



**CBD**



**Convention on  
Biological Diversity**

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/CP/MOP/8/17  
17 December 2016

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION  
ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE  
MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA  
PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Eighth meeting

Cancun, Mexico, 4-17 December 2016

**REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE  
PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY ON ITS EIGHTH MEETING**

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety held its eighth meeting in Cancun, Mexico, from 4 to 17 December 2016. It adopted 19 decisions, which appear in chapter I of the present report.

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

*Contents*

I.	Decisions adopted by the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.....	4
	VIII/1. Compliance.....	4
	VIII/2. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House .....	5
	VIII/3. Capacity-building .....	7
	VIII/4. Roster of biosafety experts .....	14
	VIII/5. Financial mechanism and resources .....	15
	VIII/6. Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives .....	16
	VIII/7. Budget for the integrated programme of work of the secretariat.....	17
	VIII/8. Subsidiary bodies (Article 30).....	25
	VIII/9. Modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.....	26
	VIII/10. Integration among the convention and its protocols.....	27
	VIII/11. Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress .....	28
	VIII/12. Risk assessment and risk management .....	29
	VIII/13. Socio-economic considerations (Article 26).....	31
	VIII/14. Monitoring and reporting (Article 33).....	32
	VIII/15. Third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan .....	34
	VIII/16. Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (Article 17) .....	37
	VIII/17. Transit and contained use of living modified organisms (Article 6) .....	39
	VIII/18. Public awareness, education and participation (Article 23).....	40
	VIII/19. Use of the term “indigenous peoples and local communities” .....	48
II.	Account of proceedings.....	49
	Item 1. Opening of the meeting .....	49
	Item 2. Organization of the meeting .....	50
	Item 3. Report on the credentials of representatives to the eighth meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety .....	52
	Item 4. Report of the Compliance Committee .....	53
	Item 5. Report of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation .....	55
	Item 6. Capacity-building and the roster of biosafety experts .....	56
	Item 7. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House .....	57
	Item 8. Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources .....	58
	Item 9. Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives .....	59
	Item 10. Report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Protocol and on budgetary matters.....	59
	Item 11. Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16).....	61
	Item 12. Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (Article 17) .....	62

Item 13. Transit and contained use of living modified organisms (Article 6) .....	63
Item 14. Review of implementation and effectiveness of the Protocol .....	64
Item 15. Socio-economic considerations (Article 26).....	66
Item 16. Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress .....	66
Item 17. Public awareness, education and participation (Article 23).....	67
Item 18. Other matters .....	68
Item 19. Adoption of the report .....	68
Item 20. Closure of the meeting .....	68

**I. DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY**

**VIII/1. Compliance**

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

*Welcoming* the activities undertaken by the Compliance Committee in the last biennium, in line with its supportive role in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and *taking note* of its recommendations as contained in the annex to its report,<sup>1</sup>

*Noting* the useful role that regional cooperation may play in supporting compliance with the Protocol,

1. *Welcomes* the progress made by Parties in complying with their obligations under the Protocol, yet *notes* with concern that, 13 years after the entry into force of the Protocol, a large number of Parties are not in full compliance in relation to most obligations under the Protocol;

2. *Urges* Parties to make use of all available means of support to assist them in fulfilling their obligations;

3. *Emphasizes* the importance of continuous and predictable support by the Global Environment Facility to eligible Parties to support their compliance with obligations under the Protocol;

4. *Urges* Parties that have not yet completely put in place legal, administrative and other measures to implement their obligations under the Protocol to do so, paying particular attention to the importance of putting in place monitoring systems as a prerequisite for effective reporting;

5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, as appropriate and following guidance provided by the Committee, to continue following up with Parties that have not yet fully complied with their obligations under the Protocol, and *requests* Parties to collaborate fully in this regard;

6. *Notes* with regret that one Party has not submitted its interim, first, second or third national reports;

7. *Also notes* that the Compliance Committee and the Executive Secretary have contacted the Party referred to in paragraph 6 above on numerous occasions, in accordance with decision BS-V/1, including by offering support in preparing its reports;

8. *Urges* the Party referred to in paragraph 6 above, as a matter of urgency, to submit its third national report to fulfil its obligation;

9. *Encourages* the Party referred to in paragraph 6 above to accept the offers of assistance of the Compliance Committee and any other assistance, should it require support to prepare its report.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/2.

## VIII/2. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House

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

*Welcoming the Web Strategy for the Convention and its Protocols,*<sup>2</sup>

*Welcoming also the cooperative activities among the focal points in Asia which were undertaken during the intersessional period in partnership among the Republic of Korea, China and the United Nations Environment Programme in an effort to enhance compliance with the Protocol,*

1. *Notes with concern* the decline in the number of records related to capacity-building activities that were registered in the Biosafety Clearing-House, and urges Parties and invites other Governments and relevant organizations to register in the Biosafety Clearing-House their capacity-building activities, projects and opportunities;

2. *Recalls* decision BS-VII/2 urging Parties and inviting other Governments to register in the Biosafety Clearing-House all their final decisions on the first intentional transboundary movement of living modified organisms for intentional introduction into the environment of the Party of import and related risk assessments as requested under the Protocol, with special emphasis on the first intentional transboundary movement of living modified organisms intended for field trials, since this category is currently underrepresented in the Biosafety Clearing-House, while recalling paragraph 1(a) of decision BS-V/2;

3. *Reminds* Parties of their obligation to notify affected or potentially affected States, the Biosafety Clearing-House and, where appropriate, relevant international organizations, when it knows of an occurrence under its jurisdiction resulting in a release that leads, or may lead, to an unintentional transboundary movement of a living modified organism that is likely to have significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health in such States;

4. *Urges* Parties that have not yet completely done so to make all required information available to the Biosafety Clearing-House and keep the records up-to-date focusing in particular on information related to: (a) national biosafety frameworks, legislation, regulations and guidelines; (b) summaries of risk assessments; (c) final decisions regarding living modified organisms and living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing; (d) national focal points and national points of contact; and (e) information on bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements into which they have entered and which have relevance for biosafety;

5. *Invites* Parties in a position to do so to provide funds to enable the translation of training materials and other resources into all of the official languages of the United Nations after the migration of the Biosafety Clearing-House to the new platform;

6. *Invites* the governing bodies of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development to strengthen the collaboration between their biosafety databases and the Biosafety Clearing-House;

7. *Requests* the Global Environment Facility to continue to make funds available in support of activities related to the Biosafety Clearing-House;

8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To continue collaborating with other biosafety databases and platforms, including those of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development;

---

<sup>2</sup> See UNEP/CBD/COP/13/14/Add.1.

(b) To continue making improvements to the central portal of the Biosafety Clearing-House, taking into account the needs of its users with a view to facilitating the submission of information and processes for validation by the respective Biosafety Clearing-House focal points, as well as following up on the recommendations of the Informal Advisory Committee on the Biosafety Clearing-House at its tenth meeting;

(c) To carry out the full migration of the Biosafety Clearing-House to its new platform with a view to enabling the Informal Advisory Committee on the Biosafety Clearing-House to test the new platform before its face-to-face meeting in 2018 while ensuring that information continues to be available to users of the Biosafety Clearing-House during the migration process and to send to the Biosafety Clearing-House focal points a chronogram detailing the migration and follow up processes;

(d) To continue organizing regional online discussions, and use other means of information exchange, for focal points through the Biosafety Clearing-House to facilitate integration and synergisms;

(e) To promote collaboration among Biosafety Clearing-House focal points at the regional and subregional levels;

(f) To create additional tools for facilitating statistical analysis of information contained in the Biosafety Clearing-House with a view to enabling Parties to analyse and better use the information;

(g) To create a portal through the Biosafety Clearing-House whereby tools, guidance and experience gained in the contained use of living modified organisms could be compiled and easily retrieved;

(h) To develop joint modalities of operation between the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention, the Biosafety Clearing-House and the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its fourteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its ninth meeting and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing at its third meeting with a view to enhancing coherence in the implementation and operation of the common elements of all components of the central clearing-house mechanism of the Convention.

