



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General

12 June 2026

English only

Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Twenty-first meeting

Montreal, Canada, 10–12 June 2026

Agenda item 8

Adoption of the report

Report of the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol on the work of its twenty-first meeting

Introduction

Attendance

1. The following members of the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety attended the twenty-first meeting:¹

African States

Mahaman Gado Zaki
Rigobert Ntep
Dorington O. Ogoyi

Asia-Pacific States

Yousef Al-Hafedh
Achmad Gusman Siswandi
Yan Liu

Eastern European States

Martin Batič
Hana Jiráková

Latin American and Caribbean States

Alejandra Ferenczi
Daniel Lewis

Western European and other States

Andreas Heissenberger
Casper Linnestad
Michelangelo Lombardo

Item 1

Opening of the meeting

2. The meeting was opened by Yan Liu, Chair of the Compliance Committee. In her opening remarks, Ms. Liu noted that, at the present meeting, the Committee would be taking stock of its efforts since 2020 in the context of providing input to the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and capacity-building action plan for the Protocol. She highlighted the critical work of the Committee and noted the areas in which it had been particularly successful in providing assistance to Parties, through formal and informal means, in complying with their obligations under the Protocol.
3. Kathryn Garforth, Legal Officer, addressed the Committee on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. She welcomed the members of the Committee and referred to the different issues that the Committee would be considering at the meeting. Ms. Garforth noted that the work of the Committee had expanded considerably in recent years and

¹ Georgina Catacora Vargas and Klodiana Marika sent their apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

emphasized that its efforts were producing tangible results in improving compliance with the obligations under the Protocol.

4. A representative of the Secretariat of the Convention reported that, with 13 members of the Committee present, there was quorum for the meeting to proceed, in accordance with rule 16 of the rules of procedure for meetings of the Committee.²

Item 2

Organizational matters

5. The Compliance Committee adopted the agenda of the meeting, as contained in document [CBD/CP/CC/21/1](#).

6. The Committee approved the organization of work proposed by the Secretariat, as contained in annex I to the annotated provisional agenda,³ and noted that the informal online exchanges to be held with certain Parties in the context of agenda item 5 would take place in the morning sessions during the second and third days of the meeting.

Item 3

General issues of compliance, including compliance with the obligation to submit a national report

7. A representative of the Secretariat introduced document [CBD/CP/CC/21/2](#) and indicated that, since the publication of that document, the one remaining Party that had not yet designated a national focal point for the Biosafety Clearing-House had done so. This brought the number of additional Parties that had designated their focal point for the Clearing-House since the Compliance Committee's twentieth meeting to two and meant that all countries that could designate a Clearing-House national focal point had done so.⁴ In providing an update on the number of fifth national reports received since 31 March 2026, the representative noted that three of the additional reports were submitted by Parties in the Asia-Pacific region, which brought the number of reports received from Parties in that region to 30 (63 per cent). Moreover, additional reports had been submitted by one Party in the Eastern European States region and one Party in the Western European and other States region, which brought the total number of reports received from each of the two regions to 20, a figure corresponding to 91 per cent and 95 per cent of Parties in those regions, respectively. The total number of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that had submitted a report was consequently 135, representing 78 per cent of Parties. The representative of the Secretariat informed members that the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) was providing bilateral in-country support to some Parties that had not yet submitted their fifth national report and had requested assistance.

1. Obligation to designate focal points

8. The Committee recalled the function of the national focal point, as set out in Article 19 of the Protocol, and noted the role of Biosafety Clearing-House focal points, as set out in the modalities of operation of the Biosafety Clearing-House.⁵ The Committee discussed the importance of the role of national focal points for the implementation of the Protocol, while recognizing that the national focal point of many Parties coordinated the implementation of the Protocol at the national level, as well as performed liaison functions.

9. The Committee welcomed the designation by two Parties of their national focal points for the Biosafety Clearing-House and also welcomed the fact that, at present, all Parties to the Protocol that were in a position to designate a national focal point for the Biosafety Clearing-House had done so.

