agriculture and their special role for food security as provided in Article 8(c)	(b)	48 (46%)	Q.35
Provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities (Article 6,7 and 12)			
39. Number and percentage of Parties where indigenous peoples and local communities have the established rights to grant access to genetic resources with measures in place with the aim of ensuring the prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities as provided in Article 6.2	(a)	23 (47%)	Q.38
40. Number and percentage of Parties with indigenous peoples and local communities in their country that have taken measures with the aim of ensuring that traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources that is held by indigenous peoples and local communities have been accessed with the prior informed consent or approval and involvement of these indigenous peoples and local communities and that mutually agreed terms have been established as provided in Article 7	(a)	21(43%)	Q.39
41. <i>New:</i> Number of indigenous peoples and local communities' community protocols and procedures developed	(f)	Not conclusive data	Q.42 requires revision Targeted survey
42. Number of indigenous peoples and local communities' customary laws, community protocols and procedures made available in the ABS Clearing-House	(f)(g)	3	ABS-CH
Contribution to conservation and sustainable use (Article 9)			
43. <i>Revised:</i> Number and percentage of Parties that reported that implementation of the Nagoya Protocol has contributed to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in their country	(b)	Not conclusive data	Q.46 requires revision

Framework of indicators	Element	Reference point (as of 22 February 2018)	Source
Model contractual clauses, codes of conduct, guidelines, best practices and standards (Articles 19 and 20)			
44. Number of model contractual clauses developed	(f)	29	Q.51, targeted survey
45. Number of codes of conduct, guidelines, best practices and standards developed	(f)	33	Q.52, targeted survey
46. Number and percentage of model contractual clauses made available in the ABS Clearing-House	(f) (g)	17 (59%)	ABS-CH
47. Number and percentage of codes of conduct, guidelines, best practices and standards made available in the ABS Clearing-House	(f) (g)	25 (75%)	ABS-CH
Awareness-raising and capacity (Article 21 and 22)			
48. Number and percentage of Parties that received external support for building and developing capacity for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol since entry into force of the Protocol	(c)	45 (43%)	Q.56
49. Number and percentage of Parties that provided external support for building and developing capacity for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol since entry into force of the Protocol	(c)	27 (26%)	Q.57
50. Number of capacity-building and development initiatives made available completed or initiated after the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol in 2010 and are providing, or have provided, direct support for country level activities contributing to the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol	(c)	90	SCBD documents on capacity-building
51. Number of capacity-building and development initiatives made available to the ABS Clearing-House	(c)(g)	57	ABS-CH
52. Number of capacity-building and awareness-raising tools and resources on access and benefit-sharing	(c)	84	SCBD documents on capacity-building
53. Number of capacity-building and awareness-raising tools and resources made available in the ABS Clearing-House	(c)(g)	34	ABS-CH
Technology transfer, collaboration and cooperation			
54. Number and percentage of Parties that have collaborated and cooperated in technical and scientific research and development programmes as a means to achieve the objective of the Protocol as provided in Article 23	(a)	46 (44%)	Q.59
Optional additional information			
55. Number and percentage of Parties that established a mechanism for budgetary allocations of funds for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol	(c)	24 (23%)	Q.61

Framework of indicators	Element	Reference point (as of 22 February 2018)	Source
56. Number and percentage of Parties that made financial resources available to other Parties	(c)	13 (12%)	Q.62
57. Number and percentage of Parties that received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions for the purposes of implementation of the Protocol as provided in Article 25	(c)	35 (33%)	Q.62
58. Average number of full time staff working to administer functions directly related to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in each Party	(c)	Not conclusive data	Q.63- requires revision
Implementation and operation of the ABS Clearing-House			
59. Number of non-Parties that have published national information (ABS measures, CNAs or checkpoints) in the ABS Clearing-House	(g)	8	ABS-CH
60. The number of visitor to the ABS Clearing-House per year	(g)	18,709 visitors (as of 22 March 2018)	Google analytics

3/2. Compliance with the Protocol

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Taking note of the report on the second meeting of the Compliance Committee⁷ and its recommendations,

1. *Welcomes* the progress made by Parties in the implementation of the Protocol, and *urges* Parties that have not yet done so to establish access and benefit-sharing legislative, administrative and policy measures and institutional arrangements;

2. *Also welcomes* the contribution of the Compliance Committee to the first assessment and review of the Protocol in the form of information and findings on general issues of compliance and recommendations to assist in addressing challenges to the implementation of the Protocol.

⁷ CBD/NP/MOP/3/2.

3/3. The Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House and information sharing (Article 14)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing

1. *Welcomes* progress made by the Secretariat in the implementation and operation of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House;⁸
2. *Welcomes* the efforts made by Parties, non-Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant stakeholders to make information available in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House;
3. *Urges* Parties that have not yet done so to publish all mandatory information available at the national level on the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House in accordance with the obligations in Article 14, paragraph 2, of the Protocol, as soon as possible, considering that the publication of mandatory information in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House is essential for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol;
4. *Urges* Parties to provide information on their national access and benefit-sharing procedures through the voluntary common format on procedures, as available in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House;
5. *Takes note* of the list of goals and priorities for the further implementation and administration of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House for the biennium 2019-2020 contained in annex to the present decision;
6. *Endorses* the joint modalities of operation for the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention, the Biosafety Clearing-House and the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, contained in the annex to decision 14/25, which are complementary to the modalities of operation of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House adopted by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol in decision [NP-1/2](#);
7. *Expresses* appreciation for the technical guidance provided by the Informal Advisory Committee;
8. *Decides* that the Informal Advisory Committee will hold at least one meeting and informal online discussions as needed, and report on the outcomes of its work to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol at its fourth meeting;
9. *Invites* Parties, non-Parties, and relevant organizations to make use of the interoperability mechanisms of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House to facilitate information exchange with their relevant databases, websites and information technology systems;
10. *Invites* Parties, non-Parties, and relevant organizations, as appropriate, to include capacity-building activities related to the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House in their relevant capacity-building activities, plans and projects in coordination with the Executive Secretary;
11. *Invites* Parties, non-Parties, relevant international organizations, regional development banks and other financial institutions, as appropriate, to support capacity-building activities related to the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, including the Protocol's system for monitoring the utilization of genetic resources;
12. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue to implement and administer the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House by following the goals and priorities for the further implementation and administration of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House contained in annex to the present decision, in accordance with the modalities of operation and feedback received, in particular that of Parties and of the Informal Advisory Committee to the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House.

⁸ See CBD/NP/MOP/3/8.

Annex

GOALS AND PRIORITIES FOR THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING CLEARING-HOUSE BY THE SECRETARIAT

Goal 1. Population and increased use of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House

Outreach and engagement

- (a) Ensure that each Party has designated its publishing authority;
- (b) Encourage and assist with the publication of all available national information, in particular competent national authorities, access and benefit-sharing measures, access and benefit-sharing procedures, and internationally recognized certificates of compliance, as necessary;
- (c) Engage with indigenous peoples and local communities and other relevant stakeholders and organizations to encourage submission of reference records;
- (d) Provide regular ABS Clearing-House announcements on updates and changes as well as related information for ABS Clearing-House users, in particular national focal points, publishing authorities and national authorized users;

Capacity-building

- (a) Disseminate and promote the use of the ABS Clearing-House capacity-building resources, including the e-learning module and step-by-step guides;
- (b) Translate capacity-building resources developed by the Executive Secretary for the ABS Clearing-House and make them available in all official languages of the United Nations;
- (c) Continue to provide face-to-face training (subject to available funding), as well as remote training upon request, as needed;
- (d) Collaborate with partners developing capacity-building projects to ensure they include relevant activities to support and promote the use of the ABS Clearing-House;
- (e) Raise awareness of the ABS Clearing-House among indigenous peoples and local communities and other relevant stakeholders, such as the business and scientific communities;
- (f) Raise awareness of the ABS Clearing-House in relevant international forums dealing with ABS-related issues;

Interoperability and collaboration

- (a) Continue to raise awareness and support capacity-building regarding the use of the interoperability mechanisms such as the application programming interface (API) including by providing relevant documentation, such as lessons learned and examples;
- (b) Facilitate the exchange of information with relevant national databases and systems;
- (c) Explore how the Bioland Tool for National Clearing-House Mechanisms can be used to facilitate the exchange of information related to access and benefit-sharing;
- (d) Continue to collaborate with relevant instruments and initiatives (such as the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture–Global Information System, InforMEA, World Federation for Culture Collections);

Goal 2. Translation and functionality for operationalizing the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House in the six official languages of the United Nations

- (a) Continue the translation of the ABS Clearing-House as a top priority;
- (b) Ensure that mechanisms and standard procedures remain in place to enable website translation to continue in a timely fashion;

Goal 3. Maintenance and improvement of functionality

- (a) Maintain and improve functionalities and finalize remaining issues;
- (b) Finalize documentation of the application programming interface, the main mechanism for interoperability;
- (c) Improve search functionality in order to sort and group records, as well as explore, analyse and present the published information in meaningful ways, including information related to capacity-building and making use of maps, charts and graphs, as appropriate;
- (d) Improve management of the common vocabularies (thesaurus), including how information is tagged with keywords to improve the retrieval of information;
- (e) Enhance website analytics to include tracking downloads and views of individual records and the files attached to them and provide national users with the relevant analytics and information;
- (f) Improve functionality to allow the easy updating of records that include references to older versions of records;

Goal 4. Integration with the clearing-house mechanism

- (a) Continue to support the implementation of the CBD web strategy;
- (b) Support the integration of the central clearing-house of the Convention and the Biosafety Clearing-House with the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House under a single platform in order to ensure a coordinated approach to web development and related information technology infrastructure.