### VIII/3. Capacity-building

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

*Recalling* decision BS-VI/3,

*Taking note* of the report on the status of implementation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol submitted by the Executive Secretary,<sup>3</sup>

*Noting with appreciation* efforts by various Parties and national, regional and international organizations that contributed to the progress made in the implementation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building, in particular with respect to focal areas 1, 2 and 5 on national biosafety frameworks, risk assessment and risk management, and public awareness, education and participation, respectively,

*Recognizing* that more work is needed to achieve the expected outcomes of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building within the remaining time until the end of the Framework and Action Plan,

*Underscoring* the need to prioritize capacity-building needs in order to facilitate efficient use of the limited available resources and to maximize the implementation of the Protocol and its Strategic Plan in the remaining period until 2020,

*Underlining* the need to undertake activities in an effective and efficient manner and to promote synergies, especially with capacity-building activities carried out under the Convention,

1. *Decides* to maintain the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol as adopted in decision BS-VI/3;

2. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to continue efforts to enhance the implementation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building;

3. *Urges* Parties, for the remaining period until 2020, to prioritize and focus, as appropriate, on operational objectives relating to the development of national biosafety legislation, risk assessment, detection and identification of living modified organisms, and public awareness, education and participation in view of their importance in facilitating the implementation of the Protocol;

4. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations in a position to do so, to provide additional financial and technical support to enable developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition to further implement the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building;

5. *Requests* the Global Environment Facility to continue to provide financial support to enable developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition to further implement the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building;

6. *Urges* Parties and other Governments to integrate biosafety in their national biodiversity strategies and actions plans and broader national development strategies in order to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals;<sup>4</sup>

7. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources and in collaboration with relevant organizations, to facilitate and support implementation of the priority

---

<sup>3</sup> UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/3.

<sup>4</sup> See United Nations General Assembly resolution 70/1 of 25 September 2015 entitled “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”.

capacity-building activities for supporting the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety contained in the annex hereto and as reflected in the Short-term Action Plan (2017-2020) to Enhance and Support Capacity-Building for the Implementation of the Convention and its Protocols as annexed to decision XIII/23 of the Conference of the Parties.



## Annex

**SHORT-TERM ACTION PLAN (2017-2020) TO ENHANCE AND SUPPORT CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR THE CONVENTION AND ITS PROTOCOLS**

**CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>COP-MOP decisions</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Expected output/outcome</b>	<b>Possible set of indicators</b>	<b>Possible partners</b>
1. * Develop capacity-building materials and guidelines on mainstreaming biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans	BS-VII/5 para. 10; BS-VII/1, para. 5	2017-2018	An e-learning module and a toolkit on mainstreaming biosafety developed and made available in English, French and Spanish  Parties' capacity to integrate biosafety issues into NBSAPs and national development plans and sectoral policies and programmes enhanced	Trends in the number of Parties accessing and using e-learning module and toolkit to promote the integration of biosafety into their NBSAPs	Strathclyde University
2. * Organize subregional trainings on mainstreaming biosafety into NBSAP and development plans, making use of the above e-learning module and toolkit (Activity 97), in collaboration with partners	BS-VII/5 para. 10; BS-VII/1, para. 5	2017-2018	Parties' capacity to integrate biosafety issues into NBSAPs and national development plans and programmes enhanced	Number persons participating in the trainings and using materials to promote the integration of biosafety into their NBSAPs  Trends in the number of countries with biosafety integrated in their NBSAPs	UNEP, UNDP, FAO

<sup>5</sup> The priority activities are marked with shading and an asterisk.

Activity	COP-MOP decisions	Timeline	Expected output/outcome	Possible set of indicators	Possible partners
3. * Support selected developing countries to implement pilot projects to develop and apply practical measures and approaches for integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the CBD at the national level and share emerging good practices and lessons learned	XII/29 para 9-11, BS-VII/5 para 12, 18 BS-VI/3 para. 9	2017-2020	At least 20 countries develop practical actions to promote integrated national implementation of the CPB and the CBD and prepare case studies on their experiences and lessons learned	Number of country case studies on the integrated implementation of the CPB and the CBD available  Number of countries sharing their experiences and lessons learned	UNEP, UNDP, FAO
4. * Organize training courses in risk assessment of LMOs	BS-VII/12, paras. 11-14	2017-2020	Improved capacity of Parties to conduct risk assessment of LMOs in accordance with the Protocol	Number of regional training courses successfully carried out  Number of people trained in risk assessment	To be determined
5. * Develop e-learning modules on risk assessment of LMOs	BS-V/12, para. 9 (d)	2017-2020	Interactive e-learning modules made available to Parties as a more cost-effective way of delivering training	Number of e-learning modules available  Number of downloads and use of the e-learning modules	To be determined

Activity	COP-MOP decisions	Timeline	Expected output/outcome	Possible set of indicators	Possible partners
6. * Organize regional and subregional training courses to enable Parties to implement the LMO identification requirements of paragraph 2 (a) of Article 18 and related decisions	BS-III/10	2017-2020	Parties are better equipped to take measures to ensure that shipments of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed or processing (LMOs-FFP) are identified through accompanying documentation and to prevent and penalize illegal transboundary movements of LMOs	<p>Number of Parties taking domestic measures to ensure that all LMOs-FFP shipments are identified in accompanying documentation</p> <p>Number of Parties with domestic measures to prevent and penalize illegal transboundary movements</p>	To be determined
7. * Organize workshops on sampling, detection and identification of LMOs	BS-VII/10, para. 5 (d); CP-VIII/16, para.10 (b)	2017-2020	<p>Parties are trained and equipped for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs</p> <p>Parties are assisted in fulfilling the requirements under Article 17 of the Cartagena Protocol</p>	<p>Number of regional capacity-building workshops successfully organized</p> <p>Number of participants taking part in the workshops</p>	EU-JRC, and reference laboratories in each region
8. * Organize online discussions and knowledge-sharing sessions through the Network of Laboratories on the detection and identification of LMOs	BS-V/9, para. 5; CP-VIII/16, para.10 (a)	2017-2020	Technical tools for the detection of illegal/ unauthorized LMOs are compiled and made available to Parties	<p>Number of Parties using tools for detecting unauthorized LMOs</p> <p>Number of downloads from BCH</p>	Network of LMO Detection and Identification Laboratories, and reference laboratories in each region, UNEP

Activity	COP-MOP decisions	Timeline	Expected output/outcome	Possible set of indicators	Possible partners
9. * Organize subregional workshops on public awareness and education concerning LMOs	BS-V/13	2017-2020	Parties' capacity to promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation concerning LMOs enhanced	Number of workshops successfully conducted  Number of individuals participating in the workshops	UNEP, Aarhus Convention
10. * Organize training courses on public participation and public access to information, to advance the implementation of the Programme of Work on public awareness, education, and public participation concerning LMOs	CP-VIII/18, para. 6	2017-2020	Parties' capacity to promote and facilitate access to biosafety information and public participation concerning LMOs enhanced	Number of training courses successfully conducted  Number of Parties participating in the training courses and having access to information	Aarhus Convention
11. Develop, in collaboration with relevant organizations, training materials on sampling, detection and identification of LMOs	BS-VII/10, para. 5 (d)	2017-2020	Parties are trained in LMO sampling, detection and identification	Number of collaborations established on the development of capacity-building curricula	Network of LMO Detection and Identification Laboratories, and reference laboratories in each region, UNEP
12. Develop learning materials on public awareness and education concerning LMOs	BS-V/12, BS-V/13	2017-2020	Learning materials readily and widely accessed and used by Parties to improve their capacity to raise public awareness and education concerning LMOs	Number of toolkits and best practices handbooks produced  Number of downloads of the materials made through the BCH	UNEP, Aarhus Convention

Activity	COP-MOP decisions	Timeline	Expected output/outcome	Possible set of indicators	Possible partners
13. Support online networks and communities of practice to facilitate exchange of knowledge, experiences and lessons learned on PAEP	BS-V/13	2017-2020	Parties are sharing experience and lessons learned on public awareness, education and participation	Trends in the number of individuals participating in discussion forums and communities of practice	UNEP, Aarhus Convention
14. Organize workshops to raise awareness of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress	CP-VIII/11, para. 4	2017-2020	Parties' awareness and understanding of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress enhanced	Number of capacity-building workshop organized  Number of Parties in attendance	To be determined

#### **VIII/4. Roster of biosafety experts**

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

*Recalling* decision BS-VI/4,

*Recognizing* the importance of the roster of experts as a useful tool for capacity-building,

1. *Invites* Parties and other Governments that have not yet done so to nominate experts to the roster and those that have done so to invite the experts nominated to the roster to update their records;

2. *Reiterates* its invitation to developed country Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to make voluntary contributions in order to fully operationalize the roster, so as to facilitate implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol for the period 2011-2020;<sup>6</sup>

3. *Decides* to expand the roster to include experts nominated by Parties and other Governments to participate in ad hoc technical expert groups and networks under the Cartagena Protocol;

4. *Encourages* Parties and other Governments to consider nominating experts in areas where there is a lack of expertise on the current roster, for example, in the areas of management of data related to biosafety and biodiversity, socio-economic analysis and trade, synthetic biology, and public awareness, education and participation;

5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to revise and streamline the nomination form for the roster of biosafety experts to facilitate the submission and retrieval of information;

6. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to incorporate a functionality through the Biosafety Clearing-House that would allow users to search the roster of experts and sort the results by the category in which the experts were nominated, including expert groups or networks under the Protocol, as well as the experts actively participating in such groups or networks;

7. *Further requests* the Executive Secretary to explore the possibility of linking the roster of experts on biosafety to tools being developed under other initiatives, such as the Bio-Bridge Initiative and the Codex Alimentarius, in order to facilitate the matching of biosafety needs identified by Parties with available funding and technical assistance.