² Decision BS-II/1, annex.

³ [CBD/CP/CC/21/1/Add.1](#)

⁴ It being noted that communication with Afghanistan and Myanmar was currently not possible.

⁵ Decision BS-I/3, annex.

10. The Committee noted with concern that Uzbekistan had still not designated a national focal point for the Protocol.

11. The Committee took note of the follow-up by the Secretariat with Parties that had yet to designate at least one competent national authority and Parties that had not made available the relevant details setting out their point of contact for receiving notifications under Article 17 of the Protocol. The Committee welcomed the publication through the Biosafety Clearing-House by one Party, of information on its competent national authority, and by three Parties, of information on their point of contact, as required under Article 17, in the period between the twentieth and twenty-first meetings. It expressed concern, however, that numerous other Parties had not yet provided the information required under the Protocol.

12. The Committee requested that the Executive Secretary:

(a) Write to the national focal point for the Convention of Uzbekistan to remind him of the obligation to designate a national focal point for the Protocol and urge him to make the designation as a matter of priority;

(b) Write to the Parties that had not provided information on their competent national authorities⁶ or their points of contact as required under Article 17,⁷ taking into account any relevant information provided through the national reports, to remind them of their obligations in that regard and urge them to make the necessary designations and provide the required information as soon as possible, for publication through the Biosafety Clearing-House.

2. Obligation to publish information through the Biosafety Clearing-House

13. The Committee reviewed information on communications from the Secretariat to Parties that had reported in their fourth national reports having put in place full or partial measures but that had not published any records thereon through the Biosafety Clearing-House or had published only a national biosafety framework developed under the UNEP project funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on the development of national biosafety frameworks.

14. The Committee welcomed the publication by Mauritania of its biosafety law through the Biosafety Clearing-House and welcomed the publication by Serbia of a record on a national measure through the Biosafety Clearing-House.

15. The Committee welcomed the information provided by Palau in its fifth national report with respect to national measures that were partially in place in the form of other laws, regulations or guidelines indirectly applicable to biosafety and the information that it was awaiting legal advice on its national regulations and legislation. The Committee acknowledged that the recently designated national focal point of Palau had indicated that further clarification would be provided following internal consultations.

16. The Committee noted with concern that a number of Parties that had been requested to upload their full or partial measures on the Biosafety Clearing-House had not responded to repeated requests from the Secretariat to do so.

17. The Committee requested that the Secretariat:

(a) Write to Mauritania to thank the Party, on behalf of the Committee, for having published its biosafety law on the Biosafety Clearing-House;

(b) Communicate with Serbia, with a view to clarifying whether the additional record concerned the partial measures referred to in its fourth national report;

⁶ Algeria, Bahrain, Cabo Verde, Congo, Dominica, Kuwait, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, State of Palestine and Uzbekistan.

⁷ Algeria, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Dominica, Georgia, Grenada, Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Nicaragua, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, State of Palestine, Suriname, United Republic of Tanzania and Uzbekistan.

(c) Continue to follow up with Palau regarding the measures referred to in its fifth national report and provide an update to the Committee at its twenty-second meeting;

(d) Continue to follow up with the seven Parties⁸ that had reported that national measures were partially in place but that either had no measures published through the Biosafety Clearing-House or had published only a national biosafety framework developed under the UNEP-GEF project and request that they upload the relevant measures as a matter of urgency.

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

(a) Urge Parties that were developing their biosafety regulatory frameworks to expedite their work, recognizing that the Protocol required Parties to take measures for its implementation and that such measures would contribute to achieving Target 17 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, and welcome the support provided in that regard to several Parties by UNEP through its Law and Environment Assistance Platform and the Government of Japan through the Japan Biodiversity Fund;

(b) Remind Parties of their obligation to publish their legal measures for the implementation of the Protocol through the Biosafety Clearing-House.

