



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
9 April 2024

English only

**Subsidiary Body on Scientific,
Technical and Technological Advice
Twenty-sixth meeting
Nairobi, 13–18 May 2024
Item 3 of the provisional agenda*
Monitoring framework for the
Kunming-Montreal Global
Biodiversity Framework**

Report of the online discussions of the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety on the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework as it relates to Target 17**

Note by the Secretariat

I. Organization of the online discussions of the Liaison Group

1. In response to the invitation by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators, online discussions of the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety were organized to provide a contribution to the development of the monitoring framework as it relates to Target 17. The online discussions were preceded by an online opening event on 7 February 2024. During the opening event, presentations were made on the process to develop indicators for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework by the Secretariat and the Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators, James Williams. The Co-Chairs of the Liaison Group explained the organization of the discussions. Members of the Liaison Group had an opportunity to ask questions.
2. The online discussions took place from 7 to 21 February 2024 and were hosted on the Biosafety Clearing-House.¹ The discussions were accessible only to members of the Liaison Group.² The discussions were moderated by the Co-Chairs of the Liaison Group, Rita Andorkó (Hungary) and Daniel Lewis (Grenada).
3. Through the online discussions, the Liaison Group was expected to:
 - (a) Advise on the wording of the list of binary questions in a manner consistent with the agreed language of Target 17 (see [Current status of Target 17 indicator and binary questions as per recommendation 25/1, annex](https://bch.cbd.int/en/portals/liaison-group/forum));

* CBD/SBSTTA/26/1.

** The present document is being issued without formal editing.

¹ <https://bch.cbd.int/en/portals/liaison-group/forum>.

² See the annex for an overview of the members of the Liaison Group.

(b) Review the complementary indicators, including in terms of their continued relevance for Target 17 (see decision 15/5, annex I, table 2, relevant text reproduced in '[Proposed complementary indicators for Target 17.pdf](#)');³

(c) Provide guidance on the methodologies that will be used to compile the global indicators based on the binary responses;³

(d) Provide input to a draft glossary of key terms.⁴

4. **The first week (7-14 February)** was dedicated to reviewing the wording of the binary questions suggested for the indicator of Target 17, focusing on the following issues: clarity, relevance, specificity and measurability of the questions and the suggested multiple choice answers; and improving consistency of the questions and answers with similar questions and answers in the national reports for the Cartagena Protocol to facilitate reporting under both instruments and avoid discrepancies. Separate discussion threads were opened, dedicated to the following binary questions:

- Thread 1: 17.1 and 17.2;
- Thread 2: 17.3; 17.3 alt.1; 17.3 alt.1 bis; 17.3 alt.2; and 17.3 bis; and 17.4 bis;
- Thread 3: 17.4 and 17.4 alt;
- Thread 4: 17.5 and 17.5 alt; and
- Thread 5: other issues related to the binary questions.

5. **The second week (15-21 February)** was dedicated to discussing other aspects of the monitoring framework. Separate discussion threads were opened, dedicated to the following issues:

- Thread 6: the complementary indicators;
- Thread 7: the methodologies that will be used to compile the global indicators based on the binary responses; and
- Thread 8: the definitions provided in the draft glossary.

II. Outcome and synthesis of the online discussions

6. Over the course of the online discussions, 64 interventions were posted by 13 Liaison Group members.

7. The Co-Chairs of the Liaison Group prepared a synthesis of the online discussions, with the assistance of the Secretariat, which was shared with the members of the Liaison Group for their review. The final synthesis is presented below.

A. Discussions relating to the wording of the binary questions for Target 17

8. A few general comments were expressed in the discussion about the wording of the binary questions suggested for the indicator for Target 17 (threads 1 to 5).

9. A member of the Liaison Group was of the view that the questions for the indicators should adhere closely to the language of Target 17, and that overlap in questions should be avoided. This member was also of the view that certain questions pertained to the achievement of the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol and that they should therefore not be addressed under Target 17. The member argued that more generic questions would enable all Parties to the Convention to answer the questions and provide greater comparability among the answers.

10. A member, recalling that Target 17 called for the (i) establishment; (2) strengthening capacity for, and; (3) implementation of measures, was of the view that the current set of questions did not address whether Parties strengthen capacity for taking measures. In this light, the member suggested that an additional binary question was needed.

³ See recommendation 25/1, annex, para. 3

⁴ Further to recommendation 25/1, annex, para. 4. The draft glossary is expected to be made available to the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for consideration at its fifth meeting, to be held from 12 to 15 March.