---

<sup>6</sup> Decision BS-VI/4, paragraph 8.

### VIII/5. Financial mechanism and resources

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

*Recalling* Article 28 of the Cartagena Protocol,

*Having considered* the information on biosafety in the report of the Council of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention at its thirteenth meeting,<sup>7</sup>

*Having also considered* the information on biosafety contained in the report of the expert team on a full assessment of the funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility,<sup>8</sup>

*Bearing in mind* the previous decisions on guidance to the financial mechanism regarding programme priorities to support the ratification and implementation of the Cartagena Protocol,

1. *Takes note* of the consolidated previous guidance to the financial mechanism related to the Cartagena Protocol;<sup>9</sup>

2. *Recommends* to the Conference of the Parties that it include the following elements in the four-year (2018-2022) outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund:

(a) Outcome 1: Increased number of ratifications of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress;

(b) Outcome 2: National implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress enhanced;

(c) Outcome 3: Parties deliver their reporting obligations under the Protocol, through submission of national reports and of relevant information through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

3. *Also recommends* to the Conference of the Parties that it:

(a) Give full consideration to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in the terms of reference to be adopted for the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism under the Convention;

(b) Invite Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to respond proactively to the survey for the fifth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism under the Convention;

4. *Further recommends* to the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the financial mechanism, with respect to support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, that it invite the Global Environment Facility:

(a) To continue to make specific funding available to eligible Parties to put in place their national biosafety frameworks;

(b) To continue to fund projects and capacity-building activities on issues identified by the Parties to facilitate further implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, including regional cooperation projects with a view to facilitating the sharing of experiences and lessons learned, and harnessing associated synergies;

(c) To ensure that the policy, strategy, programme priorities and eligibility criteria adopted in annex I to decision I/2 of the Conference of the Parties are duly followed in an efficient manner in relation to access and utilization of financial resources.

---

<sup>7</sup> UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.1.

<sup>8</sup> UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.2.

<sup>9</sup> See UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12, annex II, section B.

### VIII/6. Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives

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

*Recalling* its decisions BS-II/6, BS-V/6, BS-VI/6 and BS-VII/6,

*Welcoming* the information provided by the Executive Secretary on activities undertaken to improve cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives,<sup>10</sup>

*Also welcoming* the cooperation of the Executive Secretary, over the last intersessional period, with, *inter alia*, the World Trade Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Plant Protection Convention, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (the Aarhus Convention), the European Union Reference Laboratory for GM Food and Feed of the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, the Green Customs Initiative, the Latin American Integration Association (ALADI), the African Union Commission, the Mexican National Centre of Reference for the Detection of Genetically Modified Organisms (CNRDOGM) and the National Institute of Biology of Slovenia,

*Underlining* the importance of cooperation and coordination among relevant organizations, multilateral agreements and initiatives for the effective implementation of the Protocol and the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020, adopted at the fifth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol,<sup>11</sup>

1. *Urges* Parties to improve and strengthen collaboration at the regional and national levels among focal points of organizations, conventions and initiatives relevant to the implementation of the Biosafety Protocol, as appropriate;

2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of funds, to continue cooperation with other relevant organizations, conventions and initiatives, including relevant entities at the national and regional levels, and involving, where applicable, experts from indigenous peoples and local communities, with a view to meeting the strategic objective in focal area 5, on outreach and cooperation, of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

---

<sup>10</sup> See UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/6.

<sup>11</sup> See decision BS-V/16.



### **VIII/7. Budget for the integrated programme of work of the Secretariat**

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

*Recalling* its decision VII/7, and decision XII/32 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as decision I/13 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

1. *Decides* to adopt an integrated programme of work and budget for the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources;

2. *Also decides* to share all costs for Secretariat services among the Convention, the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya Protocol on a ratio of 76:16:8 for the biennium 2017-2018;

3. *Approves* a core (BG) programme budget for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety of 2,937,900 United States dollars for the year 2017 and of 3,007,100 United States dollars for the year 2018, representing 16 per cent of the integrated budget of 18,361,600 United States dollars for the year 2017 and 18,794,200 United States dollars for the year 2018 for the Convention and the Protocols, for the purposes listed in the tables 1a and 1b below;

4. *Adopts* the scale of assessments for the apportionment of expenses for 2017 and 2018 as contained in the table 3 below;

5. *Decides* to endorse the merger of the Trust Funds for additional voluntary contributions in support of approved activities of the Convention and its Protocols (BE, BH, BX) so that resources may be used for projects targeted at more than one instrument and, in this regard, decides that new voluntary contributions for activities should be put in the BE Trust Fund, and requests the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme to seek the approval of the United Nations Environment Assembly to change the name of the merged Trust Fund to “Special Voluntary Trust Fund for Contributions in Support of Additional Approved Activities of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols”;

6. *Acknowledges* the funding estimates for the Special Voluntary Trust Fund (BH) for Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities of the Cartagena Protocol for the period 2017-2020 included in table 2 below;

7. *Notes* that the Special Voluntary Trust Fund (BH) for Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities of the Cartagena Protocol should be extended for a period of four years beginning 1 January 2018 and ending 31 December 2021 to allow the Executive Secretary to process the administrative closing of the Trust Fund, and requests the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme to seek the approval of the United Nations Environment Assembly for this extension;

8. *Decides* to apply, *mutatis mutandis*, paragraphs 4, 6 to 20 and 24 to 47 of decision XIII/32 of the Conference of the Parties.

**Table 1a. Integrated biennium budget for the Trust Funds of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols 2017-2018**

<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>2017 (US\$ thousands)</i>	<i>2018 (US\$ thousands)</i>	<i>Total (US\$ thousands)</i>
<b>I. Programmes</b>			
Office of the Executive Secretary	2,114.2	2,215.1	4,329.3
Scientific and Policy Support	5,156.9	5,252.6	10,409.5
Mainstreaming, Cooperation and Outreach Support	2,057.1	2,098.8	4,155.9
Implementation Support	2,838.2	3,322.7	6,160.9
Administration, Finance and Conference Services	3,974.1	3,742.9	7,716.9
<b>Sub-total (I)</b>	<b>16,140.5</b>	<b>16,632.1</b>	<b>32,772.5</b>
<b>II. Programme support charge 13%</b>	2,098.3	2,162.2	4,260.4
<b>GRAND TOTAL (I + II)</b>	<b>18,238.8</b>	<b>18,794.2</b>	<b>37,033.0</b>
<b>III. Working capital reserve</b>	122.8		122.8
<b>GRAND TOTAL (II + III)</b>	<b>18,361.6</b>	<b>18,794.2</b>	<b>37,155.8</b>
Cartagena Protocol share of Integrated Budget (16%)	2,937.9	3,007.1	5,944.9
Replenishment of working capital from reserve (16%)	(19.7)		(19.7)
Less contribution from the host country (16%)	(196.1)	(197.0)	(393.2)
Set aside delegated to Executive Director of UNEP (16%)	(24.0)	(39.2)	(63.2)
Less savings from previous years (16%)	(95.5)	(95.9)	(191.4)
<b>NET TOTAL (amount to be shared by Parties)</b>	<b>2,602.6</b>	<b>2,675.0</b>	<b>5,277.5</b>

**Table 1b. Integrated biennium budget for the Trust Funds of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols 2017-2018 (by object of expenditure)**

