



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/CP/LG/2019/1/INF/2  
9 August 2019

ENGLISH ONLY

LIAISON GROUP ON THE CARTAGENA  
PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Third meeting  
Montreal, Canada, 25-30 May 2020

### REPORT ON THE ONLINE DISCUSSIONS ON THE POST-2020 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, at its ninth meeting, decided to develop a specific post-2020 implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (implementation plan) that is anchored in and complementary to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate the development of its elements ([decision CP-9/7](#)).
2. In accordance with decision CP-9/7, the Executive Secretary invited Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations to submit views on the possible structure and content of the implementation plan through [notification 2019-027](#), dated 28 February 2019.<sup>1</sup>
3. A draft implementation plan was prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of the submissions and taking into consideration the guidance provided by the meeting of the Parties in its decision CP-9/7.
4. Decision CP-9/7 also requested the Executive Secretary to convene open-ended online discussions on the draft of the implementation plan.
5. Through [notification 2019-041](#), issued on 10 May 2019, Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and indigenous peoples and local communities were invited to nominate participants to the open-ended online discussions. A total of 109 participants from 28 Parties, 4 non-Parties, and 11 organizations were nominated and registered as participants in the discussions.<sup>2</sup>
6. The open-ended online discussions were held from 8 to 22 July 2019 through the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) and were moderated by Ms. Galina Mozgova (Belarus). To facilitate the discussions, the Secretariat made available the draft implementation plan, accompanied by a note on its development, as well as an advance unedited draft synthesis of the views submitted on the possible structure and content as referred to in paragraph 2 above.
7. The views and comments shared by the participants during the discussions are summarized in section II below. The full text of all the interventions and proposals is available at <http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/post2020/ForumImplementationPlan.shtml>.
8. Taking into consideration the outcomes of the online discussions, a revised draft implementation plan will be prepared for consideration by the Liaison Group, at its thirteenth meeting, tentatively scheduled to be held from 22 to 25 October 2019.

<sup>1</sup> Submissions received further to notification 2019-027 can be accessed at <http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/post2020/submissions.shtml>

<sup>2</sup> The list of participants is available at: <http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/post2020/0002.shtml>

9. Following a peer review, the final draft implementation plan will be considered by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, at its third meeting.

## **II. SUMMARY OF THE VIEWS AND COMMENTS FROM THE ONLINE DISCUSSIONS ON THE DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

10. The discussions on the draft implementation plan were divided into five separate topics as follows: (a) general comments; (b) views and comments on the goals; (c) views and comments on the objectives; (d) views and comments on the outcomes; and (e) views and comments on the indicators. The moderator of the discussions introduced each discussion topic and provided guiding questions to facilitate the discussions.

11. The following subsections summarize the interventions under the respective discussion topics. Several posts in the general comments discussion included specific comments and views on the goals, objectives, outcomes or indicators of the draft implementation plan, which have been summarized in the section to which they were most closely related.

### **A. General comments on the draft implementation plan**

12. Participants were invited to provide general views and comments on the draft implementation plan. A total of 27 interventions were made in the general discussion.

13. The views expressed generally supported the content and structure of the implementation plan. Several participants appreciated that the elements of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020 that are still relevant were reflected, that the plan focussed on a reduced number of achievable goals, and that previous redundancies had been removed. Participants were also generally appreciative of the explanations provided in the cover note accompanying the implementation plan.

14. Several contributions stressed the need for ensuring compatibility between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the implementation plan. One participant added that the implementation plan should also be aligned with climate change mitigating policies and actions.

15. A number of interventions expressed the view that the implementation plan should include a vision and a mission that would reflect the objective of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and help communicate the purpose of the plan. In some posts, it was suggested that a vision and mission may not be needed in a document like an implementation plan that has a different purpose than a strategic plan. One participant suggested that the Protocol itself, in its chapeau and in its objective, as set out in Article 1, clearly outlines the context in which the Protocol operates and what it aims to achieve and that for this reason the implementation plan does not need to include a vision or mission.

16. Several interventions agreed that while there should be some level of flexibility in the implementation plan to adapt to new developments, its progress should remain measurable throughout the plan's full implementation period, which requires continuity, including of the indicators.

17. Several comments underlined the importance of milestones. Some indicated that milestones could be reflected in a programme of work and that they should be developed on the basis of a more advanced draft of the implementation plan. One participant stressed the importance of developing tools to assess if the milestones have been met and to act should this not be the case.