3/4. Monitoring and reporting (Article 29)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Recognizing the importance of improving the alignment of national reporting under the Convention and its Protocols and of enhancing synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions and the Rio conventions as well as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development⁹ and reporting tools for the Sustainable Development Goals, and *noting* the progress made thus far in this respect,

1. *Accepts* the invitation of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention contained in decision 14/27, paragraph 1, and *agrees* to have a synchronized national reporting cycle commencing in 2023;
2. *Welcomes* the fact that 82 of the 100 Parties that had the obligation to report have submitted their interim national report;
3. *Also welcomes* the interim national reports submitted by non-Parties;
4. *Urges* Parties that have not yet submitted their interim national report to do so as soon as possible;
5. *Expresses its appreciation* for the financial support provided by the Global Environment Facility for a number of eligible Parties to support the preparation of their interim national reports, and *notes* the importance of timely availability of financial resources to support the preparation and submission of national reports by the reporting deadline;
6. *Welcomes* the efforts made by the Secretariat to assist Parties in submitting interim national reports;
7. *Requests* the Compliance Committee to provide an input to the review of the reporting format for the next reporting cycle;
8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to review the reporting format for its consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its fourth meeting, taking into account comments received, input from the Compliance Committee, the framework of indicators contained in decision NP-3/1, the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the alignment of national reports under the Convention and its Protocols, while bearing in mind the need for continuity in the format in order to measure progress in implementation;
9. *Decides* to revisit the issue of intervals for reporting at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, taking into account the alignment of national reports under the Convention and its Protocols and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

⁹ See General Assembly resolution [70/1](#) of 25 September 2015.

3/5. Measures to assist in capacity-building and capacity development (Article 22)

A. Strategic framework for capacity-building and development for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing

1. *Takes note* of the progress made in the implementation of the strategic framework for capacity-building and development for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization;¹⁰

2. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to expand their efforts to implement the strategic framework and further share information about their capacity-building initiatives, including emerging experiences, best practices and lessons learned, and capacity-building resources through the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, using the relevant common formats;

3. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to consider developing regional and subregional projects as a way forward to support regional cooperation and address the capacity-building gaps in certain regions;

4. *Takes note* of the report of the meeting of the Informal Advisory Committee on Capacity-building for the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol held during the intersessional period,¹¹ and *decides* to extend the mandate of the Informal Advisory Committee until the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, so that it can continue to support the implementation of the strategic framework for capacity-building and development in accordance with the terms of reference contained in decision [NP-1/8](#);

5. *Decides* that the Informal Advisory Committee will hold one meeting, and online consultations as needed, and *requests* the Informal Advisory Committee to provide inputs for the evaluation of the strategic framework through a review of preliminary findings and by providing additional information and recommendations;

6. *Also decides* to evaluate the strategic framework for capacity-building and development to support the effective implementation of the Nagoya Protocol¹² on the basis of the elements in the annex to the present decision;

7. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To continue to carry out and facilitate capacity-building activities to support the ratification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol, subject to the availability of resources, as set out in the short-term action plan (2017-2020) annexed to decision [NP-2/8](#) of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and decision [XIII/23](#) of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention to enhance and support capacity-building for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

(b) To prepare an evaluation of the strategic framework for capacity-building and development in accordance with decision NP-1/8, paragraph 9(f), and submit the evaluation report for the consideration of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting, with a view to ensuring an effective approach to capacity-building under the Nagoya Protocol that is consistent with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

8. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting to review the evaluation report submitted by the Executive Secretary and submit its recommendations to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its fourth meeting.

¹⁰ [CBD/NP/MOP/3/4](#).

¹¹ [CBD/ABS/CB-IAC/2018/1/4](#).

¹² Decision [NP-1/8](#), annex I.

B. Long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol,

Recalling decisions [NP-1/8](#) and [NP-2/8](#),

1. *Takes note* of the progress report on the implementation of the short-term action plan (2017-2020) to enhance and support capacity-building for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols supported and facilitated by the Executive Secretary in collaboration with various partners;¹³
2. *Welcomes* the terms of reference for the study to provide an information base for the preparation of a long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020, as contained in decision 14/24, annex I, appendix, and *notes* that, in decision 14/24, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to commission a study, subject to the availability of resources, to provide an information base for the preparation of a long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020, and *requests* that aspects relevant to the Nagoya Protocol be considered in the study;
3. *Invites* Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations to provide the Executive Secretary with views and suggestions on the possible elements of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020;
4. *Also invites* Parties as well as indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations to participate in the consultative workshops and online discussion forums on the draft long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020, in conjunction with the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
5. *Requests* the Informal Advisory Committee on Capacity-building for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol to contribute to the development of the draft long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020;
6. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to submit a draft long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020 for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting and for subsequent consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its fourth meeting;

Annex

ELEMENTS FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT TO SUPPORT THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL

A. Scope and objectives of the evaluation

1. It is proposed that the exercise focus on evaluating the relevance and effectiveness of the strategic framework in guiding the capacity-building and development efforts during the short and medium term (2014-2020) and offering recommendations that could be useful for the possible revision of the strategic framework beyond 2020. In other words, the objective of the evaluation will be to assess the framework's contribution in helping foster a strategic, coherent and coordinated approach to capacity-building and development for the effective implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.
2. Specific objectives of the evaluation will be threefold:
 - (a) To take stock and review progress made in the implementation of the strategic framework, including the main achievements by key area of the strategic framework, limitations and lessons learned since its adoption in 2014, based on the achievement of the objectives of the strategic framework;¹⁴
 - (b) To review the relevance and effectiveness of the strategic framework in guiding and facilitating capacity-building efforts while fostering coordination and cooperation in the short and medium term;

¹³ [CBD/COP/14/INF/10](#).

¹⁴ See decision [NP-1/8](#), annex I, para. 21.

(c) To propose options and make recommendations for further capacity-building to support the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol that could be taken into consideration for the preparation of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development beyond 2020 pursuant to decision XIII/23 of the Conference of the Parties.

B. Methodology and sources of information

3. The Secretariat will be responsible for carrying out the evaluation in 2019 with inputs from Parties, international organizations and other relevant stakeholders. Three main data collection methods will be used: (a) documentation review; (b) an online survey; and (c) interviews with representatives of key organizations working on capacity-building and development related to access and benefit-sharing.

4. To guide the review, the following set of questions and sub-questions is proposed:

- (a) What progress has been made in the implementation of the strategic framework?
 - (i) What have been the main achievements relating to the implementation of the strategic framework?
 - (ii) What progress has been made in strengthening capacities in the five key areas¹⁵ identified by the strategic framework?
 - (iii) Are there any gaps (thematic and/or geographic) in the implementation of the strategic framework?
 - (iv) Have the measures and capacity-building activities proposed in appendix II of the strategic framework been used in capacity-building initiatives?
 - (v) What have been the main challenges/obstacles to implementation?
 - (vi) What have been the most successful approaches and lessons arising from the capacity-building initiatives?
- (b) To what extent has the strategic framework been effective in fostering a systematic, coherent and coordinated approach to capacity-building and development?
 - (i) To what extent is the framework being used as a reference to guide the policies and actions of Parties, organizations and donors in relation to capacity-building for access and benefit-sharing (ABS)? If so, how? If it has not been used as a reference, please explain why;
 - (ii) What have been the most useful mechanisms to facilitate coordination of the implementation of the strategic framework and how?
 - (iii) To what extent are Parties and relevant organizations cooperating on capacity-development?
- (c) In what way has the strategic framework been effective in guiding and facilitating capacity-building activities?
 - (i) How has the strategic framework been used to guide capacity-building activities at the national, regional and international levels?
 - (ii) Was the strategic framework used to guide resource mobilization by Parties and has it influenced donor financing?
 - (iii) To what extent was the strategic framework taken into account by eligible countries in the design of their ABS capacity-building projects submitted to the Global Environment Facility?
- (d) Are the elements of the strategic framework (i.e. key areas, objectives, proposed activities) still relevant?
 - (i) Are the objectives of the strategic framework still valid? To what extent?

¹⁵ See decision NP-1/8, annex I, paras. 19 and 20.

- (ii) Are the key areas and indicative activities for capacity-building¹⁶ still consistent with the overall strategic goals, objectives and desired changes in capacity-building and development to support the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol?
 - (e) Recommendations for the preparation of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development beyond 2020:
 - (i) Which are the priority capacity-building actions related to ABS that should be included in the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development beyond 2020?
 - (ii) What key recommendations can you make for enhancing capacity-building and development on ABS beyond 2020, taking into account the challenges/obstacles identified under paragraph 4(a)?
5. Information for the review will be drawn from various sources including the following:
- (a) The assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Nagoya Protocol and related decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol;
 - (b) Information published in the interim national reports;
 - (c) Information published in the ABS Clearing-House;
 - (d) Progress reports on capacity-building and development initiatives supporting the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol prepared by the Secretariat;
 - (e) Reports of the Informal Advisory Committee;
 - (f) Project reports, evaluations and submissions from the Global Environment Facility and its implementing agencies, as well as from other key organizations involved in capacity-building (for example, the ABS Capacity Development Initiative);
 - (g) Needs assessments carried out by Parties and international organizations;
 - (h) Information gathered in an online survey and targeted interviews with key stakeholders.

C. Expected output and outcomes

6. The strategic framework is a flexible and living document. From its inception, it was intended to be used, adapted and updated on the basis of emerging experiences and lessons learned. As per paragraph 44 of the strategic framework, the main output of the review will be a report to be used by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to review and, as appropriate, revise the strategic framework for capacity-building and development in conjunction with the consideration and adoption of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

¹⁶ See decision NP-1/8, annex I, appendix II.

3/6. Measures to raise awareness of the importance of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge (Article 21)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing

1. *Takes note* of progress made in the implementation of the awareness-raising strategy for the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing;¹⁷
2. *Welcomes* the awareness-raising toolkit for access and benefit-sharing developed by the Secretariat with a view to supporting the implementation of the awareness-raising strategy;
3. *Encourages* Parties, non-Parties, relevant organizations and other actors to utilize the access and benefit-sharing awareness-raising toolkit developed by the Secretariat as part of their awareness-raising and capacity-building activities and to provide feedback on its use to the Secretariat;
4. *Also encourages* Parties, non-Parties, relevant organizations and other actors to continue to implement awareness-raising activities and to make available information on awareness-raising strategies and resources through the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House;
5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue supporting the implementation of the awareness-raising strategy¹⁸ through its capacity-building activities and by encouraging the use of the access and benefit-sharing awareness-raising toolkit in access and benefit-sharing capacity-building and awareness-raising projects carried out by Parties, non-Parties and relevant organizations;
6. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to seek feedback from Parties, non-Parties and other relevant actors on the access and benefit-sharing awareness-raising toolkit and to provide an update on the progress of implementation of the awareness-raising strategy for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol at its fourth meeting.