<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>2017 (US\$ thousands)</i>	<i>2018 (US\$ thousands)</i>	<i>Total (US\$ thousands)</i>
A. Staff costs	11,329.4	11,586.0	22,915.4
B. Bureau meetings	150.0	215.0	365.0
C. Travel on official business	450.0	400.0	850.0
D. Consultants/subcontracts	75.0	75.0	150.0
E. Meetings <sup>1/2/3/</sup>	1,416.8	2,016.8	3,433.6
F. Public awareness materials	50.0	50.0	100.0
G. Temporary assistance/Overtime	100.0	100.0	200.0
H. Rent and associated costs	1,239.7	1,257.6	2,497.3
I. General operating expenses	979.6	726.6	1,706.2
J. Training	5.0	5.0	10.0
K. Expert Meetings	280.0	135.0	415.0
L. Translation of BCH/CHM and ABS CH websites	65.0	65.0	130.0
<b>Sub-total (I)</b>	<b>16,140.5</b>	<b>16,632.1</b>	<b>32,772.5</b>
<b>II. Programme support charge 13%</b>	2,098.3	2,162.2	4,260.4
<b>SUB-TOTAL (I + II)</b>	<b>18,238.8</b>	<b>18,794.2</b>	<b>37,033.0</b>
<b>III. Working capital reserve</b>	122.8		122.8
<b>GRAND TOTAL (II + III)</b>	<b>18,361.6</b>	<b>18,794.2</b>	<b>37,155.8</b>
Cartagena Protocol share of integrated budget (16%)	2,937.9	3,007.1	5,944.9
Replenishment of working capital from reserve (16%)	(19.7)		(19.7)
Less contribution from the host country (16%)	(196.1)	(197.0)	(393.2)
Set aside delegated to Executive Director of UNEP (16%)	(24.0)	(39.2)	(63.2)
Less use of reserves from previous years (16%)	(95.5)	(95.9)	(191.4)
<b>NET TOTAL (amount to be shared by Parties)</b>	<b>2,602.6</b>	<b>2,675.0</b>	<b>5,277.5</b>

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

Tenth meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Article 8(j).

Twenty-first and twenty-second meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific Technical and Technological Advice.

Second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

Fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention/Ninth meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety/Third meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing held concurrently.

2/ SBSTTA-21 (3 days), Art 8(j)-10 (3 days) back-to-back in 2017. SBSTTA-22 (6 days), SBI-2 (5 days) back-to-back in 2018.3/ Budget for the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the ninth meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the third meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing divided equally between both years of the biennium.**Table 2. Resource requirements from the Special Voluntary Trust Fund (BH) for Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2017-2020***(Thousands of United States dollars)*

<b>I. Description</b>	<b>2017-2020</b>
<b>1. EXPERT MEETINGS</b>	
<b>Scientific and Policy Support Division</b>	
AHTEG on Risk Assessment and Risk Management	70.0
AHTEG on Socio-economic Considerations	80.0
<b>2. CAPACITY-BUILDING WORKSHOPS</b>	
<b>Scientific and Policy Support Division</b>	
<b>Biosafety and Biosecurity Unit</b>	
Sampling, detection and identification of LMOs	300.0
Mainstreaming biosafety into NBSAP and development plans	360.0
Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the Convention at the national level	350.0
Risk assessment of LMOs	300.0
Implementation the LMO identification	420.0
Workshops on public awareness, education, and public participation concerning LMOs	300.0
Training courses on public participation and public access to information	200.0
Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress	300.0
<b>3. CONSULTANTS</b>	
<b>Scientific and Policy Support Division</b>	
<b>Biosafety and Biosecurity Unit</b>	
Unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs	10.0
Mainstreaming biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans	65.0
Risk assessment of LMOs	80.0
Sampling, detection and identification of LMOs	80.0
Public awareness concerning LMOs	50.0
Cooperation with other relevant organizations	10.0
<b>4. STAFF TRAVEL</b>	
<b>Scientific and Policy Support Division</b>	
<b>Biosafety and Biosecurity Unit</b>	
Mainstreaming biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans	30.0
Cooperation with other relevant organizations	15.0
<b>Sub-total I</b>	<b>3,020.0</b>
<b>II. Programme support costs (13%)</b>	<b>392.6</b>
<b>TOTAL COST (I + II)</b>	<b>3,412.6</b>

**Table 3. Contributions to the Trust Fund for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the biennium 2017-2018**

Member Country	UN scale of assessments 2017 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2017 US\$	UN scale of assessments 2017 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2018 US\$	Total Contributions 2017-2018 US\$
Afghanistan	0.006	0.009	227	0.006	0.009	233	460
Albania	0.008	0.012	303	0.008	0.012	311	614
Algeria	0.161	0.234	6,093	0.161	0.234	6,262	12,355
Angola	0.010	0.010	260	0.010	0.010	267	528
Antigua and Barbuda	0.002	0.003	76	0.002	0.003	78	153
Armenia	0.006	0.009	227	0.006	0.009	233	460
Austria	0.720	1.047	27,247	0.720	1.047	28,005	55,252
Azerbaijan	0.060	0.087	2,271	0.060	0.087	2,334	4,604
Bahamas	0.014	0.020	530	0.014	0.020	545	1,074
Bahrain	0.044	0.064	1,665	0.044	0.064	1,711	3,377
Bangladesh	0.010	0.010	260	0.010	0.010	267	528
Barbados	0.007	0.010	265	0.007	0.010	272	537
Belarus	0.056	0.081	2,119	0.056	0.081	2,178	4,297
Belgium	0.885	1.287	33,491	0.885	1.287	34,423	67,914
Belize	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Benin	0.003	0.004	114	0.003	0.004	117	230
Bhutan	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0.012	0.017	454	0.012	0.017	467	921
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.013	0.019	492	0.013	0.019	506	998
Botswana	0.014	0.020	530	0.014	0.020	545	1,074
Brazil	3.823	5.559	144,674	3.823	5.559	148,701	293,375
Bulgaria	0.045	0.065	1,703	0.045	0.065	1,750	3,453
Burkina Faso	0.004	0.006	151	0.004	0.006	156	307
Burundi	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Cabo Verde	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Cambodia	0.004	0.006	151	0.004	0.006	156	307
Cameroon	0.010	0.015	378	0.010	0.015	389	767
Central African Republic	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Chad	0.005	0.007	189	0.005	0.007	194	384
China	7.921	11.518	299,755	7.921	11.518	308,098	607,854
Colombia	0.322	0.468	12,185	0.322	0.468	12,525	24,710
Comoros	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Congo	0.006	0.009	227	0.006	0.009	233	460
Costa Rica	0.047	0.068	1,779	0.047	0.068	1,828	3,607
Cote d'Ivoire	0.009	0.013	341	0.009	0.013	350	691

Member Country	UN scale of assessments 2017 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2017 US\$	UN scale of assessments 2017 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2018 US\$	Total Contributions 2017-2018 US\$
Croatia	0.099	0.144	3,746	0.099	0.144	3,851	7,597
Cuba	0.065	0.095	2,460	0.065	0.095	2,528	4,988
Cyprus	0.043	0.063	1,627	0.043	0.063	1,673	3,300
Czech Republic	0.344	0.500	13,018	0.344	0.500	13,380	26,398
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.005	0.007	189	0.005	0.007	194	384
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.008	0.010	260	0.008	0.010	267	528
Denmark	0.584	0.849	22,100	0.584	0.849	22,715	44,816
Djibouti	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Dominica	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Dominican Republic	0.046	0.067	1,741	0.046	0.067	1,789	3,530
Ecuador	0.067	0.097	2,535	0.067	0.097	2,606	5,142
Egypt	0.152	0.221	5,752	0.152	0.221	5,912	11,664
El Salvador	0.014	0.020	530	0.014	0.020	545	1,074
Eritrea	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Estonia	0.038	0.055	1,438	0.038	0.055	1,478	2,916
Ethiopia	0.010	0.010	260	0.010	0.010	267	528
European Union		2.500	65,064	0.000	2.500	66,875	131,939
Fiji	0.003	0.004	114	0.003	0.004	117	230
Finland	0.456	0.663	17,256	0.456	0.663	17,737	34,993
France	4.859	7.065	183,880	4.859	7.065	188,998	372,877
Gabon	0.017	0.025	643	0.017	0.025	661	1,305
Gambia	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Georgia	0.008	0.012	303	0.008	0.012	311	614
Germany	6.389	9.290	241,780	6.389	9.290	248,509	490,289
Ghana	0.016	0.023	605	0.016	0.023	622	1,228
Greece	0.471	0.685	17,824	0.471	0.685	18,320	36,144
Grenada	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Guatemala	0.028	0.041	1,060	0.028	0.041	1,089	2,149
Guinea	0.002	0.003	76	0.002	0.003	78	153
Guinea-Bissau	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Guyana	0.002	0.003	76	0.002	0.003	78	153
Honduras	0.008	0.012	303	0.008	0.012	311	614
Hungary	0.161	0.234	6,093	0.161	0.234	6,262	12,355
India	0.737	1.072	27,890	0.737	1.072	28,667	56,557
Indonesia	0.504	0.733	19,073	0.504	0.733	19,604	38,677
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.471	0.685	17,824	0.471	0.685	18,320	36,144