18. Several participants argued that the implementation plan should enable a shift in focus on areas where implementation has not sufficiently advanced. A few suggested that the implementation plan should focus on assessing and addressing knowledge and capacity gaps that prevent Parties to implement the Protocol.

19. Some participants emphasized the importance of capacity-building. One intervention considered capacity-building to be the most important aspect of the implementation plan and recommended that it should also be referenced to under section A (areas for implementation). Another argued that capacity-

building should be fully addressed in the post-2020 action plan for capacity-building for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the Supplementary Protocol and that the action plan should include cross-references to the implementation plan and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

20. Support was expressed in several posts for the approach taken in the development of the draft implementation plan that where organisms developed through new technologies constitute living modified organisms, as defined in the Protocol, they are already addressed in the plan. One intervention cautioned against expanding the implementation plan's elements with "new developments", indicating that such developments do not automatically present risks that cannot be managed under the existing framework. Another participant stated that while the implementation plan should address new technological developments, the excessive generation of guidelines in this area should be avoided.

21. One participant pointed out that issues related to synthetic biology and horizon scanning should be addressed in the implementation plan. Other participants expressed the view that this could lead to duplication with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and stressed the importance of synchronizing work under the Cartagena Protocol and the Convention on Biological Diversity in this area.

22. One participant stressed the importance of using the language of the Cartagena Protocol in the implementation plan, and proposed that the word "potential" should be added before the term "adverse effects" throughout the implementation plan.

23. The suggestion that the Articles of the Protocol should be referenced within the goals of the implementation plan was welcomed by several participants who indicated this would more clearly show how the draft implementation plan is intended to address obligations under the Protocol.

24. One participant expressed the view that the draft implementation plan did not sufficiently recognize and include the perspective of indigenous peoples and local communities and proposed to add a number of indicators to address this issue.

#### **B. Views and comments on the goals in the draft implementation plan**

25. Participants were invited to provide views and comments on the goals of the draft implementation plan and in particular on whether the goals covered all areas that should be included, whether they reflected an adequate balance between ambition and pragmatism and whether their sequence and division were appropriate. Fifteen contributions were made in this discussion.

26. A summary of views and comments made on the goals under the two parts of the draft implementation plan – part A. (Areas for implementation), and B. (Enabling environment) – is provided below.

##### *1. Areas for implementation*

27. There were a number of broad comments and views on the goals.

28. One participant suggested to change the order of goals under section A (Areas for implementation), listing the goals related to obligations under the Protocol first, followed by those addressing more technical issues, using the following sequence of the goals of the draft implementation plan: 1, 9, 8, 4, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7. This proposal was supported by several other participants.

29. The same participant also recommended to introduce two new goals between goals 2 and 3 in the above-suggested sequence. These new goals would address (a) illegal and unintentional transboundary movements; and (b) handling, transport, packaging and identification. The need for these new goals, as well as corresponding objectives, outcomes and indicators, was echoed by several interventions. Several participants argued that handling, transport, packaging and identification could also be combined with the current goal 3 on detection and identification of LMOs, which would require this goal to be reworded.

30. Some participants exchanged views on whether a goal should be added on handling, use and transboundary movements of LMOs that are pharmaceuticals.

31. There was also a proposal to also include a goal addressing issues related to contained use. In response, another participant suggested this would create duplication as other bodies have authority in the area of contained use regulations and practice. This participant referred to Article 6, paragraph 2, to suggest that contained use was beyond the scope of the Protocol and considered that it is a long-established field, predating LMO biosafety.

32. As a more general comment, one participant recommended that the different goals of the implementation plan should be developed taking into consideration other scientific disciplines and technologies, as well as new biotechnologies and their applications.

33. In addition to these broader comments on the goals, numerous interventions provided more specific feedback.

34. One intervention expressed its agreement with *goal 1*. No other specific comments or views were provided.

35. *Comments and views on goal 2*: One participant stressed the importance of the precautionary principle and of following a holistic approach in the context of LMO risk assessment encompassing a sound scientific basis and taking into account socio-environmental, ethical, and ecological considerations. The participant added that, in view of the potential impacts of emerging biotechnologies on the environment, emergency measures should be prioritized. These suggestions were supported by another participant. Another intervention expressed its agreement with goal 2.