¹⁷ CBD/NP/MOP/3/6.

¹⁸ As set out in decision NP-1/9.

3/7. Cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and initiatives

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Recognizing the importance of cooperation with other international organizations, conventions and initiatives on matters related to access and benefit-sharing, and *welcoming* the cooperative activities undertaken by the Executive Secretary,

Recalling the preamble to the Nagoya Protocol, in which Parties to the Protocol recognize that international instruments related to access and benefit-sharing should be mutually supportive with a view to achieving the objectives of the Convention,

Recalling also that the preamble to the Nagoya Protocol refers to the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and the World Health Organization,

1. *Takes note* of the cooperative activities on access and benefit-sharing undertaken by the Executive Secretary;¹⁹

2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue to engage with relevant ongoing processes and policy debates, and liaise with other conventions, international organizations and initiatives, as appropriate, to provide and collect information on current discussions on matters related to access and benefit-sharing, and in particular on public health issues;

3. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to prepare a report on activities undertaken pursuant to paragraph 2 above including key developments under international agreements and instruments of relevance to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties at its fourth meeting;

4. *Further requests* the Executive Secretary to continue to engage in cooperative activities and in projects for mutually supportive implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture;

5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to share decision NP-3/14 with the World Health Organization, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and other relevant conventions and bodies.

¹⁹ [CBD/NP/MOP/3/9](#).

3/8. Financial mechanism

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing

1. *Welcomes* the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, and *expresses its appreciation* to the countries that contributed to the seventh replenishment;²⁰
2. *Also welcomes* the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy, which includes a programme for implementing the Nagoya Protocol, and *takes note* of the notional programming targets for the various Biodiversity Focal Area objectives and programmes contained in the report on the seventh replenishment;²¹
3. *Encourages* eligible Parties to prioritize access and benefit-sharing projects during the programming of their seventh-replenishment national allocations under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR);
4. *Encourages* Parties to incorporate access and benefit-sharing activities in projects developed under other programmes of the Global Environment Facility, as appropriate;
5. *Also encourages* Parties to cooperate at the regional and subregional levels and to request support from the Global Environment Facility for joint projects in order to maximize synergies and opportunities for cost-effective sharing of resources, information, experiences and expertise.

²⁰ See [CBD/NP/MOP/3/5](#).

²¹ [GEF/A.6/05/Rev.01](#).

3/9. Enhancing integration under the Convention and its Protocols with respect to provisions related to access and benefit-sharing

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Recalling decision [XII/13](#) of the Conference of the Parties regarding possible ways and means to promote integrated approaches to issues at the interface between the access and benefit-sharing-related provisions of the Convention and the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization,

Takes note of the proposed ways and means for enhanced integration,²² and *welcomes* decision 14/31 of the Conference of the Parties.

²² See [CBD/SBI/2/22](#), sect. I, recommendation 2/14, section B.

3/10. Review of experience in holding concurrently meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Recalling decisions [NP-1/12](#) and [NP-2/12](#),

Having reviewed the experience in holding concurrently meetings of the Conference of the Parties, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, using the criteria determined in decision NP-2/12, and taking into account the views of Parties, observers and participants at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, and through the surveys conducted after the meetings,

Recognizing that a further review will be undertaken at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol,

1. *Notes with satisfaction that the concurrent meetings have allowed for increased integration among the Convention and its Protocols, and improved consultations, coordination and synergies among the respective national focal points;*

2. *Notes that most of the criteria were considered as being met or partially met, and that further improvements in the functioning of the concurrent meetings are desirable, in particular to improve the outcomes and effectiveness of the meetings of the Parties to the Protocols;*

3. *Reiterates the importance of ensuring the full and effective participation of representatives of developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition, in the concurrent meetings, and highlights, in this respect, the importance, in particular, of ensuring adequate participation of representatives in meetings of the Protocols by making funding available for such participation, including in intersessional meetings;*

4. *Requests the Executive Secretary to further develop the preliminary review of the experience in concurrent meetings, using the criteria referred to in decision 2/12, on the basis of the experience gained from the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting;*

5. *Requests the Bureau and the Executive Secretary, when finalizing the proposed organization of work for the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, to take into account the present decision, the information contained in the notes by the Executive Secretary²³ and the experience gained from the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol.*

²³ [CBD/SBI/2/16](#) and [Add.1](#).

3/11. Procedure for avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in expert groups

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Recognizing the critical importance of taking decisions on the basis of the best available expert advice,

Recognizing also the need to avoid or manage, in a transparent manner, conflicts of interest by members of expert groups established from time to time to develop recommendations,

1. *Approves* the Procedure for Avoiding or Managing Conflicts of Interest in Expert Groups contained in the annex to decision 14/33 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention;

2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to ensure the implementation, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Procedure for Avoiding or Managing Conflicts of Interest in Expert Groups with respect to the work of technical expert groups under the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing, in consultation with the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice or the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties when acting as the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, as appropriate;

3. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to prepare a report on: (a) the implementation of the Procedure; and (b) relevant developments in avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in other multilateral environmental agreements, intergovernmental initiatives or organizations, and, if appropriate, propose updates and amendments to the current Procedure for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at a meeting held prior to the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol;

4. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation to consider the report referred to in paragraph 3 above and to submit recommendations, as appropriate, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol at its fifth meeting.

3/12. Digital sequence information on genetic resources

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Mindful of the objective of the Nagoya Protocol,

Recalling Article 5.1, 8, 20, 22, 23 of the Nagoya Protocol,

1. *Welcomes* decision 14/34 and decision on 14/20 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention;
2. *Recognizes* that the Open-ended Intersessional Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework will consider the outcomes of the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group referred to in paragraph 11 of decision 14/20 of the Conference of the Parties;
3. *Requests* the Open-ended Working Group to submit the outcome of its deliberations for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol at its fourth meeting.

3/13. Global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism (Article 10)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Mindful of the objective of the Nagoya Protocol,

Recalling the sovereign rights of States over their genetic resources,

Recalling also Article 10 of the Nagoya Protocol,

Recalling further Articles 9, 11 and 22 of the Nagoya Protocol,

Recalling decisions XI/1 B, NP-1/10 and NP-2/10 and *building* on the work undertaken pursuant to these decisions,

Recognizing the experience gained with implementation of the Nagoya Protocol since its entry into force while *acknowledging* that many Parties are still in the process of establishing access and benefit-sharing legislative, administrative and policy measures and institutional arrangements,

Recognizing also the ongoing need for capacity-building to support Parties and indigenous peoples and local communities in developing and implementing legislative, administrative and policy measures on access and benefit-sharing,

1. *Welcomes* the information synthesized by the Executive Secretary through the interim national reports and the Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House of relevance to Article 10;

2. *Takes note* of the information on developments in relevant international processes and organizations;²⁴

3. *Considers* that more information on specific cases of genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources that occur in transboundary situations or for which it is not possible to grant or obtain prior informed consent, accompanied by an explanation as to why such cases cannot be covered under the bilateral approach of the Nagoya Protocol as well as options for addressing those cases, including through a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism would assist in the consideration of Article 10;

4. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, relevant stakeholders and organizations to submit to the Executive Secretary:

(a) Information on specific cases which may support the need for a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism that are not covered under the bilateral approach, accompanied by an explanation as to why such cases cannot be covered under the bilateral approach set out in the Nagoya Protocol;

(b) Options for possible modalities for addressing those cases, including through a global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism;

5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To commission, subject to availability of resources, a peer-reviewed study to identify specific cases of genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources that occur in transboundary situations or for which it is not possible to grant or obtain prior informed consent;

(b) To compile and synthesize the information submitted pursuant to paragraph 4 (a) and (b);

(c) To submit the study and the synthesis for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation;

6. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation to consider the study and synthesis with a view to identifying: (a) specific cases, if any, that cannot be addressed through the bilateral approach; and (b) if identified, options for addressing these cases, including a possible global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism, and make a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol at its fourth meeting.

²⁴ [CBD/SBI/2/5](#), section III.

3/14. Specialized international access and benefit sharing instruments in the context of Article 4, paragraph 4, of the Nagoya Protocol

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Recognizing the need to strengthen coordination and mutual supportiveness among international instruments on access and benefit-sharing,

Acknowledging that any criteria to identify a specialized international access and benefit-sharing instrument and any process for recognition of such an instrument is not intended to create a hierarchy between the Nagoya Protocol and other international instruments,

1. *Takes note* of the study²⁵ and potential criteria for specialized international access and benefit-sharing instruments in the context of Article 4, paragraph 4, of the Nagoya Protocol as summarized in the annex below, and *agrees* to reconsider these potential criteria at its fourth meeting;
2. *Invites* Parties and other Governments to submit:
 - (a) Information on how specialized international access and benefit-sharing instruments are addressed in their domestic measures;
 - (b) Views on the potential criteria contained in the study, taking into account Article 4, paragraphs 1 to 3, of the Protocol;
3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue to follow developments in relevant international forums;
4. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to synthesize the information and views submitted, including the information from developments in relevant international forums, and make it available for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting;
5. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting to consider the synthesis referred to in paragraph 4 above and to make a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol at its fourth meeting;
6. *Decides* to include a standing item on “cooperation with other international organizations” on the agenda of its future meetings to take stock of developments in relevant international forums, including any information on specialized international access and benefit-sharing instruments recognized by another intergovernmental body and/or by a Party or group of Parties, with a view to enhancing mutual supportiveness between the Protocol and specialized international access and benefit-sharing instruments;
7. *Invites* Parties and other Governments to coordinate at the national level regarding access and benefit-sharing issues addressed in different international forums, as appropriate, in order to support a coherent international regime on access and benefit-sharing;
8. *Invites* Parties and other Governments which are or may become Parties to the Nagoya Protocol and to a specialized international access and benefit-sharing instrument, as appropriate, to take steps to implement both instruments in a mutually supportive manner, including with the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, where relevant or applicable, according to their national circumstances.

