



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
2 May 2024

English only

**Compliance Committee under the
Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety**
Nineteenth meeting
Montreal, Canada, 30 April–2 May 2024

Report of the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol on the work of its nineteenth meeting

Introduction

Attendance

1. The following members of the Compliance Committee were present:

African States

Mahaman Gado Zaki
Rigobert Ntep
Dorington O. Ogoyi

Asia-Pacific States

Maria Lorelie U. Agbagala
Achmad Gusman Siswandi
Yan Liu

Eastern European States

Martin Batič
Klodiana Marika
Dubravka Stepčić

Latin American and Caribbean States

Georgina M. Catacora-Vargas
Malachy Pilgrim Dottin
Jimena Nieto Carrasco

Western European and other States

Andreas Heissenberger
Casper Linnestad
Michelangelo Lombardo

Item 1

Opening of the meeting

2. The meeting was opened by the Chair of the Committee, Mr. Ntep, at 9.30 a.m. on 30 April 2024. He highlighted the fact that several members had served on the Committee for many years and expressed his appreciation for their dedicated service. He thanked the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for its support and collaboration over the past years and invited the Acting Executive Secretary to make some opening remarks.
3. The Acting Executive Secretary underlined the efforts of the Committee over the years to carry out its role of supporting Parties in complying with their obligations under the Protocol and pointed to the informal online exchanges with some Parties which would be held during the meeting as an important development in that regard. He noted that initiatives to assist Parties in developing legal measures for implementing the Cartagena Protocol would contribute to achieving the Implementation Plan for the Protocol, the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Protocol and Target 17 of the

Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. The Acting Executive Secretary acknowledged that Colombia would host the upcoming meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and recalled the leading role of Colombia in the history of the Protocol.

4. A representative of the Secretariat reported that, with all 15 members present, there was a quorum for the meeting to proceed, in accordance with rule 16 of the rules of procedure. The Chair acknowledged that this was the first time in many years that all of the members were able to attend the meeting.

Item 2

Organizational matters

(a) Adoption of the agenda

5. On the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Secretariat,¹ the Committee adopted the following agenda:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Adoption of the agenda;
 - (b) Organization of work.
3. Review of consistency of information between the fourth national reports and the Biosafety Clearing-House.
4. General issues of compliance.
5. Individual cases of non-compliance.
6. Preparation and adoption of the report and recommendations of the Compliance Committee for the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.
7. Other matters.
8. Adoption of the report.
9. Closure of the meeting.

(b) Organization of work

6. The Committee reviewed the organization of work proposed by the Secretariat, as outlined in annex I to the annotated provisional agenda.² The Committee agreed to take up item 5 (individual cases of non-compliance) ahead of item 4 (general issues of compliance) so that it could prepare for the informal online exchanges with Parties and approved the organization of work with that amendment.

Item 3

Review of consistency of information between the fourth national reports and the Biosafety Clearing-House

7. A representative of the Secretariat introduced document CBD/CP/CC/19/2. He explained that the document provided an overview of the extent of consistency between information in the fourth

¹ [CBD/CP/CC/19/1](#).

² CBD/CP/CC/19/1/Add.1.

national reports and information on the Biosafety Clearing-House on decisions taken regarding the importation or release of living modified organisms, cases of unintentional and illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms, and national laws, regulations and guidelines relevant to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. He drew the attention of members to document CBD/CP/CC/19/INF/1, providing further details on the consistency of such information.

8. Welcoming the quality and level of detail of the documentation provided, the Committee acknowledged the extensive work involved in undertaking the required analysis and underlined the usefulness of the information in the context of its work. A member noted that the work of the Committee had inspired compliance mechanisms under other multilateral environmental agreements to adopt the practice of reviewing consistency of information provided by parties to those agreements.

9. The Committee welcomed the efforts of Parties to provide information on the Biosafety Clearing-House and in national reports. It expressed concern, however, that most of the Parties that reported having taken decisions with regard to importation or release of living modified organisms had not made those decisions available on the Biosafety Clearing-House. The Committee noted that seven Parties reported being aware of an occurrence under their respective jurisdictions resulting in a release that leads or may lead to an unintentional transboundary movement of a living modified organism. It noted with concern that none of the seven Parties had notified the Biosafety Clearing-House, as required in accordance with Article 17 of the Protocol. It also noted with concern that of the 28 Parties reporting having become aware of an illegal transboundary movement of a living modified organism, 23 had not published this information on the Biosafety Clearing-House.