Member Country	UN scale of assessments 2017 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2017 US\$	UN scale of assessments 2017 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2018 US\$	Total Contributions 2017-2018 US\$
Iraq	0.129	0.188	4,882	0.129	0.188	5,018	9,899
Ireland	0.335	0.487	12,677	0.335	0.487	13,030	25,708
Italy	3.748	5.450	141,836	3.748	5.450	145,784	287,620
Jamaica	0.009	0.013	341	0.009	0.013	350	691
Japan	9.680	14.075	366,321	9.680	14.075	376,517	742,838
Jordan	0.020	0.029	757	0.020	0.029	778	1,535
Kazakhstan	0.191	0.278	7,228	0.191	0.278	7,429	14,657
Kenya	0.018	0.026	681	0.018	0.026	700	1,381
Kiribati	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Kyrgyzstan	0.002	0.003	76	0.002	0.003	78	153
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.003	0.004	114	0.003	0.004	117	230
Latvia	0.050	0.073	1,892	0.050	0.073	1,945	3,837
Lebanon	0.046	0.067	1,741	0.046	0.067	1,789	3,530
Lesotho	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Liberia	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Libya	0.125	0.182	4,730	0.125	0.182	4,862	9,592
Lithuania	0.072	0.105	2,725	0.072	0.105	2,801	5,525
Luxembourg	0.064	0.093	2,422	0.064	0.093	2,489	4,911
Madagascar	0.003	0.004	114	0.003	0.004	117	230
Malawi	0.002	0.003	76	0.002	0.003	78	153
Malaysia	0.322	0.468	12,185	0.322	0.468	12,525	24,710
Maldives	0.002	0.003	76	0.002	0.003	78	153
Mali	0.003	0.004	114	0.003	0.004	117	230
Malta	0.016	0.023	605	0.016	0.023	622	1,228
Marshall Islands	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Mauritania	0.002	0.003	76	0.002	0.003	78	153
Mauritius	0.012	0.017	454	0.012	0.017	467	921
Mexico	1.435	2.087	54,305	1.435	2.087	55,816	110,121
Mongolia	0.005	0.007	189	0.005	0.007	194	384
Montenegro	0.004	0.006	151	0.004	0.006	156	307
Morocco	0.054	0.079	2,044	0.054	0.079	2,100	4,144
Mozambique	0.004	0.006	151	0.004	0.006	156	307
Myanmar	0.010	0.010	260	0.010	0.010	267	528
Namibia	0.010	0.015	378	0.010	0.015	389	767
Nauru	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Netherlands	1.482	2.155	56,083	1.482	2.155	57,644	113,728
New Zealand	0.268	0.390	10,142	0.268	0.390	10,424	20,566

Member Country	UN scale of assessments 2017 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2017 US\$	UN scale of assessments 2017 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2018 US\$	Total Contributions 2017-2018 US\$
Nicaragua	0.004	0.006	151	0.004	0.006	156	307
Niger	0.002	0.003	76	0.002	0.003	78	153
Nigeria	0.209	0.304	7,909	0.209	0.304	8,129	16,039
Niue	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Norway	0.849	1.235	32,129	0.849	1.235	33,023	65,152
Oman	0.113	0.164	4,276	0.113	0.164	4,395	8,672
Pakistan	0.093	0.135	3,519	0.093	0.135	3,617	7,137
Palau	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Panama	0.034	0.049	1,287	0.034	0.049	1,322	2,609
Papua New Guinea	0.004	0.006	151	0.004	0.006	156	307
Paraguay	0.014	0.020	530	0.014	0.020	545	1,074
Peru	0.136	0.198	5,147	0.136	0.198	5,290	10,437
Philippines	0.165	0.240	6,244	0.165	0.240	6,418	12,662
Poland	0.841	1.223	31,826	0.841	1.223	32,712	64,538
Portugal	0.392	0.570	14,835	0.392	0.570	15,247	30,082
Qatar	0.269	0.391	10,180	0.269	0.391	10,463	20,643
Republic of Korea	2.039	2.965	77,162	2.039	2.965	79,310	156,472
Republic of Moldova	0.004	0.006	151	0.004	0.006	156	307
Romania	0.184	0.268	6,963	0.184	0.268	7,157	14,120
Rwanda	0.002	0.003	76	0.002	0.003	78	153
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Saint Lucia	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Samoa	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Saudi Arabia	1.146	1.666	43,368	1.146	1.666	44,575	87,943
Senegal	0.005	0.007	189	0.005	0.007	194	384
Serbia	0.032	0.047	1,211	0.032	0.047	1,245	2,456
Seychelles	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Slovakia	0.160	0.233	6,055	0.160	0.233	6,223	12,278
Slovenia	0.084	0.122	3,179	0.084	0.122	3,267	6,446
Solomon Islands	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Somalia	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
South Africa	0.364	0.529	13,775	0.364	0.529	14,158	27,933
Spain	2.443	3.552	92,451	2.443	3.552	95,024	187,475
Sri Lanka	0.031	0.045	1,173	0.031	0.045	1,206	2,379
State of Palestine	0.007	0.010	265	0.007	0.010	272	537
Sudan	0.010	0.010	260	0.010	0.010	267	528
Suriname	0.006	0.009	227	0.006	0.009	233	460

Member Country	UN scale of assessments 2017 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2017 US\$	UN scale of assessments 2017 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2018 US\$	Total Contributions 2017-2018 US\$
Swaziland	0.002	0.003	76	0.002	0.003	78	153
Sweden	0.956	1.390	36,178	0.956	1.390	37,185	73,363
Switzerland	1.140	1.658	43,141	1.140	1.658	44,342	87,483
Syrian Arab Republic	0.024	0.035	908	0.024	0.035	934	1,842
Tajikistan	0.004	0.006	151	0.004	0.006	156	307
Thailand	0.291	0.423	11,012	0.291	0.423	11,319	22,331
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.007	0.010	265	0.007	0.010	272	537
Togo	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Tonga	0.001	0.001	38	0.001	0.001	39	77
Trinidad and Tobago	0.034	0.049	1,287	0.034	0.049	1,322	2,609
Tunisia	0.028	0.041	1,060	0.028	0.041	1,089	2,149
Turkey	1.018	1.480	38,524	1.018	1.480	39,597	78,121
Turkmenistan	0.026	0.038	984	0.026	0.038	1,011	1,995
Uganda	0.009	0.010	260	0.009	0.010	267	528
Ukraine	0.103	0.150	3,898	0.103	0.150	4,006	7,904
United Arab Emirates	0.604	0.878	22,857	0.604	0.878	23,493	46,351
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4.463	6.490	168,894	4.463	6.490	173,595	342,488
United Republic of Tanzania	0.010	0.010	260	0.010	0.010	267	528
Uruguay	0.079	0.115	2,990	0.079	0.115	3,073	6,062
Venezuela	0.571	0.830	21,608	0.571	0.830	22,210	43,818
Viet Nam	0.058	0.084	2,195	0.058	0.084	2,256	4,451
Yemen	0.010	0.010	260	0.010	0.010	267	528
Zambia	0.007	0.010	265	0.007	0.010	272	537
Zimbabwe	0.004	0.006	151	0.004	0.006	156	307

TOTAL	67.078	100.000	2,602,554	67.078	100.000	2,674,991	5,277,545
-------	--------	---------	-----------	--------	---------	-----------	-----------



### VIII/8. Subsidiary bodies (Article 30)

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

*Recalling* decision BS-VI/9 and *taking note* of the experience gained and lessons learned in handling scientific and technical issues through the establishment of ad hoc technical expert groups and online discussion forums, such as the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management, the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Second Assessment and Review of the Protocol and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations,

*Considering* that, at the current stage, there is no need to establish an open-ended subsidiary body for scientific and technical advice under the Protocol,

1. *Decides* to continue establishing, as needed and subject to the availability of funds, ad hoc technical expert groups with specific mandates to provide advice on one or more scientific and technical issues;

2. *Also decides* to take into account the experience gained and lessons learned from ad hoc technical expert groups when establishing similar expert groups in the future, including the convening, as appropriate, of open-ended online expert forums prior to any face-to-face meetings of future ad hoc technical expert groups;

3. *Encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to provide adequate funds to enable the ad hoc technical expert groups to carry out their mandates effectively.

**VIII/9. Modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation**

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

1. *Endorses* the modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention in decision XIII/25;
2. *Decides* that the modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation should apply, *mutatis mutandis*, when the Subsidiary Body serves the Cartagena Protocol.