²⁵ “Study into criteria to identify a specialized international access and benefit-sharing instrument, and a possible process for its recognition” (CBD/SBI/2/INF/17).

*Annex***Potential criteria for specialized international access and benefit-sharing instruments in the context of Article 4, paragraph 4, of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization**

The following is a summary of the potential criteria for specialized international access and benefit-sharing instruments in the context of Article 4, paragraph 4, of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, as described in the study contained in document CBD/SBI/2/INF/17. The potential criteria are under discussion and have not been agreed by Parties to the Protocol.

1. *Intergovernmentally agreed* — The instrument would be developed and agreed through an intergovernmental process. The instrument may be binding or non-binding.
2. *Specialized* — The instrument would:
 - (a) Apply to a specific set of genetic resources and/or traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources which would otherwise fall under the scope of the Nagoya Protocol;
 - (b) Apply to specific uses of genetic resources and/or traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources which require a differentiated and hence specialized approach.
3. *Mutually supportive* — The instrument would be consistent with and supportive of, and not run counter to the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol, including with respect to:
 - (a) Consistency with biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives;
 - (b) Fairness and equity in the sharing of benefits;
 - (c) Legal certainty with respect to access to genetic resources or traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources and to benefit-sharing;
 - (d) Contribution to sustainable development, as reflected in internationally agreed goals;
 - (e) Other general principles of law, including good faith, effectiveness and legitimate expectations.

3/15. Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing

1. *Takes note* of the proposed preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and *welcomes* decision 14/34 of the Conference of the Parties;
2. *Encourages* Parties to undertake measures to enhance the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-Sharing, in the context of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
3. *Invites* Parties to participate in the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
4. *Recommends* that the findings on general issues of compliance²⁶ as well as the outcomes of the first assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, as contained in decision NP-3/1, be considered in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;
5. *Requests* that the Compliance Committee at its next meeting consider how to support and promote compliance with the Nagoya Protocol within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

²⁶ Findings and recommendations of the Compliance Committee on general issues of compliance as a contribution to the assessment and review of the Nagoya Protocol are contained in annex I to the report of the Compliance Committee under the Nagoya Protocol on the work of its second meeting (CBD/NP/MOP/3/2).

3/16. Budget for the integrated programme of work of the Secretariat

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Recalling its decision [2/13](#), and decision [XIII/32](#) of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as decision VIII/7 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Also recalling decision [III/1](#), which specifies that budget proposals should be circulated 90 days before meetings of the Conference of the Parties,

Further recalling resolution [2/18](#) of the United Nations Environment Assembly on the relationship between the United Nations Environment Programme and the multilateral environmental agreements for which it provides the secretariats,

1. *Decides to adopt an integrated programme of work and budget for the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing;*
2. *Also decides to share all costs for Secretariat services among the Convention, the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya Protocol on a ratio of 74/15/11 for the biennium 2019-2020;*
3. *Approves a core (BB) programme budget for the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing of 2,084,400 United States dollars for the year 2019 and of 2,188,500 United States dollars for the year 2020, representing 11 per cent of the integrated budget of 18,948,900 United States dollars for the year 2019 and 19,895,200 United States dollars for the year 2020 for the Convention and the Protocols, for the purposes listed in tables 1a and 1b below;*
4. *Adopts the scale of assessments for the apportionment of expenses for 2019 and 2020 as contained in table 2 below;²⁷*
5. *Authorizes the Executive Secretary on an exceptional basis to amend the 2019 scale of assessments to include all Parties for which the Nagoya Protocol enters into force on or before 31 December 2018;*
6. *Acknowledges the funding estimates for the Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing for the period 2019-2020 included in table 3 of decision 14/37 of the Conference of the Parties;*
7. *Decides to apply, mutatis mutandis, paragraphs 3 to 5 and 7 to 50 of decision 14/37 of the Conference of the Parties.*

²⁷ Refer to footnote in table 2. As per United Nations General Assembly resolution 70/245.

Table 1a. Integrated biennium budget for the Trust Funds of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols 2019-2020

	<i>2019 (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>	<i>2020 (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>	<i>Total (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>
A. Governing and subsidiary bodies	1 889.0	2 484.0	4 373.0
B. Executive direction and management	2 634.5	2 669.8	5 304.3
C. Programme of work	9 309.4	9 243.1	18 552.5
D. Administrative support	2 886.0	3 093.7	5 979.7
Subtotal	16 718.9	17 490.6	34 209.5
Programme support costs	2 173.5	2 273.8	4 447.2
Working Capital Reserve	56.6	130.7	187.4
Total	18 949.0	19 895.1	38 844.1
Nagoya Protocol share of the integrated budget (11%)	2 084.4	2 188.5	4 272.9
<u>Less:</u> Contribution from host country	(135.2)	(156.6)	(291.8)
<u>Less:</u> Use of reserves for extraordinary meetings	(93.2)	(69.6)	(162.8)
<u>Less:</u> Use of reserves from previous years	(94.9)	(94.9)	(189.8)
Net total (amount to be shared by Parties)	1 761.1	1 867.4	3 628.5
	<i>2019 (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>	<i>2020 (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>	<i>Total (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>
I. Programmes:			
Office of the Executive Secretary	3 534.0	3 444.8	6 978.8
ABS and BS Protocols	2 322.6	2 375.9	4 698.5
Science, Society and Sustainable Futures Division	3 912.3	3 909.0	7 821.3
Implementation Support Division	3 105.0	3 708.2	6 813.2
II. Administration, Finance and Conference Services	3 845.0	4 052.6	7 897.6
Subtotal	16 718.9	17 490.5	34 209.4
Programme support costs	2 173.4	2 273.9	4 447.2
III. Working Capital Reserve	56.6	130.8	187.5
Total	18 948.9	19 895.2	38 844.1
Nagoya Protocol share of the integrated budget (11%)	2 084.4	2 188.5	4 272.9
<u>Less:</u> Contribution from host country	(135.2)	(156.6)	(291.8)
<u>Less:</u> Use of reserves for extraordinary meetings	(93.2)	(69.6)	(162.8)
<u>Less:</u> Use of reserves from previous years	(94.9)	(94.9)	(189.8)
Net total (amount to be shared by Parties)	1 761.1	1 867.4	3 628.5

Table 1b. Integrated biennium budget for the Trust Funds of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols 2019-2020 (by object of expenditure)

<i>Object of expenditure</i>	<i>2019</i>	<i>2020</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>(Thousands of United States dollars)</i>		
A. Staff costs	11 453.9	11 626.6	23 080.5
B. Bureau meetings	150.0	215.0	365.0
C. Travel on official business	400.0	400.0	800.0
D. Consultants/subcontractors	50.0	50.0	100.0
E. Public awareness material/communications	50.0	50.0	100.0
F. Temporary assistance/overtime	100.0	100.0	200.0
G. Training	5.0	5.0	10.0
H. Translation of CHM website/website projects	65.0	65.0	130.0
I. Meetings ^{1/2/3}	1 569.0	2 119.0	3 688.0
J. Expert meetings	170.0	150.0	320.0
K. Extraordinary meetings on post-2020 ^{4/}	750.0	560.0	1 310.0
L. Rent and associated costs ^{5/}	1 229.5	1 423.4	2 652.9
M. General operating expenses	726.6	726.6	1 453.2
Subtotal (I)	16 719.0	17 490.6	34 209.6
II Programme support costs (13%)	2 173.5	2 273.8	4 447.2
Subtotal (I + II)	18 892.4	19 764.4	38 656.8
II I Working Capital Reserve	56.6	130.8	187.3
Grand total (II + III)	18 949.0	19 895.1	38 844.1
Nagoya Protocol share of the integrated budget (11%)	2 084.4	2 188.5	4 272.9
<u>Less contribution from host country^{5/}</u>	(135.2)	(156.6)	(291.8)
<u>Less use of reserves for extraordinary meetings^{4/}</u>	(93.2)	(69.6)	(162.8)
<u>Less use of reserves from previous years</u>	(94.9)	(94.9)	(189.9)
Net total (amount to be shared by Parties)	1 761.0	1 867.3	3 628.3

1/ Regular meetings to be funded from the core budget:

- Eleventh meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions.

- Twenty-third and twenty-fourth meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific Technical and Technological Advice.

- Third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

- Fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention / Tenth meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol / Fourth meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol held concurrently.

2/ SBSTTA-23 (3 days), Art. 8(j)-11 (3 days) back-to-back in 2019. SBSTTA-24 (6days), SBI-3 (5 days) back-to-back in 2020.

3/ Budget for COP-15/COP-MOP 10 and COP-MOP 4 divided equally between both years of the biennium.

4/ Two stand-alone meetings of the extraordinary meetings, 5 days each, plus 2 days extension for SBSTTA-23

5/ Indicative.

Table 2. Contribution to the Trust Fund for the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing for the biennium 2019-2020²⁸

Party	Scale of assessments 2016-2018	Scale with 22% ceiling, no least developed country paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2019	Contribution due as of 1 January 2020	Total 2019-2020
Afghanistan	0.006	0.011	195	207	402
Albania	0.008	0.015	260	276	536
Angola	0.010	0.010	176	187	363
Antigua and Barbuda	0.002	0.004	65	69	134
Argentina	0.892	1.648	29 023	30 776	59 800
Austria	0.720	1.330	23 427	24 842	48 269
Belarus	0.056	0.103	1 822	1 932	3 754
Belgium	0.885	1.635	28 796	30 535	59 330
Benin	0.003	0.006	98	104	201
Bhutan	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0.012	0.022	390	414	804
Botswana	0.014	0.026	456	483	939
Bulgaria	0.045	0.083	1 464	1 553	3 017
Burkina Faso	0.004	0.007	130	138	268
Burundi	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Cambodia	0.004	0.007	130	138	268
Cameroon	0.010	0.018	325	345	670
Central African Republic	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Chad	0.005	0.009	163	173	335
China	7.921	14.636	257 728	273 296	531 024
Comoros	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Congo	0.006	0.011	195	207	402
Cote d'Ivoire	0.009	0.017	293	311	603
Croatia	0.099	0.183	3 221	3 416	6 637
Cuba	0.065	0.120	2 115	2 243	4 358

²⁸ As per United Nations General Assembly resolution 70/245. A revised scale of assessments for the triennium will be applied, when released, to calculate assessed contributions for the biennium 2019-2020 (see <https://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2019/ntf-2019-017-budget-np-en.pdf>).