10. The Committee welcomed the progress of Parties in making available to the Biosafety Clearing-House information on the legal measures for the implementation of the Protocol that Parties had referred to in their fourth national reports. The Committee noted, however, that several Parties, although they had reported having full or partial measures in place in their fourth national reports, had not published any records on such measures on the Biosafety Clearing-House or had published only draft measures or only a national biosafety framework developed under the project of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on the development of national biosafety frameworks.

11. The Committee discussed the possible challenges that Parties appeared to be facing with respect to providing appropriate information to the Biosafety Clearing-House and observed that there could be political, administrative, human resource and financial constraints underlying those challenges. Members discussed examples of such challenges, including pressure from different stakeholders not to publish certain information on the Biosafety Clearing-House; sensitivity of certain information; lack of coordination among ministries, institutions and focal points; limited human resources for taking the necessary steps towards publishing information; and lack of awareness regarding the kind of information that must be shared on the Biosafety Clearing-House.

12. In that context, the Committee discussed the pivotal role of national focal points and underlined the importance for Parties to ensure that information on their national focal point, including the relevant contact details, was up to date. It recognized that the Secretariat and the Committee were already following up with Parties on the designation of their national focal points on a case-by-case basis. The Committee discussed the possibility of introducing a standardized regular form of communication with Parties on the issue, while recognizing that there were both advantages and challenges associated with such an approach.

13. The Committee welcomed the new Biosafety Clearing-House platform, launched in November 2021, including the improved common formats, and associated training tools and activities. A member noted the usefulness of both the help function on the Biosafety Clearing-House and the collaborative platforms for the sharing of experiences by Biosafety Clearing-House focal points.

While expressing optimism that the new Biosafety Clearing-House platform would facilitate submission of information by Parties, the Committee recognized that further work was still needed in developing some of the features of the Biosafety Clearing-House, including functionalities that would assist in the future review of consistency of information, and underlined that it would be important for the Secretariat to continue to allocate information technology support to enable the maintenance and enhancement of the new Biosafety Clearing-House platform.

14. The Committee welcomed the use by Parties of the free text fields in their fourth national reports to provide additional explanatory information on their responses. The Committee discussed the importance of maintaining questions in the formats for future national reports on whether Parties had made different categories of information available to the Biosafety-Clearing House, as that could alert Parties to their information-sharing obligations. In that context, the Committee underlined that it was important for Parties to provide information in their national reports on challenges that they faced in submitting information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

15. The Committee acknowledged that the Secretariat engaged in regular communications with Parties regarding their records on the Biosafety Clearing-House and that follow-up with regard to the inconsistencies identified in document CBD/CP/CC/19/2 would be undertaken in that context. The Committee requested the Secretariat, in undertaking that follow-up, to pay particular attention to Parties that reported having full or partial measures in place but that had not published any records on such measures on the Biosafety Clearing-House or had published only a national biosafety framework developed under the UNEP-GEF project.

16. The Committee decided to recommend that, at its eleventh meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol:

(a) Note with appreciation the efforts made by Parties to comply with their obligations under the Protocol to make information available to the Biosafety Clearing-House and urge Parties to ensure that the information is consistent with the information provided in their national reports;

(b) Encourage Parties to use the free text fields in the format for the fifth national report to explain the responses provided and invite Parties that are facing challenges in complying with certain obligations to share information in those free text fields on the challenges encountered;

(c) Urge Parties to systematically make all required information available on the Biosafety Clearing-House, including legal measures for implementing the Protocol, decisions on the importation or release of living modified organisms and cases of unintentional and illegal transboundary movements;

(d) Request Parties to review their national records published on the Biosafety Clearing-House for accuracy, including by verifying that: (i) the information made available to the Biosafety Clearing-House is up to date and complete; and (ii) the actual documents containing the information are uploaded correctly or, in cases where a link for accessing the document is provided, that the link is functional and up to date, noting that the Compliance Committee will be reviewing completeness of information on the Biosafety Clearing-House at its next meeting.