3. Obligation to submit national reports

19. The Committee considered the submission of fifth national reports and noted with appreciation the high number of Parties that had submitted their reports by the reporting deadline of 28 February 2026 (119 Parties, or 69 per cent) and that the number of Parties that had submitted their fifth national reports at the time of the meeting had increased to 135, which represented a submission rate of 78 per cent.

20. The Committee welcomed the efforts by the Secretariat to support Parties in the preparation and submission of their national reports, including by developing help materials in several of the official languages of the United Nations.

21. The Committee welcomed the in-person regional workshops organized and delivered by UNEP, GEF and the Secretariat to provide technical support for the drafting of national reports to eligible Parties included in GEF project No. 11907 on support for the preparation of the fifth national reports on the implementation of the Protocol. The Committee expressed its appreciation to GEF for providing the financial support for the project and its ongoing activities and considered ways in which support for future reporting could be strengthened, including by making support available further in advance of the reporting deadline.

22. The Committee discussed the experiences related to preparation of the fifth national report and recognized the benefits of synchronized reporting for the sharing of information under the Convention and its Protocols, while acknowledging that submission of the different reports on the same date posed challenges for many Parties, particularly those with limited human resource capacities.

23. In considering the status of submissions of the fourth national reports, the Committee welcomed the fact that five of the eight Parties that, at the time of the twentieth meeting, had submitted their fourth national reports only in an offline format had since published their reports on the Biosafety Clearing-House.

24. The Committee considered an update on the matter of 12 Parties that had not yet submitted a fourth national report, either online or offline, at the time of its twentieth meeting. It noted that three of the Parties were being considered individual cases of non-compliance which would be discussed under agenda item five. While welcoming the fact that, of the nine remaining Parties, one had submitted both its fourth and its fifth national reports and three had submitted their fifth national

⁸ Bahrain, Central African Republic, Chad, Gabon, Paraguay, Solomon Islands and Turkmenistan.

reports, the Committee expressed concern that five Parties had not yet submitted either their fourth or their fifth national reports.

25. The Committee requested that its Chair write to the five Parties⁹ that had not submitted either their fourth or their fifth national reports and urge them to submit a report as soon as possible. The Committee agreed to consider the matter at its twenty-second meeting in the context of individual cases of non-compliance.

26. The Committee recalled the agreement reached at its eighteenth meeting¹⁰ that the Secretariat should contact individual Parties that had not submitted their national reports three months after the submission deadline to request that they submit such reports and requested the Secretariat to continue to follow up with Parties that had not yet submitted their fifth national reports.

27. The Committee requested that its Chair write to any Parties that, by 30 November 2026, had not submitted their fifth national reports.

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

(a) Welcome the fact that more than two thirds of Parties had submitted their fifth national reports on the implementation of the Protocol by the reporting deadline;

(b) Remind those Parties that had not yet submitted their fifth national reports to do so as soon as possible through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

(c) Express its appreciation to GEF and UNEP for the support provided to eligible Parties for the preparation and submission of their fifth national reports;

(d) Recommend that, at its seventeenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, in its guidance to the financial mechanism, request GEF to make funds available in a timely manner to support eligible Parties in the preparation and submission of their sixth national reports on the implementation of the Protocol.

Item 4

Fifth assessment and review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Protocol

29. A representative of the Secretariat introduced document [CBD/CP/CC/21/3](#). He drew the Compliance Committee's attention to document CBD/SBI/7/6/Add.1 containing additional details which had been made available as a reference document for the meeting of the Committee. In sharing information about next steps in the assessment and review and mid-term evaluation process, he explained that, while the Committee would be developing an input to the process, focusing especially on goal A.4 of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan, the fifteenth meeting of the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, to be held from 16 to 18 June 2026, would provide an input focusing on all of the other goals. The representative also explained that the input provided by the Committee and the Liaison Group would inform the draft recommendation to be considered by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its seventh meeting, to be held from 4 to 12 August 2026, and that the recommendation adopted by the Subsidiary Body would be considered by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its twelfth meeting.