36. *Comments and views on goal 3*: One intervention expressed its agreement with goal 3. Another participant suggested that this goal should also refer to labelling to facilitate the identification, handling and packaging of LMOs.

37. *Comments and views on goal 4*: One participant stressed that this goal should aim to enhance the availability and exchange of relevant information through the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) *in a timely manner* to help identify possible unintentional and illegal movements. Another participant questioned the meaning of the term “enhanced” in the description of this goal and suggested that the exchange of information through the BCH could be improved if incomplete information was also accepted, and that this would in particular serve exchange of information on the detection of illegal transboundary movements.

38. *Comments and views on goal 5*: Several participants suggested to acknowledge the voluntary nature of Article 26 in the description of this goal. Several participants welcomed the following proposal for a re-formulation of the goal (addition in italics): “Parties *that choose to do so* are able to take into account socioeconomic considerations when taking decisions on the import of LMOs in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol”. One participant suggested to delete this goal if its wording would not reflect the voluntary nature of socioeconomic considerations. Another participant disagreed with the proposed deletion.

39. One participant emphasized that the concerns of indigenous peoples and local communities should be part of socioeconomic considerations prior to the import, handling, transport and utilization of LMOs.

40. Another participant expressed their agreement with this goal.

41. *Comments and views on goal 6*: Several participants welcomed identifying LMOs that are unlikely to have adverse effects, as it would facilitate the safe management of LMOs in accordance with the Protocol. There was a proposal to reword this goal as follows (addition in italics): “Parties identify LMOs or traits that *are likely to* have adverse effects and those that are unlikely to have adverse effects on biological diversity and take appropriate measures.”

42. Others suggested the deletion of this goal, arguing, inter alia, that it combined two unconnected issues and that, contrary to the other goals under section A (Areas for implementation), goal 6 neither referred to an article of the Protocol nor to the Supplementary Protocol. Other participants who were in favour of deleting this goal stated that facilitating the import of LMOs that are unlikely to have adverse effects on biological diversity went beyond the objective and the scope of the Cartagena Protocol.

43. Another intervention expressed its agreement with this goal.
44. *Comments and views on goal 7:* Several participants agreed that it was important to address issues of liability and redress in the implementation plan. One participant suggested that, as the goals of the implementation plan were intended to describe “desirable achievements”, goal 7 should be reformulated to “All Parties to the Cartagena Protocol are also Parties to the Nagoya Kuala-Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress”. One participant noted that some Parties that had not ratified the Nagoya Kuala-Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress had nevertheless implemented its objectives through national legislation or policy. They proposed a different rewording of the goal: “Increased number of Cartagena Protocol Parties that have implemented the requirements of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress in national legislation or policy.”
45. Another participant stated that goal 7 should either be addressed under a separate (sub-) area or only be referred to in the introductory part of the draft implementation plan, as the Supplementary Protocol is an independent legal framework that may in the future require its own implementation plan.
46. Several interventions proposed to delete this goal, which was opposed by others.
47. One intervention expressed support for *goal 8* but no other specific comments or views were provided.
48. *Comments and views on goal 9:* One participant suggested to rephrase the goal as follows (addition in italics): “Full information on the implementation of the Protocol is made available by Parties *in their national reports*” to clarify that this goal refers to Article 33 of the Protocol and not to the information provided through the BCH.

## 2. Enabling environment

49. One intervention expressed support for *goal 1*. No other specific comments or views were provided.
50. *Comments and views on goal 2:* One participant expressed its support for this goal while another proposed to reword it as follows (addition in italics): “Parties mobilize resources to support implementation of the Protocol *in accordance with Article 28 of the Protocol and Article 20 of the CBD.*”
51. Another participant noted the importance of the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) focal area for biodiversity, from which continuous funding for biosafety-related activities by Parties should be secured and called for increased coordination between GEF operational focal points and Cartagena Protocol National Focal Points.
52. *Comments and views on goal 3:* It was noted that, in addition to activities by Parties, activities of relevant organizations and other stakeholders could also contribute to enhancing public awareness, education and participation in biosafety.
53. *Comments and views on goal 4:* To enhance the participation of non-Parties and other relevant stakeholders, it was suggested to reword this goal as follows (addition in italics): “Cooperation by Parties on biosafety issues at the national, regional and international levels is enhanced *and encouraged to stimulate South-South innovation exchange and technology transfer through social enterprises.*” While supporting this goal, one participant questioned the meaning of the term “enhanced”.