Item 4

General issues of compliance

17. A representative of the Secretariat introduced document CBD/CP/CC/19/3. He explained that the document provided an overview of follow-up actions taken since the previous meeting, focusing on compliance with the obligation to: (a) report on measures taken to implement the Protocol; (b) make information available to the Biosafety Clearing-House; and (c) introduce the measures necessary to implement the Protocol. With regard to compliance with the reporting obligation, the

representative explained that, since the issuance of the document, the Secretariat had received an offline version of the fourth national report of the Plurinational State of Bolivia. A total of 155 fourth national reports had therefore been received by the Secretariat, including 10 reports received offline. In conclusion, he noted that nine Parties had not submitted their fourth national report (in addition to the seven Parties that had not submitted either their third or their fourth national report, which was addressed under agenda item 5).

18. The Committee reiterated its invitation to the members of the Committee to engage with Parties in their respective regions on compliance-related issues identified by the Committee, such as the designation of national focal points, the submission of national reports and the submission of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

19. The Committee recalled the recommendations arising from its consideration of general issues of compliance at its eighteenth meeting for submission to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties.

Item 5

Individual cases of non-compliance

20. A representative of the Secretariat introduced document CBD/CP/CC/19/4. He indicated that, since the issuance of the document, there had been some developments concerning Parties that had been requested to prepare a compliance action plan. The representative informed the Committee that the Secretariat had received a response from Guinea in which it explained that some progress had been made in the development of measures in that regard. The representative of the Secretariat also informed the Committee that a response had been received from the United Arab Emirates, which indicated that legal instruments had recently been adopted and provided copies of those instruments. He explained that the Secretariat was encouraging the United Arab Emirates to upload the instruments on the Biosafety Clearing-House. The representative of the Secretariat further informed the Committee that compliance action plans had recently been received from Lebanon, Samoa and Trinidad and Tobago and that those action plans had been shared by the Secretariat through the online collaborative portal of the Compliance Committee. The representative drew the attention of the Committee to document CBD/CP/CC/19/INF/2, in which a table was provided showing the status of the preparation and submission by a number of Parties of a compliance action plan as requested by the Committee.

21. The Committee expressed its appreciation to the Chair of the Committee and the Secretariat for the extensive work undertaken to communicate with Parties, further to the request of the Committee at its eighteenth meeting.

1. Individual cases of non-compliance concerning the obligation to report (Article 33)

22. The Committee noted that there were seven Parties³ that had still not submitted either their third or their fourth national report despite the efforts of the Committee to remind them, on multiple occasions over many years, of their reporting obligation under Article 33 of the Protocol. The Committee expressed concern that the number of those Parties was higher than the number of Parties in a similar situation on previous occasions when the Committee had considered repeated non-compliance with the reporting obligation.⁴

23. The Committee acknowledged that follow-up on the matter had proceeded in an incremental manner and included letters from the Executive Secretary and subsequently from the Chair of the Committee to national focal points, as well as multiple informal communications from the

³ Belize, Libya, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Seychelles and Syrian Arab Republic.

⁴ See documents CBD/CP/MOP/9/2 and UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/2.

Secretariat. It noted that in cases where no response had been received, letters from the Chair had been sent to the ministries of foreign affairs.

24. The Committee recalled that at its thirteenth and fifteenth meetings, held in February 2016 and May 2018, respectively, it had decided on measures in the face of similar recurrent cases of non-compliance with the reporting obligation, recommending that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol issue a caution to the Parties that had not submitted their national reports over multiple reporting cycles. The Committee discussed how the recommendations had been useful in leading to the submission of national reports by those Parties and agreed that it was important for the Committee to be consistent in its approach to Parties in such a situation.

25. Against that background, the Committee agreed to recommend that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, at its eleventh meeting, caution the seven Parties that had not submitted either their third or their fourth national report, in accordance with section VI, paragraph 2 (b), of the Procedures and Mechanisms on Compliance under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, as contained in the annex to decision BS-I/7 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, unless a report was submitted before the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. The Committee requested that its Chair inform the Parties concerned of the Committee's recommendation, urging them to submit their fourth national report as soon as possible. A draft text for the caution is contained in the annex to the present report.