**VIII/10. Integration among the Convention and its Protocols**

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

1. *Decides* to use the following criteria for reviewing experience with the holding of concurrent meetings in accordance with decision BS-VII/9, paragraph 5:

(a) Full and effective participation of representatives of developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition, in the meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol;

(b) Effective development of the outcomes of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol;

(c) Increased integration among the Convention and its Protocols;

(d) Cost-effectiveness, including with respect to the need to have experts on matters related to the Cartagena Protocol present during the entire two-week period of the concurrent meetings;

(e) Number of Parties reporting improved consultations, coordination and synergies among their national focal points of the Convention and the Protocols;

(f) Evaluation by the host Governments of the logistical and technical burdens of the concurrent meetings they hosted;

2. *Reiterates* its call to developed country Parties to increase their contributions to the relevant voluntary trust funds in order to ensure the full and effective participation of representatives of developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition, in the concurrent meetings;

3. *Urges* cooperation and integrated work between the different existing and future expert groups under the Convention and its Protocols in order to make efficient use of human and financial resources.

**VIII/11. Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress**

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

1. *Welcomes* those Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety that have deposited their instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress and *welcomes also* the efforts undertaken by some of those Parties towards the implementation of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol;

2. *Calls upon* other Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to expedite their internal processes and to deposit their instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol as soon as possible with a view to ensuring the expeditious entry into force of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol;

3. *Calls upon* States that are Parties to the Convention but not Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to ratify, accept, approve or accede to the Cartagena Protocol, as appropriate, without further delay, so that they can also become Parties to the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol;

4. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of funds, to develop capacity-building materials and undertake further awareness-raising activities in order to expedite the entry into force and implementation of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol.

## VIII/12. Risk assessment and risk management

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

1. *Acknowledges* the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management, having completed its mandate, as well as the Online Forum on Risk Assessment and Risk Management;<sup>12</sup>
2. *Takes note* of the voluntary Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms as the outcome of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group with input from the Online Forum;<sup>13</sup>
3. *Invites* interested Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to take the Guidance into account as a voluntary tool to assist in conducting risk assessment in accordance with the Cartagena Protocol while acknowledging that other guidance documents and national approaches can also assist in conducting risk assessment in accordance with the Protocol;
4. *Invites* interested Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations that have used the Guidance and/or other guidance documents and national approaches to share an assessment of their applicability and usefulness through the Biosafety Clearing-House;
5. *Invites* the Global Environment Facility to continue to provide funding for a global capacity-building project and other projects on risk assessment and risk management;
6. *Invites* Parties to submit to the Executive Secretary (a) information on their needs and priorities for further guidance on specific topics of risk assessment of living modified organisms, (b) proposals on criteria, including the technical justification, that may facilitate the selection of topics for the development of further guidance, and (c) views on perceived gaps in existing guidance materials;
7. *Decides* to extend the Online Forum on Risk Assessment and Risk Management to exchange experiences on risk assessment, provide information and views on, and perceived gaps in existing guidance materials, and proposals to address any gaps identified;
8. *Invites* the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol to appoint a lead moderator for the online discussions and reporting on discussions, for the next intersessional period, ensuring regional rotation;
9. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:
  - (a) To assist the lead moderator of the online discussions referred to in paragraph 7 above in preparing a report of the online discussions and submitting it for peer review by the Online Forum before final presentation;
  - (b) To compile the views referred to in paragraph 6 above;
  - (c) To submit the results of (a) and (b) above to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice;
10. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice to review the information provided and to recommend a way forward to address the needs, priorities and gaps identified by Parties for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its ninth meeting, including the possible establishment of a new ad hoc technical expert group, with the understanding that new guidance proposals should only be

---

<sup>12</sup> See UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/8.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

presented upon approval by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol;

11. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to support, upon invitation by a Party, regional and subregional capacity-building activities on risk assessment of living modified organisms.

**VIII/13. Socio-economic considerations (Article 26)**

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

*Recalling* decisions BS-VI/13 and BS-VII/13,

*Noting with regret* that a face-to-face meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations could not be held due to the lack of sufficient funds and that, as a consequence, certain elements of its mandate could not be addressed,

*Welcoming* the online discussion of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations and the progress made,

*Taking note* of the conclusions of the online discussion of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations,<sup>14</sup>

*Recognizing* that a face-to-face meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations would be required for addressing the outstanding parts of its mandate,

*Acknowledging* that the continued work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations towards achieving operational objective 1.7 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety may also contribute to further conceptual clarity,

*Taking note* of national and regional activities on socio-economic considerations,

1. *Takes note* of the revised Framework for Conceptual Clarity;<sup>15</sup>
2. *Decides* to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations, replacing any experts, as needed, including indigenous peoples and local communities as observers, and in accordance with the consolidated modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity,<sup>16</sup> to allow it to meet face-to-face, subject to the availability of funds, to work on the guidelines envisaged under the outcomes for operational objective 1.7 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;
3. *Urges* Parties to provide the necessary funds for a face-to-face meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations, ensuring the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, supported by such online discussions as may be necessary to achieve its mandate;
4. *Requests* the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations to submit a report for consideration by the Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its ninth meeting.

---

<sup>14</sup> See UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/13, annex.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Decision VIII/10 of the Conference of the Parties, annex III.

#### VIII/14. Monitoring and reporting (Article 33)

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

*Taking note of the third national reports submitted by Parties and welcoming the analysis thereof prepared by the Executive Secretary,<sup>17</sup>*

*Considering the challenges with the reporting format for the third national report identified by the Liaison Group on Capacity-building at its eleventh meeting<sup>18</sup> and the Compliance Committee at its thirteenth meeting,<sup>19</sup>*

1. *Expresses concern about the lower rate of submission of the third national reports in comparison to the previous reporting cycle, and notes with concern that third national reports are still due from 37 Parties, including 4 Parties that have accessed funds from the Global Environment Facility for the preparation of their third national reports;*

2. *Welcomes the financial support provided by the Global Environment Facility to a number of eligible Parties to support the preparation of their national reports, but notes with concern that 39 Parties that were eligible for Global Environment Facility funding to complete their national reports either did not apply for that funding or were unable to access the financial support;*

3. *Also welcomes the efforts made by the Secretariat to assist Parties in submitting national reports and to ensure their completeness;*

4. *Notes the effect of the challenges posed by new administrative changes within the United Nations and its impact on the current reporting cycle, such as delays in the submission of the third national reports;*

5. *Urges Parties that have not yet submitted their third national report to do so as soon as possible;<sup>20</sup>*

6. *Also urges Parties that have not submitted a complete third national report to do so as soon as possible;*

7. *Requests the Compliance Committee to explore the reasons for the lower rate of submission of the third national reports;*

8. *Requests the Executive Secretary:*

(a) *To develop a revised format for the fourth national reports with a view to ensuring that complete and accurate information is captured while striving to ensure the applicability of the baseline information, as established in decision BS-VI/15, in particular by:*

(i) *Improving the formulation of questions for their clarity, providing further explanation where necessary;*

(ii) *Eliminating the redundancy observed in the questions used for the third national report;*

---

<sup>17</sup> UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/11 and Add.1.

<sup>18</sup> See UNEP/CBD/BSLGC/11/3.

<sup>19</sup> See UNEP/CBD/BS/CC/13/6.

<sup>20</sup> Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belize, Cabo Verde, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Fiji, Greece, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Libya, Malta, Marshall Islands, Montenegro, Myanmar, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, State of Palestine, Syrian Arab Republic, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, and Turkmenistan.



- (iii) Adding questions that address mainstreaming of biosafety into national biodiversity strategies and action plans, other policies and legislation;
- (b) To submit the revised format for the fourth national reports for review by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its ninth meeting.

### **VIII/15. Third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan**

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

*Recalling* decision BS-VII/3,

*Also recalling* decision BS-VI/15, paragraphs 1 and 2,

*Taking note* of the comparative analysis prepared by the Executive Secretary<sup>21</sup> and reviewed by the Subsidiary Body at its first meeting with input from the Compliance Committee and a contribution from the Liaison Group on Capacity Building,

1. *Welcomes* the work of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in undertaking the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020;<sup>22</sup>

2. *Also welcomes* the input of the Compliance Committee to the assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan,<sup>23</sup> and *requests* the Committee to continue providing inputs to the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan;

3. *Further welcomes* the contribution from the Liaison Group on Capacity Building;<sup>24</sup>

4. *Welcomes further* the Compliance Committee's supportive role, carried out pursuant to decision BS-V/1, as a contribution to the progress reported, and *requests* the Committee to continue carrying out this supportive role in accordance with its mandate;

5. *Notes with concern* the lower rate of submission of the third national reports in comparison with the previous reporting cycle, and *urges* the Parties that have not yet submitted their third national report to do so as soon as possible;

6. *Notes* the absence of clear linkages between some of the outcomes and indicators in the current Strategic Plan, and *agrees* to improve such linkages in a follow-up to the present Strategic Plan;

7. *Also notes* that, in the follow-up to the present Strategic Plan, indicators should be simplified, streamlined and made easily measurable with a view to ensuring that progress towards achieving operational objectives can be readily tracked and quantified;

8. *Further notes* the slow progress in: (a) the development of modalities for cooperation and guidance in identifying living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health; (b) capacity-building for risk assessment and risk management; (c) socioeconomic considerations; and (d) capacity-building to take appropriate measures in cases of unintentional release of living modified organisms that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health;

9. *Notes with concern* that, to date, only approximately half of the Parties have fully put in place legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol, and *urges* Parties that have not yet fully done so to put in place their national biosafety frameworks, in particular biosafety legislation, as a matter of priority;

---

<sup>21</sup> UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.1.