Party	Scale of assessments 2016-2018	Scale with 22% ceiling, no least developed country paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2019	Contribution due as of 1 January 2020	Total 2019-2020
Czechia	0.344	0.636	11 193	11 869	23 062
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.008	0.010	176	187	363
Denmark	0.584	1.079	19 002	20 150	39 151
Djibouti	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Dominican Republic	0.046	0.085	1 497	1 587	3 084
Ecuador	0.067	0.124	2 180	2 312	4 492
Egypt	0.152	0.281	4 946	5 244	10 190
Eswatini	0.002	0.004	65	69	134
Ethiopia	0.010	0.010	176	187	363
European Union	0.000	2.500	44 024	46 683	90 708
Fiji	0.003	0.006	98	104	201
Finland	0.456	0.843	14 837	15 733	30 570
France	4.859	8.978	158 099	167 649	325 747
Gabon	0.017	0.031	553	587	1 140
Gambia	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Germany	6.389	11.805	207 881	220 438	428 319
Guatemala	0.028	0.052	911	966	1 877
Guinea	0.002	0.004	65	69	134
Guinea-Bissau	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Guyana	0.002	0.004	65	69	134
Honduras	0.008	0.015	260	276	536
Hungary	0.161	0.297	5 239	5 555	10 793
India	0.737	1.362	23 980	25 428	49 408
Indonesia	0.504	0.931	16 399	17 389	33 788
Japan	9.680	17.886	314 961	333 986	648 947
Jordan	0.020	0.037	651	690	1 341
Kazakhstan	0.191	0.353	6 215	6 590	12 805
Kenya	0.018	0.033	586	621	1 207
Kuwait	0.285	0.527	9 273	9 833	19 106
Kyrgyzstan	0.002	0.004	65	69	134

Party	Scale of assessments 2016-2018	Scale with 22% ceiling, no least developed country paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2019	Contribution due as of 1 January 2020	Total 2019-2020
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.003	0.006	98	104	201
Lebanon	0.046	0.085	1 497	1 587	3 084
Lesotho	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Liberia	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Luxembourg	0.064	0.118	2 082	2 208	4 291
Madagascar	0.003	0.006	98	104	201
Malawi	0.002	0.004	65	69	134
Mali	0.003	0.006	98	104	201
Malta	0.016	0.030	521	552	1 073
Marshall Islands	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Mauritania	0.002	0.004	65	69	134
Mauritius	0.012	0.022	390	414	804
Mexico	1.435	2.651	46 691	49 511	96 202
Micronesia (Federated States of)	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Mongolia	0.005	0.009	163	173	335
Mozambique	0.004	0.007	130	138	268
Myanmar	0.010	0.010	176	187	363
Namibia	0.010	0.018	325	345	670
Netherlands	1.482	2.738	48 220	51 133	99 353
Niger	0.002	0.004	65	69	134
Norway	0.849	1.569	27 624	29 293	56 917
Pakistan	0.093	0.172	3 026	3 209	6 235
Palau	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Panama	0.034	0.063	1 106	1 173	2 279
Peru	0.136	0.251	4 425	4 692	9 117
Philippines	0.165	0.305	5 369	5 693	11 062
Portugal	0.392	0.724	12 755	13 525	26 280
Qatar	0.269	0.497	8 753	9 281	18 034
Republic of Korea	2.039	3.767	66 344	70 351	136 695
Republic of Moldova	0.004	0.007	130	138	268
Rwanda	0.002	0.004	65	69	134

Party	Scale of assessments 2016-2018	Scale with 22% ceiling, no least developed country paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2019	Contribution due as of 1 January 2020	Total 2019-2020
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Samoa	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Sao Tome and Principe	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Senegal	0.005	0.009	163	173	335
Seychelles	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Sierra Leone	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Slovakia	0.160	0.296	5 206	5 520	10 726
South Africa	0.364	0.673	11 844	12 559	24 403
Spain	2.443	4.514	79 489	84 290	163 779
Sudan	0.010	0.010	176	187	363
Sweden	0.956	1.766	31 106	32 985	64 090
Switzerland	1.140	2.106	37 093	39 333	76 426
Syrian Arab Republic	0.024	0.044	781	828	1 609
Tajikistan	0.004	0.007	130	138	268
Togo	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Tuvalu	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Uganda	0.009	0.010	176	187	363
United Arab Emirates	0.604	1.116	19 653	20 840	40 492
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4.463	8.246	145 214	153 986	299 200
United Republic of Tanzania	0.010	0.018	325	345	670
Uruguay	0.079	0.146	2 570	2 726	5 296
Vanuatu	0.001	0.002	33	35	67
Viet Nam	0.058	0.107	1 887	2 001	3 888
Zambia	0.007	0.013	228	242	469
Zimbabwe	0.004	0.007	130	138	268
Total	52.793	100.000	1 760 968	1 867 338	3 628 306

II. ACCOUNT OF PROCEEDINGS

A. Background

1. Following an offer of the Government of Egypt, which was welcomed by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in decision XIII/33, and in accordance with Article 26, paragraph 6, of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol was held in Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, from 17 to 29 November 2018, concurrently with the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

B. Attendance

2. All States were invited to participate in the meeting. The following Parties to the Nagoya Protocol attended:

Afghanistan	Finland	Namibia
Albania	France	Netherlands
Angola	Gabon	Niger
Antigua and Barbuda	Gambia	Norway
Argentina	Germany	Palau
Austria	Guatemala	Panama
Belarus	Guinea	Peru
Belgium	Guinea-Bissau	Philippines
Benin	Guyana	Portugal
Bhutan	Honduras	Qatar
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Hungary	Republic of Korea
Botswana	India	Republic of Moldova
Bulgaria	Indonesia	Rwanda
Burkina Faso	Japan	Samoa
Burundi	Jordan	Sao Tome and Principe
Cambodia	Kenya	Senegal
Cameroon	Kuwait	Seychelles
Central African Republic	Kyrgyzstan	Sierra Leone
Chad	Lao People's Democratic	Slovakia
China	Republic	South Africa
Comoros	Lebanon	Spain
Congo	Lesotho	Sudan
Croatia	Liberia	Sweden
Cuba	Luxembourg	Switzerland
Czechia	Madagascar	Syrian Arab Republic
Côte d'Ivoire	Malawi	Tajikistan
Democratic Republic of the	Mali	Togo
Congo	Malta	Uganda
Denmark	Marshall Islands	United Arab Emirates
Djibouti	Mauritania	United Kingdom of Great
Dominican Republic	Mauritius	Britain and Northern Ireland
Ecuador	Mexico	United Republic of Tanzania
Egypt	Micronesia (Federated States	Uruguay
Eswatini	of)	Viet Nam
Ethiopia	Mongolia	Zambia
European Union	Mozambique	Zimbabwe
Fiji	Myanmar	

3. The following States not party to the Nagoya Protocol were also represented:

Algeria	Holy See	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Andorra	Iceland	Saint Lucia
Armenia	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Azerbaijan	Iraq	Saudi Arabia
Bahrain	Ireland	Serbia
Bangladesh	Israel	Singapore
Belize	Italy	Slovenia
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Jamaica	Solomon Islands
Brazil	Kiribati	Somalia
Cabo Verde	Latvia	South Sudan
Canada	Libya	Sri Lanka
Chile	Liechtenstein	State of Palestine
Colombia	Lithuania	Suriname
Cook Islands	Malaysia	Thailand
Costa Rica	Maldives	Tonga
Cyprus	Monaco	Trinidad and Tobago
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Morocco	Tunisia
El Salvador	Nepal	Turkey
Equatorial Guinea	New Zealand	Turkmenistan
Eritrea	Nicaragua	Tuvalu
Estonia	Nigeria	Ukraine
Georgia	Oman	United States of America
Ghana	Papua New Guinea	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Greece	Paraguay	Yemen
Grenada	Poland	
Haiti	Romania	
	Russian Federation	

4. For all other participants, see annex I to the report of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CBD/COP/14/14).

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

5. The third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol was opened at 11 a.m. on 17 November 2018 by Mr. José Octavio Tripp Villanueva, Ambassador of Mexico to Egypt, on behalf of Mr. Rafael Pacchiano Alamán, Minister of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico and outgoing President of the Conference of the Parties, who also served as President of the second Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol.

6. Opening statements were made by Ms. Yasmine Fouad, Minister of Environment of Egypt and President of the Conference of the Parties at its fourteenth meeting, also serving as President of the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol; Ms. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity; Ms. Maria Fernanda Espinosa, President of the United Nations General Assembly, via video; and Mr. Abdel Fattah El Sisi, President of Egypt.

7. In her statement, the President referred to the outcomes of the high-level segment, including the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration: Investing in Biodiversity for People and Planet. The Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration was issued as CBD/COP/14/12 and the report of the high-level segment as CBD/COP/14/12/Add.1.

8. Two video presentations were screened, the first prepared by the Government of Mexico on mainstreaming biodiversity and the second by the Government of Egypt on biodiversity and its vital connection with the survival of humanity. There was also a performance by schoolchildren on the importance of biodiversity.

9. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018, statements were made by Ms. Amina Mohammed, Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations, via video, and Ms. Corli Pretorius, Deputy Director of the United Nations Environment Programme's (UNEP) World Conservation Monitoring Centre.