26. The Committee highlighted the importance of ensuring that the recommendation to caution those Parties would be considered in the light of background information on the steps taken by the Committee leading to the recommendation. The Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare an information document to support consideration of the recommendation by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its eleventh meeting.

2. Individual cases of non-compliance concerning the obligation to take measures to implement the Protocol (Article 2 (1))

(a) Parties that had submitted a compliance action plan

27. Further to the request by the Committee at its eighteenth meeting, the Secretariat had made arrangements for the Committee to engage in informal online exchanges with Parties with compliance action plans under active consideration. In accordance with those arrangements, the Committee held informal exchanges with Burundi, Guinea, Morocco and Oman.⁵ A Committee member from the region of the Party concerned led the exchange. During each exchange, a discussion was held on the status of progress with respect to the actions set out in the compliance action plan of the respective Party and the challenges the Party was facing in that regard. Furthermore, the Committee followed up with the Parties on the possibility of requesting support for the development of national legislation from UNEP, through its Law and Environment Assistance Platform.

28. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the opportunity to speak directly to the representatives of those Parties. The exchanges had enabled the Committee to gain a better understanding of the progress made by the Parties in developing measures to implement the Protocol and the outstanding actions and difficulties that the Parties were facing in that regard. The Committee recognized that the Parties concerned had benefited from the exchanges, as the exchanges had enabled the Parties to discuss their plans and challenges directly with the Committee and ask the Committee for additional guidance. The Committee recognized that the exchanges had helped to

⁵ Barbados and Kyrgyzstan had informed the Secretariat that they were not available to connect to the online exchanges on the dates of the meeting of the Committee.

establish direct contact between the members of the Committee and the responsible national officers, which could facilitate follow-up on compliance issues.

29. The Committee emphasized the importance of financial support for Parties with compliance action plans under active consideration and welcomed the fact that three of the Parties it had engaged with through the online exchanges were at an advanced stage of accessing funds from UNEP through its Law and Environment Assistance Platform. The Committee recognized that despite the funding opportunity for the development of legislation, some of those Parties would need further support to strengthen their implementation of the Protocol. The Committee noted that among the challenges mentioned by the Parties, related to enacting biosafety measures once those measures were developed, were the lack of political will and the prioritization of biosafety.

30. The Committee discussed how additional resources were needed. It acknowledged the opportunity for accessing funds through GEF, while recognizing limitations in that regard, resulting from, inter alia, the lack of information and capacities as well as the length of the process for accessing funding from GEF.

31. The Committee suggested that in the context of future exchanges, Parties could be asked whether they were undertaking any activities on living modified organisms and whether any informal guidelines or measures were in place. The Committee noted that it should avoid suggesting that it would be able to provide assistance extending beyond its means and mandate.

32. The Committee requested the Secretariat to continue following up with the four Parties that had participated in the exchanges. The Committee agreed to hold informal online exchanges with the two Parties (Barbados and Kyrgyzstan) that had been unable to participate during the nineteenth meeting and requested the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements in that regard, tentatively for September 2024.

33. The Chair noted that Lebanon, Samoa, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and Tunisia had submitted their compliance action plans since the previous meeting of the Committee. The Committee welcomed the submission of compliance action plans by those five Parties. The Committee agreed that its Chair would write to the national focal points of Samoa, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and Tunisia to thank them for their submissions and to inform them that the Secretariat would follow up on the progress made with regard to the activities outlined in the plans.

34. The Committee noted that the compliance action plan submitted by Lebanon did not include timelines. The Committee agreed that its Chair would write to the national focal point to thank Lebanon for the submission of its compliance action plan. In the letter, the Chair, while acknowledging the challenges described in the plan, would nevertheless urge Lebanon to provide timelines for the activities presented in the plan to facilitate follow-up.

35. The Committee decided to recommend that, at its eleventh meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol:

(a) Recognize the usefulness of the compliance action plans in advancing the development of measures to implement the Protocol and the role of the Compliance Committee in facilitating support to Parties in this regard;

(b) Welcome the support for the development of biosafety legislation provided by the United Nations Environment Programme through its Law and Environment Assistance Platform to Parties with a compliance action plan under active consideration;

(c) Urge Parties and invite other Governments to provide voluntary funds in support of the eleven Parties⁶ that had developed compliance action plans, as well as any additional Parties that would develop and implement compliance action plans at the request of the Committee;

(d) Urge eligible Parties to prioritize biosafety projects during the programming of their national allocations under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources.