## C. Views and comments on the objectives

54. Participants were invited to provide views and comments on the objectives under each goal in the draft implementation plan and in particular on whether the objectives adequately cover what must be accomplished to achieve the goals and ensure the implementation of the Protocol. Eight participants provided views and comments in this discussion topic.

55. One participant made a general comment to indicate that for certain goals, the current objectives do not fully outline what should be accomplished to reach the goal. Specific proposals for how to address this are reflected below.

56. A summary of specific views and comments made on the objectives under part *A. Areas for Implementation*, and *B. Enabling environment*, is provided below.

#### *1. Areas for implementation*

57. *Comments and views on goal 1 - objectives 1.1 to 1.4*: It was noted that the objectives under goal 1 were important, but not sufficient to assess whether national biosafety frameworks are truly functional. It was suggested that other elements were necessary for national biosafety frameworks to be transparent and understandable.

58. A proposal was made to reword objective 1.1. as follows (addition in italics): “Parties to the Cartagena Protocol have adopted *legal, administrative and other* measures to implement their obligations under the Protocol.”

59. Questioning the relevance of national strategies and action plans to address biosafety issues, a proposal to reformulate objective 1.2 was made: “Parties effectively implement their biosafety legislation or policy”.

60. Another participant suggested to place objective 1.2. after objective 1.4.

61. Another participant was of the view that objective 1.4 would be more relevant in the post-2020 action plan for capacity-building than in the implementation plan.

62. *Comments and views on goal 2 - objectives 2.1 and 2.2*: There was a proposal to use the text of goal 2 for objective 2.1 and vice versa, as the application of risk assessment and risk management procedures would require Parties to carry out scientifically sound risk assessment of LMOs and manage and control identified risk.

63. Another intervention suggested to reverse the order of objectives 2.1. and 2.2.

64. One participant suggested not to use the term “appropriate” in the descriptions of objectives 2.1 and 2.2 and proposed to reformulate both objectives as follows (addition in italics): objective 2.1. “Parties apply risk assessment and risk management procedures on LMOs *as required by the Protocol*,” and objective 2.2. “Parties have access to guidance materials for carrying out risk assessment and risk management, *that is consistent with the requirements of the Protocol*.”

65. Another posting suggested to reformulate objective 2.1. as follows (addition in italics): “Parties apply appropriate risk assessment and risk management procedures on LMOs, *including those LMOs developed through new technologies such as synthetic biology*” and to reformulate objective 2.2. as: “Parties have access to *and use* appropriate guidance materials for carrying out risk assessment and risk management”.

66. Another participant proposed to add an objective, with the following wording: “Parties have appropriate human capability to carry out risk assessment and risk management procedures” and to place this objective following objective 2.1.

67. Two other proposals for additional objectives under goal 2 were made: “Measures to validate the risk assessment and monitor the effectiveness of the management measures are in place;” and “Parties can effectively review risk assessments provided by developer and make decisions.”

68. *Comments and views on goal 3 – objective 3.1*: A participant proposed to reformulate objective 3.1 as follows: “Parties have established appropriate guidance materials and technical tools for the detection and identification of LMOs.”

69. Another participant recommended that in addition to mentioning guidance materials, objective 3.1 should also refer to primary scientific literature, which risk assessors need to evaluate the potential risks

and benefits of LMOs. The same participant suggested to add an objective under this goal that would read: “Parties build human capability for appropriate risk assessment and detection capacity.”

70. Another intervention also proposed to add an objective with the following text: “Parties have access to laboratories able to detect and identify LMOs”. This proposal was supported by several other participants, with one noting that this newly suggested objective would require a corresponding indicator.

71. Another participant recommended to add two objectives, as follows: “Parties shall cooperate to identify LMOs” and “Parties have mechanisms to prevent illegal transboundary movement.”

72. To reflect paragraph 3 of decision BS-VII/10, one participant proposed to add the following additional objective: “Parties have access to all the information necessary to detect and identify LMOs, including information that allows for their unique identification and where reference materials may be obtained.” The participant added that corresponding indicators would have to be formulated for the proposed objective.

73. *Comments and views on goal 5 - objectives 5.1. – 5.2:* a participant proposed to revise the wording of objective 5.1 as follows (addition in italics): “Parties have access to appropriate guidance materials for taking into account socio-economic considerations in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol *and consistent with national needs and priorities*”.