10. Representatives viewed two films, one by the National Geographic Society and the other by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), as well as a video message from Mr. Paul McCartney.
11. General statements were made by representatives of Argentina (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Canada (on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries), the European Union and its 28 member States, Belarus (on behalf of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe), Rwanda (on behalf of the African Group) and Malaysia (on behalf of the Group of Like-minded Megadiverse Countries).
12. Statements were also made by representatives of the Indigenous Women's Biodiversity Network (IWBN), the International Indigenous Forum for Biodiversity (IIFB), the CBD Alliance and the Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN) and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).
13. The opening statements are summarized in annex II to the report of the Conference of the Parties on its fourteenth meeting.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Election of the President and substitute officers

Election of the President

14. Pursuant to Article 26, paragraph 3, of the Nagoya Protocol, the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties also serves as the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol. Accordingly, Ms. Fouad, who had been elected President of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, also served as the President of the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol.

Election of substitute officers

15. Article 26, paragraph 3, of the Nagoya Protocol stipulated that any member of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties who was representing a Party to the Convention that was not a Party to the Protocol must be substituted by a member elected by and from among the Parties to the Protocol. The Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting had elected 10 members of the Bureau to serve until the closure of the fourteenth meeting. Subsequently, at its second meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol had elected five substitute Bureau members for those regions where the Conference of the Parties Bureau member was representing a Party to the Convention that was not a Party to the Nagoya Protocol. Since then, however, one such country had ratified the Nagoya Protocol. In addition, three representatives had been replaced by the Party or region concerned.

16. Accordingly, the following representatives served as substitute Bureau members: Ms. Marina Hernandez (Dominican Republic), substituting for Mr. Randolph Edmead (Saint Kitts and Nevis); Mr. Luciano Martin Donadio Linares (Argentina) substituting for Ms. Clarissa Nina (Brazil); and Mr. Gaute Voigt-Hanssen (Norway) substituting for Mr. Basil Van Havre (Canada).

17. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018, it was agreed that, on the proposal of the Bureau, Mr. Monyrak Meng (Cambodia) would serve as Rapporteur for the meeting.

18. At its 4th plenary session, on 22 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties elected 10 representatives to serve as members of the Bureau for a term of office commencing upon the closure of its fourteenth meeting and ending at the closure of its fifteenth meeting. Three of the representatives elected were from countries that were not Parties to the Nagoya Protocol. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 22 November, the following representatives were therefore elected to serve as substitute members for the Bureau for the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol: Mr. Dilosharvo Dustov (Tajikistan), substituting for Ms. Teona Karchava (Georgia); Mr. Luciano Martin Donadio Linares (Argentina), substituting for Mr. Carlos Manuel Rodriguez (Costa Rica); and Ms. Marie Haraldstad (Norway), substituting for Ms. Rosemary Paterson (New Zealand).

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

19. At the 2nd plenary session, on 17 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted the following agenda on the basis of the agenda prepared by the Executive Secretary in consultation with the Bureau (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1).

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters.
3. Report on the credentials of representatives to the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol.
4. Reports of subsidiary bodies.
5. Report of the Compliance Committee (Article 30).
6. Administration of the Protocol and budget for the trust funds.
7. Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 31).
8. Financial mechanism and resources (Article 25).
9. Measures to assist in capacity-building and capacity development (Article 22).
10. The Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House and information-sharing (Article 14).
11. Monitoring and reporting (Article 29).
12. Measures to raise awareness of the importance of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge (Article 21).
13. Enhancing integration under the Convention and its Protocols with respect to provisions related to access and benefit-sharing.
14. Cooperation with other international organizations, conventions and initiatives.
15. Review of the effectiveness of structures and processes.
16. Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.
17. Digital sequence information on genetic resources.
18. Specialized international access and benefit-sharing instruments in the context of Article 4, paragraph 4, of the Nagoya Protocol.
19. Global multilateral benefit-sharing mechanism (Article 10).
20. Other matters.
21. Adoption of the report.
22. Closure of the meeting.

2.3. Organization of work

20. At the 2nd plenary session, on 17 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties agreed to organize its work as set out in annex II to the proposed organization of work (CBD/COP/14/1/Add.2) and endorsed the establishment of the two working groups by the Conference of the Parties.

Parallel events and awards

21. During the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, three awards ceremonies were held. In addition, multiple related events were held in parallel with the meeting. More information on those award ceremonies and parallel events can be found in annex IV to the report of the Conference of the Parties on its fourteenth meeting.

ITEM 3. REPORT ON THE CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE THIRD MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL

22. Agenda item 3 was taken up at the 2nd plenary session, on 17 November 2018. In accordance with rule 19 of the rules of procedure, the Bureau was to examine and report on the credentials of delegations. Accordingly, the President informed the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol that the Bureau had designated Ms. Elena Makeyeva (Belarus), a Vice-President of the Bureau, to examine and report on credentials.

23. At the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 22 November 2018, Ms. Makeyeva informed the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol that 111 Parties were registered as attending the meeting. The Bureau had examined the credentials of the representatives of 94 Parties that were attending the meeting. The credentials of 84 delegations were in full compliance with rule 18 of the rules of procedure. Those of 10 delegations did not fully comply with rule 18 and a further 17 delegations had not presented their credentials to date.

24. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 29 November 2018, Ms. Makeyeva informed the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol that 111 Parties or Parties that were in the process of acceding to the Protocol were registered as attending the meeting. The Bureau had examined the credentials of the representatives of 99 Parties. The credentials of 93 delegations were in full compliance with the provisions of rule 18 of the rules of procedure, those of 6 delegations did not fully comply with the provisions of rule 18, and a further 12 delegations had not presented their credentials. More information is available in document CBD/COP/14/INF/49.

25. A number of heads of delegations had signed a declaration to the effect that they would submit their credentials, in the proper form and in their original version, to the Executive Secretary within 30 days of the closure of the meeting, and no later than 29 December 2018. In keeping with past practice, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol agreed with the Bureau's proposal that those delegations that had yet to submit their credentials, or whose credentials did not fully comply with the provisions of rule 18, should be allowed to participate fully in the meeting on a provisional basis.

26. The President expressed the hope that all delegations that had been requested to present their credentials to the Executive Secretary would do so no later than 29 December 2018. Following the end of the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, credentials from an additional six Parties were received.

27. By the date of issuance of the present report, credentials that were fully compliant with rule 18 of the rules of procedure had been received from the following 99 Parties: Angola; Antigua and Barbuda; Argentina; Austria; Belarus; Belgium; Benin; Bolivia; Botswana; Bulgaria; Burkina Faso; Burundi; Cambodia; Cameroon; Central African Republic; Chad; China; Cote d'Ivoire; Croatia; Cuba; Czechia; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Ecuador; Egypt; Eswatini; Ethiopia; European Union; Fiji; Finland; France; Gabon; Gambia; Germany; Guatemala; Guinea; Guinea-Bissau; Guyana; Honduras; Hungary; India; Indonesia; Japan; Kenya; Kuwait; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Lesotho; Liberia; Luxembourg; Madagascar; Malawi; Malaysia; Malta; Marshall Islands; Mauritania; Mauritius; Mexico; Micronesia (Federated States of); Mongolia; Mozambique; Myanmar; Namibia; Netherlands; Niger; Norway; Palau; Panama; Peru; Philippines; Portugal; Qatar; Republic of Korea; Republic of Moldova; Rwanda; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Samoa; Senegal; Serbia; Seychelles; Sierra Leone; Slovakia; South Africa; Spain; Sudan; Sweden; Switzerland; Syrian Arab Republic; Tajikistan; Togo; Tuvalu; Uganda; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United Republic of Tanzania; Uruguay; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); Viet Nam; Zambia; and Zimbabwe.

ITEM 4. REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY BODIES

28. Agenda item 4 was taken up at the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties had before it the reports of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice on its twenty-second meeting (CBD/SBSTTA/22/12) and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation on its second meeting (CBD/SBI/2/22).

29. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties took note of the reports of intersessional meetings of subsidiary bodies and agreed to consider the recommendations contained in the reports under the relevant agenda items.

ITEM 5. REPORT OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE (ARTICLE 30)

30. Agenda item 5 was taken up at the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018.

31. Mr. Kaspar Sollberger, Chair of the Compliance Committee, reported on the second meeting of the Compliance Committee, held in Montreal from 24 to 26 April 2018 (see CBD/NP/MOP/3/2). In addition to providing an overview of the information contained in the report, he noted that additional interim national reports had been received since the April meeting, and 82 of the 100 Parties that had the obligation to report had now submitted their interim national reports.

32. Following Mr. Sollberger's report, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol agreed to consider the Committee's recommendations under the relevant agenda items. For the Committee's recommendations contained in annex II, section A, of the report of the Committee, the President said she would prepare a draft decision.

33. At the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 22 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol considered a draft decision submitted by the President and adopted it as decision NP-3/2.

34. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol elected the following as members of the Compliance Committee to serve as members of the Compliance Committee beginning in 2019:

Africa

Ms. Betty Kauna Schroder (Namibia)
 Ms. El Kitma El Awad Mohammed (Sudan)
 Mr. Ashenafi Ayenew (Ethiopia) (as alternate)
 Mr. William Etim Okin (Nigeria) (as alternate)

Asia and the Pacific

Mr. Park Won Seog (Republic of Korea)
 Mr. Belal K. Al-Hayek (Syrian Arab Republic)

Central and Eastern Europe

Ms. Elena Makeyeva (Belarus)
 Mr. Dilovarsho Dustov (Tajikistan)
 Mr. Peter Manka (Slovenia) (as alternate)

Latin America and the Caribbean

Ms. Yolanda Octavalo (Ecuador)
 Ms. Micaela Bonafina (Argentina)

Western Europe and Others

Mr. Gaute Voigt-Hanssen (Norway)
 Ms. Salomé Sidler (Switzerland)
 Ms. Mery Ciacci (European Union) (as alternate)

35. At the same plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol also elected two representatives from indigenous peoples and local communities to serve as observers: Ms. Jennifer Tauli Corpuz and Ms. Yeshing Juliana Upún Yos (both from IIFB/IWBN).