(b) Parties that had not submitted a compliance action plan but that had informed the Committee of progress made in the adoption of measures to implement the Protocol

36. The Committee welcomed the publication of Proclamation No. 179/2017 by Eritrea on the Biosafety Clearing-House. It noted how the follow-up in the context of its request to Eritrea to develop a compliance action plan had helped clarify the situation of non-compliance. The Committee requested its Chair to write to the national focal point of Eritrea to thank the country for addressing the compliance issue by publishing the text of its proclamation on the Biosafety Clearing-House.

37. The Committee expressed regret that neither Mauritania nor Saint Lucia had published on the Biosafety Clearing-House the measures they had reported having adopted and that the two Parties had not responded to communications sent in that regard. The Committee decided that communications with Mauritania and Saint Lucia on the publication of their respective measures on the Biosafety Clearing-House would be conducted in the context of follow-up regarding inconsistency between information provided in the fourth national report and information on the Biosafety Clearing-House.

38. The Chair recalled that, while the United Arab Emirates had informed the Secretariat of the adoption of measures, the measures had not yet been published on the Biosafety Clearing-House. The Committee welcomed the information provided by the United Arab Emirates on the adoption of the measures. It acknowledged that, while the Secretariat had been in contact with the United Arab Emirates regarding the publication of the measures on the Biosafety Clearing-House, those measures were still to be published by the United Arab Emirates. The Committee agreed that follow-up with the United Arab Emirates would be carried out in the context of communications regarding inconsistency between information provided in the fourth national report and on the Biosafety Clearing-House.

(c) Parties that had not submitted a compliance action plan or provided further information to the Committee on measures to implement the Protocol

39. The Committee considered the cases of Grenada, Guyana and Palau, which had been requested to prepare a compliance action plan but had since indicated in their fourth national reports that measures were partially in place. The Committee expressed regret that those Parties had still not published their measures on the Biosafety Clearing-House despite having been urged by the Chair to do so following the eighteenth meeting of the Committee. The Committee decided to follow up with those Parties in the context of communications regarding the inconsistency between information provided in the fourth national reports and on the Biosafety Clearing-House.

40. The Committee expressed concern that seven Parties⁷ among those that it had requested to prepare a compliance action plan following its fifteenth meeting had still not done so nor had they provided any information on the adoption of measures. Recalling that its Chair had already written to the national focal points of those Parties on multiple occasions to request them to prepare a compliance action plan, the Committee agreed to request its Chair to write to the ministers overseeing

⁶ Barbados, Burundi, Guinea, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Morocco, Oman, Samoa, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and Tunisia.

⁷ Bahamas, Botswana, Dominica, Fiji, Gambia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Yemen.

the national focal points for the Protocol, urging the Parties to prepare a compliance action plan and submit it to the Committee without further delay.

41. The Committee noted that it might need to consider additional actions in the future to address ongoing non-compliance by Parties with the obligation to adopt measures in cases where those Parties had not responded to the request of the Committee for submission of a compliance action plan.

(d) Additional Parties requested to prepare a compliance action plan identified by the Committee at its eighteenth meeting

42. The Committee recalled that, at its eighteenth meeting, it had identified additional Parties that would be requested to prepare a compliance action plan based on information from the third and fourth national reports that had been submitted after the fifteenth meeting of the Committee.

43. The Committee recalled that Angola had been requested to prepare a compliance action plan. It noted that, while Angola had since reported in its fourth national report that measures were partially in place, the records had not been published on the Biosafety Clearing-House. The Committee decided to follow up with Angola in the context of communications regarding inconsistency between information provided in the fourth national reports and on the Biosafety Clearing-House.

44. The Committee noted that no response had been received from seven of the Parties⁸ it had requested to prepare a compliance action plan following its eighteenth meeting. Acknowledging that those Parties had only recently been requested to prepare their compliance action plan, the Committee requested that its Chair write again to those Parties in the second half of 2024, urging those Parties that, by then, had still not shared their compliance action plan to prepare and submit their plan as a matter of urgency.