74. Another participant suggested to replace, in objective 5.1., “access to” with “established”, while yet another participant proposed to insert the words “and use” after “access to.” Further, it was mentioned that, in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol, Parties could also develop their own guidance materials, taking into account their country’s domestic laws and interests, as well as their needs and priorities.

75. *Comments and views on goal 6 – objectives 6.1. – 6.2:* The following rewording was suggested for objective 6.1 (addition in italics): “Modalities for cooperation on identifying LMOs or traits that *are likely to have adverse effects* and those that are unlikely to have adverse effects on biological diversity are developed.”

76. Another participant stressed the need to add an objective 6.3, proposing the following text: “Availability of insurance and compensation arrangements in liability instruments” to ensure the coverage of claims for damages, economic losses and ecological degradation. Other participants pointed out that issues related to liability were to be addressed under goal 7.

77. A further proposal for an additional objective was made, focusing on LMOs or traits that are unlikely to have adverse effects.

78. *Comments and views on goal 7 - objective 7.1:* It was recommended that this objective be reworded as follows (addition in italics): “*All Parties to the Cartagena Protocol become Parties to the Supplementary Protocol*”.

79. No specific comments and views were provided on the *objectives of goal 8 and goal 9* of the draft implementation plan.

80. For the proposed *additional goal* on illegal and unintentional transboundary movements (see para.29), a participant formulated the following two objectives: “Monitoring concepts for the identification of not approved LMOs are in place including sampling methods, detection and identification;” and “Management measures for identified unapproved LMOs are applied.”

## 2. Enabling environment

81. *Comments and views on goal 1 – objectives 1.1. – 1.4:* A participant proposed to add a new objective: “The needs of developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States among them, for financial resources and access to and transfer of technology and know-how in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, are met.” The participant added that the newly suggested objective would need a corresponding indicator.

82. *Comments and views on goal 2 – objectives 2.1. - 2.3:* Alternative wording for objective 2.3 was proposed (addition in italics): “*New and additional resources from developed country Parties* are mobilized to strengthen capacities for implementation of the Protocol.”

83. No specific comments and views were provided on the *objectives of goal 3*.

84. *Comments and views on goal 4 – objectives 4.1. – 4.2:* It was suggested that the objective of goal 4 should be: “Parties should cooperate to support implementation of the Protocol including overcoming the operational gaps through the exchange of scientific, technical and institutional knowledge.”

#### **D. Views and comments on the outcomes**

85. Participants were invited to provide comments and views on the outcomes and in particular on whether the proposed outcomes adequately described the effect of achieving the corresponding goals. Four contributions were made in this discussion.

86. A summary of specific views and comments made on the outcomes under part A (Areas for Implementation), and B (Enabling environment), is provided below.

##### *1. Areas for implementation*

87. *Comments and views on the outcome for goal 1:* To make the outcome of this goal more specific, the following re-formulation was suggested (addition in italics): “Functional national biosafety *with adequate regulatory and legislative frameworks* to enable competent authorities of all Parties to carry out their responsibilities *most efficiently* under the Protocol.”

88. Another intervention proposed a different rewording of the outcome: “Functional national biosafety frameworks enable competent authorities of all Parties to *implement their obligations* under the Protocol.” The participant explained that the suggested change would align the outcome with objective 1.1, which refers to Parties adopting measures to implement their obligations under the Protocol.

89. *Comments and views on the outcome for goal 2:* It was suggested that the outcome of this goal should explicitly refer to: the precautionary principle in addressing uncertainties; the importance of risk management plans for risk assessment applications; and the development of standards under the Cartagena Protocol.

90. A proposal for rewording the outcome was made as follows (addition in italics): “Parties identify and appropriately manage risks to biodiversity of LMOs, *also taking into account risks to human health*”.

91. *Comments and views on the outcome for goal 5:* A suggestion was made to rephrase the outcome of this goal as follows: “Parties that want to take socio-economic considerations into account are able to do the assessment on basis of the provided guidance.”

92. *Comments and views on the outcome for goal 7:* One participant recommended having two outcomes (and possibly two goals) related to the Supplementary Protocol, including one to increase the number of ratifications and another related to the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol by Parties having already ratified it. It was mentioned that while the current outcome of goal 7 covers both aspects, the goal itself does not.