<sup>22</sup> UNEP/CBD/COP/13/6, sect. I, recommendation 1/3.

<sup>23</sup> UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/INF/34.

<sup>24</sup> UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/INF/35.

10. *Calls upon* Parties, for the remaining period of the Strategic Plan, to consider prioritizing the operational objectives relating to the development of biosafety legislation, risk assessment, risk management, detection and identification of living modified organisms, and public awareness, education and training in view of their critical importance in facilitating the implementation of the Protocol;

11. *Urges* Parties to undertake targeted capacity-building activities on biosafety and to share relevant experiences and lessons learned from these activities through the Biosafety Clearing-House in order to facilitate further development and implementation of the Protocol;

12. *Encourages* Parties to make use of the Biosafety Clearing-House to share experiences on national processes and best practices related to socioeconomic considerations in decision-making related to living modified organisms, as appropriate, and in accordance with national legislation;

13. *Also encourages* those Parties that have not yet done so to deposit their instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the Nagoya Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress as soon as possible;

14. *Further encourages* Parties to continue to enhance capacity for public awareness, education and participation regarding the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms, including for indigenous peoples and local communities, and to integrate training, public awareness, education and participation into national initiatives for communication, education and public awareness, initiatives for the Sustainable Development Goals, initiatives for climate change mitigation and adaptation and other environmental initiatives;

15. *Recommends* 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 continue to assist eligible Parties that have not yet done so to put in place a national biosafety framework and to make funds available to this end;

16. *Notes* that a lack of awareness and political support for biosafety issues contributes to limited access to and uptake of funding for biosafety, and *urges* Parties to enhance efforts to raise awareness of key biosafety-related issues among policy- and decision makers;

17. *Urges* Parties to strengthen national consultative mechanisms among relevant government institutions regarding the programming of national Global Environment Facility allocations with a view to ensuring appropriate funding for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol;

18. *Invites* Parties in a position to do so and international organizations to provide support for the implementation of the Protocol, based on the expressed needs of Parties, especially for developing countries and, in particular, least developed countries and small island developing States, as well as countries with economies in transition;

19. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To undertake regional and subregional workshops and other relevant activities, subject to the availability of resources, in order to enhance the capacity of Parties to promote the integration of biosafety considerations into national biodiversity strategies and action plans, national development plans and national strategies to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals;

(b) To carry out further capacity-building activities, subject to the availability of resources, including on the possible impact of living modified organisms on indigenous peoples and local communities, while ensuring gender balance, and considering the Short-term Action Plan (2017-2020) to enhance and support capacity-building for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols;<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Conference of the Parties decision XIII/23, annex.

(c) To further enhance cooperation and collaboration in biosafety with relevant organizations.

**VIII/16. Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (Article 17)**

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

1. *Adopts* the operational definitions of the terms “unintentional transboundary movement” and “illegal transboundary movement”, as contained in the annex to the present decision, and *deems it appropriate* to use them for the purpose of facilitating the implementation of the Protocol;

2. *Encourages* Parties to make use of the operational definitions of the terms “unintentional transboundary movement” and “illegal transboundary movement” when completing their national reports;

3. *Urges* Parties to submit to the Biosafety Clearing-House information and available guidance on the mechanisms for emergency measures in case of a release that leads or may lead to an unintentional transboundary movement of a living modified organism that is likely to have significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health;

4. *Takes note* of the draft training manual on the detection and identification of living modified organisms;

5. *Invites* Parties to provide information regarding their capacity and needs in the detection and identification of living modified organisms, including a list of laboratories and their specific activities;

6. *Encourages* Parties to establish effective mechanisms to support the workflow for sampling, detection and identification by, for example, providing border control officials and laboratories with the appropriate mandates to sample, detect and identify living modified organisms, ensuring that laboratories remain functional and that they receive high-quality test samples;

7. *Also encourages* Parties to establish, support and participate in regional and subregional networks on the detection of living modified organisms in order to promote technical cooperation in the field and, subject to the availability of funds, for example through the roster of biosafety experts, provide the networks with opportunities to host training workshops, and *requests* the Global Environment Facility to provide funds for the hosting of such workshops;

8. *Invites* Parties to nominate experts in the field of living modified organism detection and identification to the roster of biosafety experts;

9. *Encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to submit to the Biosafety Clearing-House information on methods for the detection and identification of living modified organisms, with special emphasis on validated methods;

10. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To continue organizing online discussions and face-to-face meetings, subject to the availability of resources, of the Network of Laboratories focusing on the detection and identification of living modified organisms;

(b) To continue convening, in cooperation with relevant organizations, subject to the availability of resources, regional and subregional capacity-building activities, such as online training and face-to-face workshops in the fields of sampling, detection and identification of living modified organisms with specific emphasis on the topics of (i) sampling at the border, including training, (ii) establishment and maintenance of quality assurance and quality control systems, (iii) interpretation of the results of living modified organism analysis reports, (iv) environmental sampling, (v) developing reference materials, (vi) validation procedures, and (vii) measurement of uncertainty;

(c) To continue working on the draft training manual, in an expeditious manner, in collaboration with the Network of Laboratories for the Detection and Identification of Living Modified Organisms, and make a draft version available, in all official languages, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its ninth meeting with a view to its possible approval before its official final publication;

(d) To improve the user interface of the methods for the detection and identification of living modified organisms with a view to creating a searchable and indexed database and regularly update its content, as needed;

(e) To create in the Biosafety Clearing-House a system for the easy identification of capacity-building training opportunities related to detection and identification of living modified organisms;

(f) To align the language of the relevant questions in the draft format for the fourth national report with the operational definitions contained in the annex to the present decision.

#### *Annex*

#### **OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS “UNINTENTIONAL TRANSBOUNDARY MOVEMENT” AND “ILLEGAL TRANSBOUNDARY MOVEMENT”<sup>26</sup>**

“*Illegal transboundary movement*” is a transboundary movement of living modified organisms carried out in contravention of the domestic measures to implement the Protocol that have been adopted by the Party concerned.

“*Unintentional transboundary movement*” is a transboundary movement of a living modified organism that has inadvertently crossed the national borders of a Party where the living modified organism was released, and the requirements of Article 17 of the Protocol apply to such transboundary movements only if the living modified organism involved is likely to have significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health, in the affected or potentially affected States.

---

<sup>26</sup> These operational definitions supersede any previous draft versions, including those proposed by the Compliance Committee.

**VIII/17. Transit and contained use of living modified organisms (Article 6)**

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

1. *Welcomes* the progress towards operational objective 1.8 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the Period 2011-2020;<sup>27</sup>

2. *Encourages* Parties and *invites* other Governments to make available to the Biosafety Clearing-House their laws, regulations and guidelines regarding contained use and transit of living modified organisms;

3. *Notes* the limited number of final decisions related to transit and contained use that have been made available to the Biosafety Clearing-House;

4. *Also notes* the lack of clarity regarding the type of information that is to be submitted to the Biosafety Clearing-House when final decisions are taken regarding the importation of living modified organisms destined for contained use;

5. *Requests* the Compliance Committee to assess if information that has been submitted to the Biosafety Clearing-House under contained use is in accordance with Article 6 of the Cartagena Protocol, and make a recommendation in this regard for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its ninth meeting;

6. *Invites* Parties and other Governments, in the context of operational objective 1.8 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020, to submit to the Biosafety Clearing-House practical guidance on specific measures for contained use that effectively limit the contact of living modified organisms with, and their impact on, the external environment;

7. *Encourages* Parties to further develop measures to manage living modified organisms in transit and to make available in the Biosafety Clearing-House information on such measures;

8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To compile the information submitted under paragraph 6 above for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its ninth meeting with a view to identifying areas where activities might be needed to support Parties in their efforts to develop national measures on contained use;

(b) To continue improving in the Biosafety Clearing-House the means to allow easy retrieval of information relating to transit and contained use, including the information submitted under paragraphs 4 and 6 above.