30. The Committee reviewed goal A.4 as well as information provided under related goals with particular emphasis on its work on compliance related to the following objectives of the

⁹ Afghanistan, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Fiji and Niue, it being noted that communication with Afghanistan was currently not possible.

¹⁰ See [CBD/CP/CC/18/5](#), para. 30.

implementation plan: A.1.1, related to adopting measures to implement the obligations under the Protocol; A.1.2, related to the designation of national focal points, competent national authorities and contact points for emergency measures (Article 17); A.2.1, concerning the provision of mandatory information to the Biosafety Clearing-House; and A.3.1, related to the timely submission of national reports.

31. The Committee agreed that its active engagement with Parties on several key issues under the Protocol had contributed to creating an environment that was conducive to compliance and thus to supporting the effective implementation of the Protocol. The Committee noted, however, that while its efforts to facilitate compliance had been fruitful in many areas, challenges persisted.

32. The Committee noted that the development of biosafety legislation remained a challenge for several Parties, especially in some regions. The Committee acknowledged, however, that despite its efforts and the financial support (albeit limited) made available in that regard, only limited progress in compliance by Parties with their obligation under Article 2 (1) of the Protocol had been observable. The Committee recognized that: in some cases, its efforts had contributed to the adoption of legislation or the publication of measures; in other cases, its efforts had led to renewed political attention; and, in a few cases, those efforts had led to the obtaining of technical assistance for the development of biosafety legislation. The Committee agreed that further support and political will would be required to ensure that compliance in that area improved, especially since the Parties that had still not adopted any biosafety measures were likely facing several other implementation-related challenges.

33. The Committee noted with appreciation that its work in relation to the obligation to make information available to the Biosafety Clearing-House had improved the completeness and accuracy of information on the Clearing-House and that its efforts regarding the obligation to designate competent national authorities and national focal points had led to the provision of the necessary information by numerous Parties.

34. With respect to the obligation to submit national reports, the Committee recognized that its work had contributed to achieving high submission rates over time. The Committee noted its important work related to facilitating the resolution of numerous individual cases of non-compliance with the reporting obligation.

35. The Committee acknowledged that there had been considerable improvement with respect to the number of Parties that had submitted their national reports by the deadline for the submission of fifth national reports. The Committee underscored that timely reporting should remain a priority in future reporting cycles.

36. The Committee agreed on its contribution to the fifth assessment and review of the Protocol and midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Protocol as contained in the annex to the present report.

Item 5

Individual cases of non-compliance

37. In introducing document [CBD/CP/CC/21/4](#), a representative of the Secretariat indicated that there had been further developments with regard to several cases since the document had been published. He noted that a revised compliance action plan had been submitted by Fiji on 25 May 2026 and made available on the Compliance Committee's collaborative portal on the Biosafety Clearing-House. The representative explained that Botswana had submitted a revised version of its compliance action plan shortly before the meeting, in which it provided an updated time frame for the activities set out in the plan. The revised plan would be made available on the Committee's collaborative portal. He noted that a representative of Papua New Guinea had reached out to the Secretariat shortly before the meeting to indicate that, while the Party was planning to submit its fifth national report in 2026, it faced challenges in that regard.

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

38. The Committee recalled decision [CP-11/1 B](#), in which Belize, Libya and Papua New Guinea had been cautioned for not having submitted their third or fourth national reports and had been requested to submit their fourth national reports as a matter of urgency.

39. The Committee welcomed the publication by Belize and Libya of a fourth and fifth national report on the Biosafety Clearing-House and welcomed the fact that those two Parties had availed themselves of the financial support that had been offered by GEF for the development of their reports.

40. The Committee noted that Papua New Guinea was the only remaining Party that had not submitted its third and fourth national reports and welcomed the recent communications between the Secretariat and Papua New Guinea. The Committee agreed to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 43 (c) and 43 (d) below, should Papua New Guinea not submit its report prior to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

41. The Committee requested the Secretariat to continue its follow-up with Papua New Guinea with respect to providing technical support, as necessary, for the submission of its national report as soon as possible.