ITEM 6. ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROTOCOL AND BUDGET FOR THE TRUST FUNDS

36. Agenda item 6 was taken up at the 2nd session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol had before it the report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Convention and the Cartagena and Nagoya protocols for the biennium 2017–2018, including the budget for the trust funds (CBD/COP/14/3), the proposed budget for the programme of work of the Convention and the Cartagena and Nagoya protocols for the biennium 2019–2020 (CBD/COP/14/4) and elements of a draft decision on the matter (see CBD/COP/14/2) as well as an information document on the administration of the Convention and the budget for the trust funds of the Convention and the Cartagena and Nagoya protocols (CBD/COP/14/INF/17).
37. A statement was made by the representative of Japan.
38. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol took note of the reports and decided to establish a contact group on the budget with a mandate to review the matter and prepare a draft budget for the programme of work for the biennium 2019–2020 for the consideration of the Parties. The contact group would be chaired by Mr. Spencer Thomas (Grenada), would be open to all Parties and would meet informally at the invitation of its chair, with meetings advertised in advance in the daily calendar of meetings.
39. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol heard progress reports from the chair of the open-ended contact group on the budget at the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 22 November 2018, and at the 5th plenary session, on 25 November 2018.
40. At its 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol took up draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.16, on the budget for the integrated programme of work of the Secretariat.
41. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted the draft decision as decision NP-3/16 (for the text, see chap. I).

**ITEM 7. ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROTOCOL
(ARTICLE 31)**

42. Working Group I took up agenda item 7 at its 1st meeting, on 18 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 31) (CBD/NP/MOP/3/3) and a draft decision based on recommendation [SBI-2/2](#) and additional elements from document CBD/NP/MOP/3/3, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2). It also had before it the following information documents on the assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Nagoya Protocol: (a) analysis of information contained in the interim national reports and information published in the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House (CBD/SBI/2/INF/3); (b) statistical overview of the answers provided in the interim national report for the Nagoya Protocol (CBD/SBI/2/INF/4); (c) review of implementation and operation of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House (CBD/SBI/2/INF/7); and (d) stock-taking of model contractual clauses, codes of conduct, guidelines, best practices and standards, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities' customary laws, community protocols and procedures (CBD/SBI/2/INF/8).
43. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, the European Union and its 28 member States, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Uganda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).
44. At its 2nd meeting, on 18 November 2018, the Working Group resumed its consideration of the item.
45. Statements were made by representatives of the Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Guinea, Jordan, Lebanon, Niger, South Africa, Sudan and Switzerland.
46. Statements were also made by representatives of Costa Rica and Morocco.
47. A statement was made by a representative of FAO.
48. A further statement was made by a representative of IIFB.

49. The Chair said he would prepare a revised draft decision on the matter, taking into account the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.

50. At its 7th meeting, on 21 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair.

51. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, Japan, Madagascar, Mexico and Niger.

52. A statement was also made by a representative of IIFB.

53. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.2.

54. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.2, as orally amended, as decision NP-3/1 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 8. FINANCIAL MECHANISM AND RESOURCES (ARTICLE 25)

55. Working Group I took up agenda item 8 at its 4th meeting, on 19 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the financial mechanism and resources (CBD/NP/MOP/3/5) and the report of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) (CBD/COP/14/7). It also had before it a draft decision in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2).

56. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, India and Mexico.

57. The Chair said he would prepare a revised draft decision on the matter, taking into account the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.

58. The Working Group considered the revised draft decision prepared by the Chair at its 9th meeting, on 22 November 2018.

59. A statement was made by a representative of GEF.

60. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.6.

61. At its 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.6 as decision NP-3/8 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 9. MEASURES TO ASSIST IN CAPACITY-BUILDING AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT (ARTICLE 22)

62. Working Group I took up agenda item 9 at its 4th meeting, on 19 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a progress report on measures to assist in capacity-building and capacity development (Article 22) (CBD/NP/MOP/3/4) as well as the following information documents: (a) report of the Informal Advisory Committee on Capacity-building for the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on its third meeting (CBD/ABS/CB-IAC/2018/1/4); (b) overview of capacity-building and development initiatives providing direct support to countries for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol (CBD/NP/MOP/3/INF/1); (c) overview of access and benefit-sharing capacity-building tools and resources (CBD/NP/MOP/3/INF/2); and (d) capacity-building programme to support the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol: overview and lessons (CBD/NP/MOP/3/INF/6).

63. The Working Group also had before it a draft decision, based on recommendation SBI-2/8 and additional elements from document CBD/NP/MOP/3/4, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2). The second part of the draft decision, relating to the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building, had been taken from recommendation 2/8, section II, of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and was linked to the draft decision of the Conference of the Parties on capacity-building. Any

changes incorporated into the latter following its discussion under the relevant agenda item of the Conference of the Parties would therefore be reflected, as necessary, in the draft decision currently under consideration. That being so, the Working Group focused its consideration on the new text contained in the first part of the draft decision, relating to the Strategic Framework for capacity-building and development for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

64. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, India, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Mexico, the Philippines, South Africa, Uganda and Viet Nam.

65. A statement was also made by a representative of Morocco.

66. A further statement was made by a representative of IIFB.

67. The Chair said he would prepare a revised draft decision on the matter, taking into account the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.

68. At its 9th meeting, on 22 November 2018, the Working Group considered the revised draft decision prepared by the Chair.

69. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, Mexico and Uganda.

70. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.5.

71. At its 8th plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol took up and adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.5 as decision NP-3/5 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 10. THE ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING CLEARING-HOUSE AND INFORMATION-SHARING (ARTICLE 14)

72. Working Group I took up the item at its 4th meeting, on 19 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a report on progress in the implementation and operation of the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House (CBD/NP/MOP/3/8) and the report of the Informal Advisory Committee to the Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House at its third meeting (CBD/ABS/CH-IAC/2017/1/4). It also had before it a draft decision taken from section VII of CBD/NP/MOP/3/8, except for paragraphs 3 and 4, which had come from recommendations of the Compliance Committee contained in document CBD/NP/MOP/3/2, annex II, section C. The draft decision was set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2).

73. The Working Group began by considering the joint modalities of operation, which were referred to in paragraph 4 of the draft decision.

74. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, India, Jordan, Norway and South Africa.

75. Statements were also made by representatives of Canada and Thailand.

76. At its 5th meeting, on 20 November 2018, the Working Group resumed its consideration of the agenda item, focusing on the remaining parts of the draft decision.

77. Statements were made by representatives of Belarus, Benin, Congo, the European Union and its 28 member States, Guinea, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Mexico, Mozambique, Niger, South Africa, Switzerland and Uganda.

78. Further statements were made by representatives of Costa Rica and Morocco.

79. Following the discussion, the Chair said that he would prepare a revised draft decision for the consideration of the Working Group.

80. At its 10th meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair.
81. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, India, Japan, Mexico, South Africa and Uganda.
82. A statement was also made by a representative of Morocco.
83. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.8.
84. At its 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.8 as decision NP-3/3 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 11. MONITORING AND REPORTING (ARTICLE 29)

85. Working Group I took up agenda item 11 at its 5th meeting, on 20 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary (CBD/NP/MOP/3/7) containing information on interim national reports submitted by Parties and non-Parties, as well as information on the reporting format and intervals for reporting, taking into account recommendation SBI/2-11 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. It also had before it a draft decision set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2) containing the draft recommendation from SBI-2/11, relevant recommendations from the Compliance Committee and additional elements from document CBD/NP/MOP/3/7.
86. The Chair recalled that the first paragraph of the draft decision was linked to a decision being considered by the Conference of the Parties on alignment of national reporting. In addition, the number of interim national reports submitted had increased and the draft decision would need to be amended to reflect that new information.
87. Statements were made by representatives of Belarus, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, the European Union and its 28 member States, India, Jordan, Mexico, South Africa, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania.
88. The Chair said that he would prepare a revised draft decision, taking into consideration the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.
89. At its 9th meeting, on 22 November 2018, the Working Group considered the revised draft decision prepared by the Chair.
90. A representative of the secretariat drew attention to a section of text that required amendment to reflect earlier comments.
91. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.7.
92. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.7 as decision NP-3/4 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 12. MEASURES TO RAISE AWARENESS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF GENETIC RESOURCES AND ASSOCIATED TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE (ARTICLE 21)

93. Working Group I took up the first aspect of agenda item 12 at its 4th meeting, on 19 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a progress report on measures to raise awareness of the importance of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge (Article 21) (CBD/NP/MOP/3/6) and the CEPA Toolkit including considerations for access and benefit-sharing (CBD/NP/MOP/3/INF/7). It also had before it a draft decision set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2).
94. Statements were made by representatives of Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, Mexico, South Africa and Sudan.
95. The Chair said he would prepare a revised draft decision on the matter, taking into account the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.

96. At its 9th meeting, on 22 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision prepared by the Chair.

97. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States and Uganda.

98. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.4.

99. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.4 as decision NP-3/6 (for the text, see chap. I.)

ITEM 13. ENHANCING INTEGRATION UNDER THE CONVENTION AND ITS PROTOCOLS WITH RESPECT TO PROVISIONS RELATED TO ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING

100. Working Group I took up agenda item 13 at its 6th meeting, on 21 November 2018 in conjunction with agenda item 13 of the Conference of the Parties and agenda item 11 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on recommendation SBI-2/14 set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2).

101. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Colombia, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Malawi and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

102. A statement was also made by a representative of Morocco.

103. A further statement was made by a representative of ISAAA.

104. The Chair said that he would prepare a revised draft decision, taking into consideration the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.

105. At its 12th meeting, on 28 November 2018, Working Group I considered a revised draft decision submitted by its Chair, which it approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/COP/14/L.11.

106. At its 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.11 as decision NP-3/9 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 14. COOPERATION WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, CONVENTIONS AND INITIATIVES

107. Working Group I took up agenda item 14 at its 6th meeting, on 21 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note summarizing relevant cooperative activities (CBD/NP/MOP/3/9) as well as the following information documents: (a) a report on a study carried out by the Secretariat of WHO (CBD/NP/MOP/3/INF/3); (b) the document provided by the Executive Secretary to the Secretariat of WHO on information provided by Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on the national implementation of Article 8(b) and other relevant provisions of the Protocol (CBD/NP/MOP/3/INF/4); (c) implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the context of human and animal health, and food safety: access to pathogens and fair and equitable sharing of benefits: questions and answers” (CBD/NP/MOP/3/INF/5); update on recent developments under the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture of relevance to the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol (CBD/NP/MOP/3/INF/30).

108. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, Kenya and Mexico.

109. Further statements were made by representatives of WHO and WIPO.

110. The Chair said that he would prepare a draft decision, taking into consideration the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.

111. At its 11th meeting, on 26 November 2018, the Working Group considered a draft decision submitted by its Chair.
112. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, Mexico, Norway, Switzerland, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.
113. At its 13th meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair.
114. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Mexico, Norway, South Africa, Switzerland and Uganda.
115. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.14.
116. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol took up the draft decision at the 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018.
117. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, Japan, Mexico and Uganda.
118. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted, as orally amended, draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.14 as decision NP-3/7 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 15. REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES

Review of experience in holding concurrent meetings of the Convention and its protocols

119. Working Group I took up the first aspect of agenda item 13 at its 6th meeting, on 21 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on section A of recommendation SBI-2/15, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2).
120. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, the European Union and its 28 member States, Honduras, India, Jordan, Mexico, Panama, Switzerland and Uganda (on behalf of the African Group).
121. Statements were also made by representatives of Canada, Morocco, New Zealand and Paraguay.
122. Further statements were made by representatives of the J. Craig Venter Institute, PRRI and Third World Network (on behalf of the Corporate Europe Observatory, EcoNexus, ETC Group, Friends of the Earth International and Pro Natura).
123. At its 10th meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair, which it approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.9.
124. At its 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.9 as decision NP-3/10 (for the text, see chap. I).

Procedure for avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in expert groups

125. Working Group I took up the second aspect of agenda item 15 at its 6th meeting, on 21 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on section B of recommendation SBI-2/15, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2) and a summary of views submitted by Parties and observers regarding the procedure for avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in expert groups (CBD/COP/14/INF/3).
126. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, the European Union and its 28 member States, Honduras, India, Jordan, Mexico, Panama, Switzerland and Uganda (on behalf of the African Group).
127. Statements were also made by representatives of Canada, Morocco, New Zealand and Paraguay.

128. Further statements were made by representatives of the J. Craig Venter Institute, PRRI and Third World Network (on behalf of the Corporate Europe Observatory, EcoNexus, ETC Group, Friends of the Earth International and Pro Natura).

129. Following the exchange of views, the Chair established a group of friends of the Chair to continue discussion of the unresolved issues.

130. At its 12th meeting, on 28 November 2018, Working Group I considered a revised draft decision submitted by its Chair.

131. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States and Switzerland.

132. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.10.

133. At its 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties adopted, as corrected orally by the Secretariat, draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.10 as decision NP-3/11 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 16. PREPARATION FOR THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020

134. Agenda item 16 was taken up at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 20 November 2018, in conjunction with agenda item 17 of the Conference of the Parties and agenda item 14 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol had before it a draft decision based on recommendation SBI-2/19 and the relevant recommendations from the Compliance Committee, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2).

135. Statements were made by representatives of Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba (on behalf of the small island developing States), Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, India, Japan, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Norway, Palau (on behalf of the Pacific island countries), Panama, Philippines, South Africa (on behalf of the African Group), Saint Kitts and Nevis (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Sudan, Switzerland, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

136. Statements were also made by representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia (on behalf of the Group of Like-minded Megadiverse Countries), Costa Rica, Iraq, Jamaica, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand and Turkey.

137. Additional statements were made by representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) (on behalf of the International Treaty on Plant and Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture), the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women) and the secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (on behalf of the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions).

138. Further statements were made by representatives of BirdLife International (also on behalf of Conservation International, GYBN, the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), Rare, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), The Nature Conservancy, The Pew Charitable Trusts and WWF), Friends of the Earth International (also on behalf of EcoNexus, the European Network for Ecological Reflection and Action (ECOROPA), Forests of the World, Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (FARN) and the Global Forest Coalition), the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON), GYBN, the International Committee for Food Sovereignty, IIFB, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS), and WWF.

139. Based on the views expressed, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol agreed to establish a contact group, chaired by Ms. Charlotta Sörqvist (Sweden), to discuss the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

140. At the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 22 November 2018, the chair of the contact group reported on the progress made.

141. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol heard another report by the chair of the contact group.

142. The representative of Norway informed the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol that, subject to parliamentary approval, Norway would donate \$350,000 for regional workshops in Africa, the Latin American and Caribbean region and the Asian and Pacific region as its contribution to further discussion on the post-2020 framework. He also said that Norway would provide travel support to delegates from developing countries attending the ninth Trondheim Conference on Biodiversity, to be held in July 2019.

143. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol resumed consideration of the draft decision on the matter.

144. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, Japan, Mexico, Peru, South Africa and Switzerland.

145. Subsequently, at the 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol took up a revised version of the draft decision, presented as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.12.

146. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States and Mexico.

147. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted the draft decision, as orally amended, as decision NP-3/15 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 17. DIGITAL SEQUENCE INFORMATION ON GENETIC RESOURCES

148. Working Group I took up agenda item 17 at its 2nd meeting, on 18 November 2018 in conjunction with agenda item 18 of the Conference of the Parties. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on recommendation SBSTTA-22/1, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2). The following documents were also made available for the information of the meeting of the Parties: a synthesis of views and information on the potential implications of the use of digital sequence information on genetic resources for the three objectives of the Convention and the objective of the Nagoya Protocol (CBD/DSI/AHTEG/2018/1/2); case studies and examples of the use of digital sequence information in relation to the objectives of the Convention and the Nagoya Protocol (CBD/DSI/AHTEG/2018/1/2/Add.1); digital sequence information on genetic resources in relevant ongoing international processes and policy debates (CBD/DSI/AHTEG/2018/1/2/Add.2); a fact-finding and scoping study on digital sequence information on genetic resources in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol (CBD/DSI/AHTEG/2018/1/3); and a submission from the secretariat of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CBD/COP/14/INF/29).

149. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Cameroon, China, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, the European Union and its 28 member States, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi (on behalf of the African Group), Malaysia, Mexico, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

150. Statements were also made by representatives of Brazil (on behalf of the Group of Like-minded Megadiverse Countries), Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Morocco, New Zealand, Thailand and Turkey.

151. Further statements were made by representatives of the African Union, the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs, WHO and WIPO.

152. A statement was made by a representative of IIFB.
153. The Working Group decided to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Ms. Georgina Catacora-Vargas (Bolivia, Plurinational State of) and Mr. Nikolay Tzvetkov (Bulgaria), to continue discussion of the issues relating to the item.
154. At its 13th meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Chair of the Working Group introduced a draft decision.
155. Statements were made by the representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, Japan, Malaysia Mexico, the Republic of Korea and Switzerland.
156. The Chair said that the view expressed by the representative of Switzerland, supported by the representative of Japan, would be reflected in the report of the Working Group.
157. The representative of Switzerland said that while he supported the process for further clarification of the issue of digital sequence of information on genetic resources, he did not see the need for a separate decision on the matter under the Nagoya Protocol.
158. Following the exchange of views, the Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.15.
159. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol took up draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.15 at its 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018.
160. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, the European Union and its 28 member States, Japan, Malaysia (on behalf of the Group of Like-minded Megadiverse Countries), Mexico, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland and Uganda (on behalf of the African Group).
161. A representative of Mexico, requesting that her statement be reflected in the report, expressed appreciation for the spirit of compromise shown in agreeing consensual text for the draft decision, which Mexico supported as it would ensure further progress, for the time being, on a matter of importance to compliance with Article 17 of the Protocol.
162. Following the exchange of views, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.15, as orally amended, as decision NP-3/12 (for the text, see chap. I).

**ITEM 18. SPECIALIZED INTERNATIONAL ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING
INSTRUMENTS IN THE CONTEXT OF ARTICLE 4, PARAGRAPH 4,
OF THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL**

163. Working Group I took up agenda item 18 at its 2nd meeting, on 18 November 2018. In considering the item, it had before it a draft decision based on recommendation SBI-2/5, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2). A study into criteria to identify a specialized international access and benefit-sharing instrument and a possible process for its recognition (CBD/SBI/2/INF/17) considered by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its second meeting was also made available for the information of the meeting of the Parties.
164. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Malawi, Mexico, Norway, the Philippines, South Africa (on behalf of the African Group), Switzerland, Uganda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).
165. Statements were also made by representatives of FAO and WHO.
166. At the 5th meeting of the Working Group, on 20 November 2018, the Chair said that he would prepare a revised draft decision on the matter with the help of the Secretariat.
167. At its 8th meeting, on 22 November 2018, the Working Group considered the revised draft decision submitted by the Chair.
168. Statements were made by representatives of Gabon, Mexico, the Philippines and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

169. Following the exchange of views, the Working Group approved the revised draft decision for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.3.

170. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.3 as decision NP-3/14. for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 19. GLOBAL MULTILATERAL BENEFIT-SHARING MECHANISM (ARTICLE 10)

171. Working Group I took up agenda item 19 at its 3rd meeting, on 19 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on recommendation SBI-2/4, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/NP/MOP/3/1/Add.2).

172. Statements were made by representatives of Argentina, Ecuador, Egypt, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, India, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Mexico, Niger, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, South Africa (on behalf of the African Group), Sudan, Switzerland, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

173. A statement was also made by a representative of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs.

174. A representative of IIFB also made a statement.

175. The Working Group agreed to establish a contact group to resolve the outstanding issues. The contact group would be facilitated by Thomas Greiber (Germany) and Christine Achello (Uganda).

176. At its 13th meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair.

177. Statements were made by the representatives of Colombia, the European Union and its 28 member States, India, Japan, Mexico, Malawi, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea and Switzerland.

178. Following the exchange of views, the Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/13/L.13.

179. At its 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.13 as decision NP 3/13 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 20. OTHER MATTERS

180. No other matters were considered.

ITEM 21. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

181. The present report was adopted at the 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018, on the basis of the draft report presented by the Rapporteur (CBD/NP/MOP/3/L.1), on the understanding that the rapporteur would be entrusted with its finalization.

ITEM 22. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

182. The President declared the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol closed at 9 p.m. on 29 November 2018.