1. Questions 17.1 and 17.2.

11. The discussions in thread 1 focused on questions 17.1 and 17.2.
12. Concerned about the reporting burden on Parties, some members stressed the importance of harmonizing questions on similar topics among the reports under the Convention and the Protocols where possible, so that cross-references could be used.
13. Members were of the view that the questions should be clearly split into questions addressing the biosafety element of Target 17 (Article 8(g) of the Convention) and questions addressing the aspects on access to biotechnology research (Article 19 of the Convention). Some members noted that Article 19, paragraph 4, addressed a biosafety element and were of the view that this element should also be covered by the binary questions related to biosafety. A member was of the view that a question on Article 19, paragraph 4, should be added in the context of the Biosafety Clearing-House.
14. Several members, noting that the questions addressed both the adoption of measures and the implementation of measures, were of the view that these two different issues should be addressed in separate questions to enable Parties to respond to the question in a meaningful way.
15. In this vein, suggestions were made to focus, in question 17.1, on the adoption of biosafety measures and, in question 17.2, on the implementation of those biosafety measures. A member suggested broadening question 17.2 to address the ‘capacity for the implementation of biosafety measures’.
16. A member was of the view that the term ‘other measures’ in question 17.1 was not specific enough. Another member was of the view that this wording was adequate as it provided the necessary flexibility. It was also pointed out that the term was adequate for reasons of consistency with reporting under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, where the term was also used.
17. Discrepancies between multiple choice answers for questions 17.1 and 17.2 on the one hand and the questions on similar issues in the reporting format for the Cartagena Protocol were noted by several members. In this context, it was suggested to use the multiple-choice answers provided in the reporting format for the Cartagena Protocol (question 7 of the reporting format for the fifth national report of the Cartagena Protocol⁵) for the question on the adoption of measures. In this light, several members suggested replacing the multiple choice answer ‘(c) Yes, but not fully’ with ‘(c) Yes, partially’.

2. Questions 17.3; 17.3 alt.1; 17.3 alt.1 bis; 17.3 alt.2; and 17.3 bis; and 17.4 bis.

18. The discussions in thread 2 focused on questions 17.3; 17.3 alt.1; 17.3 alt.1 bis; 17.3 alt.2; and 17.3 bis; and 17.4 bis.
19. Members of the Liaison Group acknowledged that the wording of most questions attempted to follow, to different degrees, the wording of Article 19, paragraph 1, and paragraph 2. A member stressed the need to avoid overlap in questions.
20. Some members were of the view that the wording of the questions could be simplified by paraphrasing certain elements of Article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2. In this context, some members suggested referring to ‘measures’ rather than ‘legislative, administrative or policy measures, as appropriate’ in question 17.3 alt.2 on Article 19, paragraph 1. Another member however, suggested creating three separate questions, each addressing one type of measure (one question addressing policy measures; one question for legal measures; and one question for administrative measures).
21. In relation to question 17.3 alt 1 bis on Article 19, paragraph 2, a member suggested using “practical measures to ensure access” rather than ‘all practicable measures to promote and advance priority access on a fair and equitable basis’. However, on question 17.3 bis, another member

⁵ CBD/CP/MOP/10/5.

suggested using the terminology ‘promote and advance’ rather than ‘ensure’ for consistency with the wording of Article 19, paragraph 2.

22. A member, reiterating the various elements of Article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, stressed that all elements are mandatory and that for all these elements information should be collected through the questions. In this light, the suggestion was made to also add questions on the elements of Article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, which were not sufficiently addressed in any of the questions, in particular: for Article 19, paragraph 1, whether the research is carried out in countries providing the genetic resources; and for Article 19, paragraph 2, whether the access to results and benefits is granted on ‘mutually agreed terms’.

23. A member was of the view that Article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, had essentially provided the enabling text for the development 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 and suggested that a question should be added asking Parties whether they had become Party to the Nagoya Protocol.

3. Questions 17.4 and 17.4 alt.

24. The discussions in thread 3 focused on questions 17.4 and 17.4 alt.

25. Some members were of the view that questions 17.4 and 17.4 alt on risk assessment and risk management respectively do not fit well within the broader reference to biosafety in Target 17 and that these specific issues are already addressed under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and that there is no need to include questions on these issues in the reporting under Target 17.

26. Other members however, stressing the importance of particularly risk assessment for biosafety, were of the view that a question on risk assessment would be justified to measure progress on Target 17. In this context, some members suggested that question 17.4 should make particular reference to Article 8(g) of the Convention.

27. For the wording of question 17.4, several members suggested deleting the terms currently appearing in square brackets. These members were of the view that deleting this text would help avoid addressing the two separate issues of risk assessment and risk management both in one question.