42. The Committee requested that its Chair:

(a) Write to the national focal points of Belize and Libya to thank them for submitting their fourth and fifth national reports;

(b) Write again to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea to recall the previous communications and the caution in decision CP 11/1 B, convey the recommendation in paragraphs 43 (c) and (d) below and underscore the necessity of submitting a national report as a matter of urgency.

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

(a) Recall the caution in decision CP-11/1 B and welcome the funding extended by GEF to the cautioned Parties to prepare their fourth and fifth national reports;

(b) Welcome the submission of the fourth and fifth national reports by Belize and Libya, which resolved their non-compliance with the reporting obligation;

(c) Express grave concern that Papua New Guinea had not submitted a third, fourth or fifth national report;

(d) Request the Committee to consider possible measures to address the repeated non-compliance of Papua New Guinea with its reporting obligation and make a recommendation in that regard to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol for consideration at its thirteenth meeting.

2. Individual cases of non-compliance concerning the obligation to take the necessary and appropriate legal, administrative and other measures to implement the obligations under the Protocol (Article 2 (1))

(a) Parties that submitted a compliance action plan

44. The Committee reviewed the status of the 18 compliance action plans under its consideration and discussed follow-up with regard to each specific situation.

(i) *Guyana, Liberia and Marshall Islands*

45. The Committee welcomed the submission of compliance action plans by Guyana, Liberia and the Marshall Islands and reviewed the activities described in the plans. The Committee was of the view that the plans adequately provided for actions leading to the development of the necessary measures and associated timelines.

46. The Committee requested that its Chair write to the national focal points of Guyana, Liberia and the Marshall Islands to thank them for the submission of their respective compliance action plans and inform them that the Secretariat would follow up on the progress made with regard to the activities outlined in the plans. In the letter of the Chair, the possibility of applying for technical assistance through the Law and Environment Assistance Platform would be brought to the attention of the focal points.

47. The Committee agreed that its Chair, in her letter to the Marshall Islands, suggest that identifying further opportunities for advancing the development of the legislation be considered, in addition to the elements currently listed under output 1 of their compliance action plan. The Committee also agreed that its Chair, in her letter to Liberia, request the Party to specify the date by which it expected that the biosafety legislation would be enacted.

(ii) *Fiji*

48. The Committee welcomed the submission by Fiji of a revised plan, which included a detailed breakdown of activities aimed towards the development of biosafety legislation and associated timelines, pursuant to the request of the Committee at its twentieth meeting.

49. The Committee requested its Chair to write to the national focal point of Fiji to thank her for submitting a revised plan and inform her that the Secretariat would follow up on progress made with regard to the activities outlined in the plan.

(iii) *Yemen*

50. The Committee recalled that the compliance action plan of Yemen had been considered for the first time at the Committee's twentieth meeting and that under the plan the adoption of a biosafety law was foreseen by the end of 2027. It noted that, while no update had been provided by Yemen to the Secretariat since the twentieth meeting, the country had indicated in its fifth national report that a comprehensive national biosafety law had yet to be enacted and that progress was constrained by prevailing national circumstances. The Committee therefore requested the Secretariat to continue following up with the national focal point of Yemen and agreed to review the situation at its twenty-second meeting, at which time more information on the process related to the adoption of the law might be available.

(iv) *Botswana*

51. The Committee welcomed the revised plan submitted by Botswana, which included an updated time frame for the actions to be taken for the development of biosafety legislation. The Committee requested the Secretariat to thank the national focal point of Botswana, on behalf of the Committee, for updating its plan and continue to follow up with the Party regarding the delivery of the activities outlined in the plan.

(v) *Antigua and Barbuda, Lebanon, Samoa, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and Tunisia*

52. The Committee engaged in informal online exchanges with Antigua and Barbuda, Trinidad and Tobago and Tunisia. A Committee member from the region of the Party concerned led each exchange, during which 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 that the Party was facing in that regard. The Parties were invited to describe national activities undertaken with regard to living modified organisms.