3. Individual cases of non-compliance concerning the obligation to designate a national focal point (Article 19)

45. The Committee recognized that two Parties⁹ had not designated a national focal point for the Cartagena Protocol over a period of several years, despite numerous communications from the Secretariat and the Chair of the Committee reminding them of their obligation to do so.

46. The Committee decided to request that its Chair write to the minister overseeing the national focal points for the Convention, with a copy to the national focal point for the Convention and the national focal point for the Biosafety Clearing-House.

Item 6

Preparation and adoption of the report and recommendations of the Compliance Committee for the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol

47. The Committee considered and adopted a consolidated report (to be issued as document CBD/CP/MOP/11/2) on the work of its two intersessional meetings, including recommendations for consideration and adoption, as appropriate, by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its eleventh meeting.

⁸ Antigua and Barbuda, Cabo Verde, Djibouti, Kuwait, Liberia, Marshall Islands and Somalia. The Committee, at its eighteenth meeting, had identified Myanmar as a Party to be requested to prepare a compliance action plan. However, no letter could be sent to Myanmar, in accordance with the guidance provided further to General Assembly resolution 78/124, in which the Assembly had approved the report of the Credentials Committee (A/78/605). In its report, the Credentials Committee had agreed to postpone its consideration of the credentials pertaining to the representatives of Afghanistan and Myanmar.

⁹ Marshall Islands and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

Item 7**Other matters**

48. The Secretariat explained that, as a result of delays in convening meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and the extension of terms, the terms of all of the members were due to end on 31 December 2024. Recognizing that it had been six years since elections for members of the Compliance Committee had been held and in order to maintain the staggering of terms, it was explained that the Secretariat intended to propose to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol that it extend the terms of five members until 31 December 2026.

49. Committee members raised concerns about diverging interpretations of the definition under the Cartagena Protocol of the term “living modified organism” and varying legislative approaches among Parties concerning new developments in biotechnology, including genome editing. The Committee recognized that clarity on the applicability of the definition of the term “living modified organism” in the context of new developments in biotechnology would form the basis for the Committee to carry out its role in reviewing compliance by Parties with their obligations under the Protocol. The Committee recalled its discussion on new genomic technologies at its eighteenth meeting in that regard.¹⁰ The Committee agreed that it was not for the Committee itself to resolve the issue but that it would be important to draw the attention of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to the matter. The Committee decided to recommend that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol consider the issue further at its eleventh meeting.

50. At the request of a member of the Committee, a representative of the Secretariat provided an update on the process for the development of the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, in particular in relation to Target 17 on biosafety and biotechnology. The representative of the Secretariat described the work carried out by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators, the input provided by the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the documentation prepared for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-sixth meeting.

Item 8**Adoption of the report**

51. The Chair introduced the draft report of the meeting, which was adopted, as orally amended.

Item 9**Closure of the meeting**

52. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the meeting was closed at 5.25 p.m. on 2 May 2024.

¹⁰ See document CBD/CP/CC/18/5, paras. 47–49.

Annex

Draft decision

Caution

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

Recalling Article 33 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,¹

Recalling also section VI, paragraph 2 (b), of the Procedures and Mechanisms on Compliance under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, as contained in the annex to decision BS-I/7 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol of 27 February 2004,

Noting with regret that Belize, Libya, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Seychelles and the Syrian Arab Republic² have not submitted their third or fourth national reports,

Noting that the Compliance Committee and the Executive Secretary have contacted Belize, Libya, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Seychelles and the Syrian Arab Republic² on numerous occasions, in accordance with decision BS-V/1 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol of 15 October 2010, which included offering support to those Parties in preparing their reports,

1. *Cautions* Belize, Libya, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Seychelles and the Syrian Arab Republic;²

2. *Requests* Belize, Libya, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Seychelles and the Syrian Arab Republic,² as a matter of urgency, to submit their fourth national reports;

3. *Encourages* Belize, Libya, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Seychelles and the Syrian Arab Republic² to seek the assistance of the Compliance Committee, in accordance with decision BS-V/1, should they require support in preparing their reports.

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2226, No. 30619.

² List of Parties to be updated before the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.