93. *Suggestions for outcomes under additional goals:* Following the suggestion to introduce new goals on (a) illegal and unintentional transboundary movements; and (b) handling, transport, packaging and identification, one participant proposed to develop outcomes for these additional goals, along the following lines: “Parties handle unintentional transboundary movements according to the Protocol”, and “Parties are able to fulfil their obligations under handling, transport, packaging and identification according to the Protocol.”

94. Another participant suggested that the outcome for the proposed new goal on unintentional transboundary movements could be: “Parties are able to prevent, identify and monitor unintended and illegal transboundary movements and releases.”

## 2. Enabling environment

95. No specific comments and views on the *outcomes for goals 1, 2 and 4* were made.
96. *Comments and views on the outcome for goal 3*: According to one intervention, the outcome should address more aspects than only “decision-taking”, in line with what is reflected in the objectives of this goal.
97. Another participant noted that activities of relevant organizations and other stakeholders also contribute to informing the public and involving the public in decision-making on the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs, and suggested that this should be reflected in the outcome under this goal.
98. One participant suggested to reword the outcome for goal 3 as follows: “Through public awareness, education and participation, Parties ensure that the public is appropriately informed about the benefits and potential risk of LMOs and involved in decision-taking on the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs.”

### E. Views and comments on the indicators

99. Participants were invited to provide comments and views on the indicators and, in particular, on whether the indicators are sufficiently clear, simple and measurable, and whether they adequately enable measuring progress on achieving the outcomes. Seven contributions were made in this discussion.
100. Participants generally supported the suggested indicators. To make the implementation plan more user-friendly, it was suggested that each objective should have at least one corresponding indicator with a corresponding number.
101. It was also recommended that the implementation plan should not include indicators that do not measure a specific objective.
102. A participant, noting the emphasis on progress made by Parties, was of the view that insufficient consideration was given to the roles of stakeholders who contribute to the implementation of the Protocol and suggested to address this.
103. A summary of specific views and comments made on the indicators under part A (Areas for implementation), and B (Enabling environment), is provided below.

#### 1. Areas for implementation

104. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 1*: One participant commented that the indicators under this goal were inadequate for measuring whether national biosafety frameworks are functional.
105. Another participant questioned the need for indicator 3.
106. Suggestions for additional indicators were made. One intervention proposed an indicator for objective 1.4., as follows: “Percentage of Parties that have the necessary budget and trained staff to carry out their tasks”.
107. Another participant proposed the following additional indicator: “Percentage of Parties providing information on the integration of biosafety into national strategies, action plans, programs and legislation.”
108. To better measure the functionality of national biosafety frameworks, another post proposed to add an indicator on the percentage of transboundary movements of LMOs for which information is provided that complies with Articles 8, 10 and 13.
109. Further, it was suggested to add an indicator reading as follows: “Percentage of Parties that have established legislation or policies addressing the concerns of indigenous peoples and local communities about biosafety.”
110. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 2*: It was suggested to rephrase indicator 1 under this goal, as follows (addition in italics): “Percentage of Parties taking decisions on

LMOs *on the basis of* risk assessment as required by the Protocol, *and in accordance with the precautionary approach*”.

111. One participant was of the view that an indicator measuring the percentage of performed risk assessments and applied management measures was necessary.

112. A proposal was made to add an indicator corresponding to objective 2.2, reading: “Percentage of Parties that have the tools and capacity to access relevant guidance materials.”

113. It was also suggested to add the following indicator: “Percentage of Parties who have secured free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and have engaged indigenous peoples and local communities in carrying out risk assessment and risk management.”

114. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 3:* Regarding indicator 1, it was noted that standard setting, including thresholds and sampling methodologies, would also facilitate the response of Parties to unintentional and illegal transboundary movements, in addition to the indicator’s reference to detection methods.

115. There was a proposal to reword indicator 2, as follows: “Percentage of Parties that have established operational guidance material and techniques to detect and identify LMOs.”

116. With respect to indicator 2, there was also a suggestion to include a reference to primary scientific literature, in line with a similar proposal made for objective 3.1.

117. Another proposal, supported by several participants, suggested adding an indicator to measure the percentage of Parties that have implemented the necessary legal preconditions and have access to functional organizational and technical infrastructure (laboratories/facilities/trained personnel) to detect and identify LMOs. The proposal also suggested that, for reasons of consistency, access to such facilities/infrastructure might also be referred to in objective 3.1.