28. A member supported having questions on both risk assessment and risk management, and that a further question on the advance informed agreement procedure, addressed in Article 19, paragraph 3, should be added.

29. Another member was of the view that of the two questions 17.4 and 17.4 alt, the latter provided a more direct link with the text of Article 8(g) of the Convention and that this question could be addressed in the context of questions 17.1 and 17.2.

30. A member suggested referring to ‘risk analysis’, arguing that this concept includes both risk assessment and risk management.

31. A member was of the view that response (b) – ‘No, but under development’ – is not relevant for questions 17.4 and 17.4 alt and suggested that this answer be removed from the multiple-choice options.

4. Discussions on questions 17.5 and 17.5 alt.

32. The discussions in thread 4 focused on questions 17.5 and 17.5 alt.

33. Some members supported retaining both questions 17.5 and 17.5 alt, although some suggestions for improvement were made. Some members were of the view that question 17.5 alt is a follow-up question to question 17.5 and should therefore be presented as 17.5 bis.

34. Some members suggested that question 17.5 be closer aligned with the wording of Article 19, paragraph 4, using a variation of ‘provide available information about the use and safety regulations in handling living modified organisms’.

35. A member was of the view that question 17.5 alt, relating to resources for strengthening capacity, could be addressed in the context of question 17.2. Another member argued that a separate question should be created for this important issue.

36. A member was of the view that the multiple-choice response (b) – ‘Yes, some information available’ – would be inadequate for question 17.5 alt, as sufficiency of resources cannot be equated with the availability of information only, but should also extend to elements such as institutional capacity and financial resources. The suggestion was made to replace multiple choice answer ‘(b) yes, some information available’ with ‘(b) yes, to some extent’ for question 17.5 alt.

B. Discussions relating to the complementary indicators, methodological issues, and the glossary relating to Target 17

1. Discussions on the complementary indicators

37. The discussions in thread 6 focused on the complementary indicators for Target 17, proposed in decision 15/5. For ease of reference, the complementary indicators contained in decision 15/5, on which the discussions centred, are reproduced in the box below.

1. Number of countries that have the necessary biosafety legal and administrative measures in place
2. Number of countries that implement their biosafety measures
3. Number of countries that have the necessary measures and means for detection and identification of products of biotechnology
4. Number of countries that carry out scientifically sound risk assessments to support biosafety decision-making
5. Number of countries that establish and implement risk management measures
6. Percentage of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety implementing the relevant provisions of the Protocol
7. Number of countries with legal and technical measures for restoration and compensation
8. Percentage of Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress
9. Percentage of countries with systems in place for restoration and compensation of damage to conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity
10. Number of countries that establish and implement risk management measures
11. Number of countries with mechanisms to facilitate the sharing of and access to information on potential adverse impacts of biotechnology on biodiversity and human health

38. Indicator-specific interventions were made in relation to the following complementary indicators:

(a) **Complementary indicator 1:** Some members were of the view that this indicator was unnecessary as it addressed an issue already covered in binary question 17.1;

(b) **Complementary indicator 2:** Some members were of the view that this indicator was unnecessary as it addressed an issue already covered in binary question 17.2. A member was of the view that the indicator was not relevant because it was too broad and addressed any implementation efforts. Another member suggested that the term ‘biosafety measures’ should be qualified to avoid overlap with other indicators;

(c) **Complementary indicator 3:** Several members were of the view that this indicator was important and should be retained;

(d) **Complementary indicator 6:** Several members were of the view that this indicator would be difficult to measure and that the indicator was not sufficiently clear, as it referred to an undefined group of provisions;

(e) **Complementary indicator 7:** Several members were of the view that this indicator was already addressed by complementary indicator 9 and that it should therefore be deleted;

(f) **Complementary indicator 8:** A member was of the view that the complementary indicators addressing liability and redress and the Nagoya Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (complementary indicators 7, 8 and 9) were important as these issues were not addressed in the binary questions;

(g) **Complementary indicator 10:** Members noted that the indicator was identical to complementary indicator 5 and that one of them should be deleted.

39. Some members were of the view that additional complementary indicators were needed addressing the following issues:

- consultation of the public and participation in decision making on living modified organisms, further to Article 23 of the Cartagena Protocol;
- access to results and benefits arising from biotechnologies further to Article 19, paragraph 2 of the Convention. A member noted that such an additional complementary indicator may not be needed if the benefit-sharing aspects currently addressed in binary question 17.2 would be addressed separately in the further development of the binary questions.