53. The Committee was of the view that the exchanges had been useful in addition to the regular follow-up undertaken on behalf of the Committee and were an efficient and effective means of communicating with Parties on progress made and challenges faced.

54. The Committee recognized that, while technical staff engaged in work on biosafety had an important role to play in the development of draft legislation, the adoption of such legislation was outside their control. The Committee encouraged the Executive Secretary, when meeting with high-level officials of Parties facing ongoing compliance issues, to draw those issues to their attention and encourage them to take action in that regard.

55. The Committee requested the Secretariat to continue following up with the three Parties that had participated in the exchanges.

56. Noting with regret that Lebanon, Samoa and Suriname had not replied to the invitation from the Chair of the Committee to participate in an informal exchange, the Committee requested that its Chair write again to the national focal points of the three Parties with a view to inviting them to participate in an online exchange with the Committee, to be held after the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. The Committee requested the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements in that regard.

(vi) *Burundi, Guinea and Morocco*

57. The Committee noted the updates received from Burundi, Guinea and Morocco on their respective activities associated with their compliance action plans. A representative of the Secretariat transmitted information received from UNEP on the support provided to those Parties through the Law and Environment Assistance Platform to assist them in developing their biosafety legislation.

58. The Committee welcomed the progress made and requested that the Secretariat continue to follow up with the national focal points of those Parties and UNEP on further progress.

(vii) *Kyrgyzstan*

59. The Committee took note of the information contained in the fifth national report of Kyrgyzstan on the adoption of a law on biosafety. The Committee requested the Secretariat to follow up with Kyrgyzstan and urge it to publish its biosafety legislation through the Clearing-House.

(viii) *Barbados and Oman*

60. The Committee noted with concern that no update had been received from either Barbados or Oman since the informal online exchanges held in 2024 and noted that, according to the information provided by Barbados in its fifth national report, no progress appeared to have been made with respect to the adoption of legal measures. The Committee noted with concern that Oman had not yet submitted its fifth national report and requested that its Chair write to the national focal points of both Parties to request an update on progress related to their compliance action plans.

(b) Parties that have not submitted a compliance action plan

61. The Compliance Committee considered individual cases of non-compliance concerning eight Parties¹¹ that had been requested to submit a compliance action plan but had not yet done so.

62. The Committee noted with appreciation the information provided by the Gambia in its fifth national report and in its communications with the Secretariat. While welcoming the interest demonstrated by the country in developing a compliance action plan, the Committee at the same time recognized that the country had reported that it had adopted partial measures and that several records in that regard had been submitted to the Clearing-House. The Committee requested the Secretariat to follow up with the national focal point of the Gambia for further clarification.

¹¹ Bahamas, Cabo Verde, Djibouti, Dominica, Gambia, Kuwait, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Somalia.

63. The Committee took note of the information provided by Somalia in its fifth national report indicating that measures for the implementation of the Protocol were now partially in place. The Committee consequently concluded that Somalia no longer seemed to fulfil the criteria for developing a compliance action plan and decided to request that its Chair write to the national focal point of Somalia, and send a copy of the communication to the national focal point for the Clearing-House, to request that the partial measures, including the legislation referenced in its national report, be published through the Clearing-House. The Committee requested the Secretariat to provide an update on the matter at its next meeting, under the item on general issues of compliance.

64. The Committee expressed concern that, on multiple occasions, the remaining six Parties, namely, the Bahamas, Cabo Verde, Djibouti, Dominica, Kuwait and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, had not responded to the requests by the Committee to prepare compliance action plans. The Committee agreed that it had exhausted its means of written communication to request that the Parties prepare compliance action plans and decided to invite the national focal points of the six Parties to participate in online exchanges during its twenty-second meeting as an alternative means of encouraging them to prepare their compliance action plans. The Committee requested its Chair to send a letter of invitation to the Parties concerned and requested the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements. Furthermore, some Committee members indicated that they would follow up informally with the Parties concerned in their region.