118. Another participant suggested to add the following indicator: “Percentage of Parties cooperating to identify LMOs”.

119. Further to the suggestion to add a new objective under goal 3 (“Parties build human capability for appropriate risk assessment and detection capacity”), it was proposed to also develop a corresponding indicator to measure the percentage of Parties that provide training to build risk assessment capacity. It was suggested that such training should enable risk assessors to undertake a scientific assessment of the risks and benefits of each LMO.

120. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 4:* A proposal was made to reflect in indicator 1 the need for measuring change over time and the following rewording was suggested (addition in italics): “*Increase in* percentage of Parties making mandatory information available to the BCH.”

121. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 5:* It was proposed to reformulate indicator 1 as follows (addition in italics): “Percentage of parties that have *established* appropriate guidance materials *and techniques* for taking into account socio economic consideration in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol.”

122. A recommendation was also made to include an indicator for measuring the percentage of Parties that find the available guidance materials useful for taking into account socioeconomic considerations.

123. Another suggestion was made for an additional indicator, as follows: “Percentage of Parties that are able to take into account socioeconomic and cultural considerations arising from the impacts of LMOs on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, especially with regard to the value of biodiversity to indigenous peoples and local communities.”

124. To acknowledge the voluntary nature of Article 26, another participant proposed to add an indicator, that would read: “Percentage of Parties that take into account socioeconomic considerations or have made an informed decision to either not take into account socioeconomic considerations or take them into account selectively.”

125. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 6:* Several participants supported the suggestion to add an indicator, related to paragraph 4 of Article 7 of the Protocol, with the following wording: “Number of events in the BCH on LMOs that are "not likely" to have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.”

126. Another participant proposed to add the following indicator: “Percentage of Parties who have ensured the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in identifying LMOs or traits that are likely to have possible impacts on indigenous peoples’ traditional knowledge, innovations and practices relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.”

127. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 7:* It was proposed to add the following indicator: “Percentage of Parties that have in place national rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage resulting from LMOs finding their origin in a transboundary movement.”

128. Another participant recommended to add the following indicator: “Number of Parties that have implemented the requirements of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress in national legislation or policy.”

129. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 8:* A proposal was made to amend indicator 1 as follows (addition in italics): “Percentage of Parties that comply with their obligations *as indicated in their national reports.*”

130. It was also suggested that an indicator be added, as follows: “Percentage of non-compliance issues identified by the Compliance Committee that have been resolved.”

131. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 9:* An intervention recommended to add the following indicator under this goal: “Percentage of Parties that involved indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.”

132. *Comments and views on the indicators for the additional goals:* For the proposed new goal addressing illegal and unintentional transboundary movements, it was mentioned that corresponding indicators would be needed to show how many Parties have control mechanisms in place and to assess if these mechanisms have been successful. Also in relation to this newly proposed goal, another intervention proposed the following possible corresponding indicator: “Percentage of Parties that have mechanisms (e.g. relevant domestic legislation) to prevent illegal transboundary movements.”

## 2. *Enabling environment*

133. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 1:* It was noted that indicator 2 under this goal only applied to those Parties that have identified capacity-building needs, and it was therefore suggested to amend this indicator to (addition in italics): “Percentage of *those Parties that require capacity-building and that undertake* capacity-building activities”.

134. Several interventions supported the idea to add the following indicator: “Percentage of Parties that contribute financially or technologically to enhance other Parties’ capacity.” Another suggestion was made to add the following indicator: “Percentage of Parties that have identified capacity-building for indigenous peoples and local communities.”

135. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 2:* It was suggested to rephrase indicator 2 as follows (addition in italics): “Percentage of *developing country* Parties reporting that they have benefitted from additional resources *from developed country Parties.*”

136. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 3:* A proposal was made to add the following indicator: “Percentage of Parties engaging indigenous peoples and local communities in decision-making processes”.

137. *Comments and views on the indicators for the outcome of goal 4:* A proposal was made to reformulate indicator 2, as follows (addition in italics): “Percentage of Parties that have mechanisms for

involving stakeholders, *including, indigenous peoples and local communities*, from different sectors in the implementation of the Protocol.”

138. It was also suggested to add an indicator under this goal, reading: “Number of formal regional agreements between Parties to implement the Protocol.”

---