40. A member was of the view that there should be separate complementary indicators addressing biosafety aspects on the one hand and benefit sharing aspects on the other, and that these should link to elements of Article 8(g) and to the four paragraphs of Article 19.

41. Another member raised the question whether the complementary indicators that relate to specific issues under the Cartagena Protocol were needed, referring in particular to complementary indicators 3, 6, 8 and 10. This member noted that information on these indicators would already be collected in the national reports under the Cartagena Protocol.

42. Some observations were made on the purpose of the complementary indicators. Several members were of the view that overlap between the binary questions and the complementary indicators should be avoided.

2. **Discussions on the methodology to compile the global indicators based on the binary responses**

43. The discussions in thread 7 focused on the methodology to compile the global indicators based on the responses to the binary questions.⁶

44. The discussion focused on the suitability of aggregating responses to compile the global indicator. The members contributing to this discussion were of the view that it would not be appropriate to aggregate all “Yes” answers, which include “Yes, fully” and “Yes, partially”, for the indicator to be considered as having been fully met. These members argued that such an approach would not provide the necessary level of granularity that was needed to measure progress on Target 17 in a meaningful way.

⁶ Members reacted to the methodological concepts set out in the annex to recommendation 25/1.

45. Some members underlined the need to ensure that the global indicator would be reflecting the multiple elements of the Target. A member underlined the importance of ensuring that binary questions are formulated clearly, to facilitate reporting by Parties.

3. Discussions on the glossary

46. The discussions in thread 8 focused on terms related to Target 17 as provided in the draft glossary of terms prepared for consideration by the AHTEG on Indicators, at its fifth meeting, to be held from 12 to 15 March 2024.

47. Several members stressed the importance of using definitions provided in the Convention and the Cartagena Protocol for the glossary, if they are available. In this context, support was expressed for the description of the term “living modified organism”.

48. Several members were of the view that, where terms are not defined in the Convention or the Protocol, descriptions from other sources could be used.

49. In this context, some members supported the description of the term “biosafety” while others suggested replacing the word ‘possible’ with ‘potential’.

50. Some members suggested drawing from the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms and Monitoring in the Context of Risk Assessment for a different description of the term “risk assessment”.⁷ Another member suggested revisions to the description of the term “risk assessment” as contained in the draft glossary.

51. Different views were expressed about using an alternative formulation for the description of the term ‘scientifically sound’. The following description of ‘scientifically sound’ was suggested by a member: “Ensuring the quality and relevance of the information used as well as the outcome of the risk assessment, based on criteria for the quality of scientific information, which come from the scientific traditions of transparency through data and materials access and the description of experiments with sufficient detail that they could be reproduced and reported, and results verified by independent replication.” Another member preferred the more concise description of this term as contained in the draft glossary.

52. A member suggested changing the description of the term “biotechnological research activities” as follows: “Activities related to the study of scientific knowledge in the field of biotechnology”.

53. A member suggested using descriptions of terms used in materials prepared by FAO.⁸ Another member supported using these materials, only if these terms were not described or defined in the Convention or the Protocol.

⁷ UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/8/Add.1

⁸ FAO. 2022. *Gene editing and agrifood systems*. Rome (<https://doi.org/10.4060/cc3579en>); FAO & WHO. 2023. *Food safety aspects of cell-based food*. Rome (<https://doi.org/10.4060/cc4855en>); the FAO Information toolkit on food biotechnologies with a focus on food safety (<https://www.fao.org/sustainable-development-goals-helpdesk/transform/article-detail/information-toolkit-on-food-biotechnologies-with-a-focus-on-food-safety/en>); and the FAO. 2001. *Glossary of biotechnology for food and agriculture – a revised augmented edition of the glossary of biotechnology and genetic engineering* (<https://www.fao.org/3/Y2775E/Y2775E00.htm>).

Annex

Members of the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Andreas Heissenberger	Austria
Galina Mozgova	Belarus
Yan Liu	China
Tanya Romy	Cuba
Joachim Bendiek	Germany
Eric Amaning Okoree	Ghana
Daniel Lewis	Grenada
Rita Andorkó	Hungary
Lilian Chimphepo	Malawi
Tim Strabala	New Zealand
Mulieta Fe L. Estacio	Philippines
Martin Batič	Slovenia
Menik Pradeepa Ranaweera	Sri Lanka
Komi Anthe	Togo
Ana Laura Mello	Uruguay
Preet Lidder	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Alex Owusu-Biney	United Nations Environment Programme
Sarah Lukie	Croplife International, Global Industry Coalition
Li Lin Lim	Third World Network