65. The Committee decided to consider, at its twenty-second meeting, further steps that could be taken, should any of the Parties not respond to the invitation.

Item 6

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

66. The Committee considered and adopted a consolidated report (to be issued as document CBD/CP/MOP/12/3) 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 twelfth meeting.

Item 7

Other matters

67. In response to a question from a member of the Committee, a representative of the Secretariat provided an update on the opportunities for projects on biosafety utilizing the set-aside under the ninth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund, whereby resources could be used to support implementation of the Protocol through global or regional projects. She indicated that the efforts of the Committee and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol had contributed to those positive developments.

68. A member of the Committee commended the Secretariat on the development of the activity spotlight feature on the Biosafety Clearing-House, highlighting Parties that were actively publishing records. The Committee recognized that the feature could serve as an incentive for Parties to make information available to the Clearing-House, thereby promoting compliance by Parties with their obligations in that regard.

69. A representative of the Secretariat informed the Committee that the terms of five of its members would end on 31 December 2026 and that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol would therefore be invited to elect five members at its twelfth meeting. The members of the Committee whose terms would end at the end of 2026 were: Mahaman Gado Zaki (African States); Achmad Gusman Siswandi (Asia-Pacific States); Martin Batič (Eastern European States); Georgina Catacora Vargas (Latin American and Caribbean States); and Michelangelo Lombardo (Western European and other States).

70. The Committee noted that Mr. Batič had served two consecutive terms and would not be eligible for re-election. The Committee paid tribute to him for his long service to the Committee and commitment to supporting the implementation of the Protocol. Mr. Batič thanked the members of the Committee and stated that it was an honour to have been a member of the Committee and to have contributed to its important work.

Item 8**Adoption of the report**

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

Item 9**Closure of the meeting**

72. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the meeting was closed at 1.05 p.m. on 12 June 2026.

Annex

Contribution by the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol to the fifth assessment and review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Protocol

The Compliance Committee recommends that, as its contribution to the fifth assessment and review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Protocol, the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, at its seventh meeting, consider the following elements for its recommended draft decision for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its twelfth meeting:

1. Welcome progress made by Parties in complying with their obligations under the Protocol, notably those concerning the submission of national reports and the publishing of information on the Biosafety Clearing-House;
2. Also welcome the high rate of compliance with the obligation to designate national focal points;
3. Note with appreciation the progress made by Parties in designating competent national authorities but express concern that a small group of Parties have still not designated their competent national authorities and urge them to do so as soon as possible;
4. Welcome the supportive role of the Compliance Committee and acknowledge the importance of its regular and incremental follow-up with Parties on compliance matters, the formal compliance measures and the informal efforts of the Compliance Committee in support of compliance and achieving goal A.4 of the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;
5. Request Parties to fully cooperate when receiving communications from the Compliance Committee;
6. Express concern that several Parties have not taken any measures or only draft or temporary measures for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol;
7. Request Parties that have not yet fully done so to, as a matter of priority, put in place legal, administrative and other measures to implement their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol and take action to secure the necessary political will and awareness, while acknowledging that Parties face various challenges that prevent them from fully complying with the obligations under Article 2 (1) of the Protocol;
8. Urge Parties that have not yet fully done so to make all required information available to the Biosafety Clearing-House and keep their records up to date, noting in particular that information on illegal and unintentional transboundary movements reported in the fifth national reports has not been shared through the Clearing-House in numerous instances;
9. Recommend that the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, invite the Global Environment Facility to make specific funding available to eligible Parties to: (a) put in place legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol; and (b) support eligible Parties in implementing compliance action plans regarding the achievement of compliance with the Protocol;
10. Welcome the Committee's contribution to the fifth assessment and review of the Cartagena Protocol and midterm evaluation of the implementation plan for the Protocol and request

the Committee to continue providing a contribution to the sixth assessment and review and final evaluation of the implementation plan for the Protocol.