---

<sup>27</sup> See UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.1.

### VIII/18. Public awareness, education and participation (Article 23)

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

*Recalling* decisions BS-IV/17 and BS-V/13 recognizing the need for a cohesive and focused approach to public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms,

*Welcoming* the progress made since the adoption, in decision BS-V/13, of the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms,

*Taking note* of the report on the status of implementation of the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms under the Protocol,<sup>28</sup>

1. *Extends* the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation at all levels concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms until 2020 with revised priority areas/activities as identified by the Parties and contained in the annex to the present decision, with due consideration to specific regional and subregional circumstances, to enable a streamlined strategic focus and foster further commitment to advancing the implementation of the programme of work;

2. *Urges* developed country Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to provide additional support, including financial resources, to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to implement the programme of work;

3. *Urges* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to implement the programme of work and actively share their experiences and lessons learned through the Biosafety Clearing-House, and relevant national and regional clearing-houses;

4. *Invites* Parties to participate in the biosafety theme in the Forum on National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs Forum)<sup>29</sup> in order to promote and facilitate the integration of the programme of work into national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

5. *Requests* the Global Environment Facility to provide eligible Parties with financial resources to facilitate effective implementation of the programme of work;

6. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of funds:

(a) To assist in the implementation of the priority areas and activities of the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms, including public participation and access to information concerning living modified organisms;

(b) To provide links to national websites and national biosafety clearing-houses on the website of the Protocol and the Convention;

(c) To continue and enhance cooperation with relevant organizations, as well as gender initiatives and other international, regional and national initiatives to further facilitate the implementation of the programme of work;

---

<sup>28</sup> UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/15.

<sup>29</sup> Available at: <http://nbsapforum.net/#categories/340>.



7. *Encourages* Parties to continue to enhance capacity for public awareness, education and participation, including access to information, regarding the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms, including for indigenous peoples and local communities, and to integrate training, public awareness, education and participation into national initiatives for communication, education and public awareness, initiatives for the Sustainable Development Goals, initiatives for climate change mitigation and adaptation and other environmental initiatives;

8. *Encourages* regional stakeholders and donors to play a greater role in supporting the integration of the programme of work into national initiatives to implement focal area 5 of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety<sup>30</sup> in order to enhance capacity on public awareness, education and participation and Focal Area 5 of the Strategic Plan for Biosafety with a view to raising the profile of the Protocol through outreach and communication.

---

<sup>30</sup> [Decision BS-VI/3](#) of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, annex.

*Annex*

**PRIORITY ACTIVITIES/AREAS FOR THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ON PUBLIC AWARENESS, EDUCATION AND PARTICIPATION CONCERNING THE SAFE TRANSFER, HANDLING AND USE OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS**

<b>Programme element 1: Capacity-building for the promotion of public awareness, education and participation</b>			
<b>Goal: To strengthen the institutional and technical capacity of Parties to promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms</b>			
<b>Priority Area 1</b>	<b>Sub-activities</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Suggested actors</b>
<b>Advance legal and/or policy frameworks and mechanisms</b>	Adopt, harmonize and implement legal and/or policy frameworks and mechanisms related to Article 23 of the Protocol, in particular the NBFs and incorporating general access to information laws into biosafety procedures (e.g. the Freedom of Information laws)	Within 2 years	-Parties -Relevant organizations -SCBD
	Integrate and promote the programme of work elements into awareness and education components in the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and other national initiatives to implement Focal Area 2 on capacity-building for Article 23 and 5 on outreach of the Strategic Plan for Biosafety as well as Focal Area 5 on public awareness, education and participation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the effective implementation of the Protocol		
	Share and announce the availability of frameworks and mechanisms related to Article 23 in the Central Portal and national and regional Biosafety Clearing-House nodes		
	Integrate gender-perspectives in policies and frameworks related to Article 23		
	Identify a dedicated budget for the programme of work		
	Incorporate the communication plan template developed by the Secretariat and make use of draft communication plans developed in public awareness and participation workshops held by the Secretariat to ensure implementation of awareness/outreach programmes		
	Every quarter, systematically track, evaluate and proactively exchange information on the progress of the indicators in the programme of work in the Biosafety Clearing-House and with the Executive Secretary		

<b>Priority Area 2</b>	<b>Sub-activities</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Suggested actors</b>
<b>Build and maintain joint initiatives</b>	Organize joint awareness and educational activities	Within 2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Parties</li> <li>-Relevant organizations</li> <li>-SCBD</li> <li>-Academia</li> </ul>
	Participate in international, regional and national events related to the Strategic Plan for Biosafety, the Convention on Biodiversity and the Food and Agriculture Organization to integrate the Programme of Work in other initiatives		
	Promote the ratification of the Cartagena Protocol and its Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress through joint regional and subregional cooperation		
<b>Priority Area 3</b>	<b>Sub-activities</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Suggested actors</b>
<b>Advance tools, resources and processes to broaden training activities</b>	Develop and make use of the Secretariat's e-learning modules on access to information, public participation and upcoming public education as well as upcoming training activities	Within 3 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Parties (e.g. focal points, ministries)</li> <li>-Relevant organizations</li> <li>-SCBD</li> <li>-Media</li> </ul>
	Disseminate and make available templates and other resources		
	Facilitate training-of-trainers programmes related to Article 23, with a particular focus on women, indigenous peoples and local communities		
	Make use of relevant tools, guidelines and other related resources in developing training activities and materials		
	Nominate national biosafety education experts to facilitate biosafety education		
	Put in place a mechanisms targeted for women, indigenous peoples and local communities, and customs officials to participate in biosafety education (e.g. participating in workshops and accessing research centres)		
	Develop a media strategy (e.g. facilitating journalist training on biosafety issues)		
	Develop and exchange guidelines and other resources on a regional level related to Article 23		
<b>Programme element 2: Public awareness and education</b>			
<b>Goal: To promote broad public awareness and education of issues concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms</b>			
<b>Priority Area 4</b>	<b>Sub-activities</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Suggested actors</b>
<b>Communicate biosafety and empower a wider audience</b>	Set up an e-mail list serve as well as identify local areas (e.g. libraries and bulletin boards) and traditional methods to disseminate information (e.g. developing visual/graphic representation of biosafety information)	Within 2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Parties (e.g. focal points, local and national</li> </ul>

	Organize awareness workshops, in particular for women and indigenous peoples and local communities		government) -SCBD -Relevant organizations
	Disseminate information to United Nations bodies and other relevant international/regional bodies		
	Facilitate the translation of information materials through partners		
	Integrate communication activities with biodiversity, environment, sustainable development and other related agendas		
	Integrate biosafety issues into youth and gender-related awareness efforts held by other relevant programmes and other initiatives		
	Participate in national awareness-activities related to biodiversity, environment and related international days		
	Make use of the awareness survey template developed by the Secretariat and seek assistance by regional organizations to conduct national surveys online and/or offline in particular also ensuring that questions are targeted to women and indigenous peoples and local communities		
	Invite media to participate in the Biosafety Media Network <sup>31</sup>		
	Develop biosafety messages		
	Enhance the networking and communication among national focal points to the Cartagena Protocol		
	Train and assign scientists and media to communicate biosafety issues		
	Facilitate a high-level dialogue including Ministries and Heads of States and Governments to increase the level of public awareness, education and participation with regards to biosafety issues		
	Nominate experts as communicators and educators		
<b>Priority Area 5</b>	<b>Sub-activities</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Suggested actors</b>
<b>Strengthen biosafety education at all levels</b>	Develop tools and methods for public education on biosafety and promoting new learning methods/technologies	Within 3 years	-Parties (e.g. focal points, Ministries -Academia (e.g. school boards,
	Develop procedures to integrate biosafety, in a harmonized way, into education including developing relations with various stakeholders involved in public education		

<sup>31</sup> The media network is available at [http://bch.cbd.int/onlineconferences/portal\\_art23/media\\_network.shtml](http://bch.cbd.int/onlineconferences/portal_art23/media_network.shtml).

	<p>Join networks with relevant educational focal points and integrate biosafety into biodiversity and other related environmental education at all levels</p> <p>Promote exchange of programmes for scientist and public servants on a national and regional level</p> <p>Integrate work on Article 23 with CEPA and use CEPA toolkit, as appropriate, including materials in particular for youth education</p> <p>Make use of the Secretariat’s educational package, as appropriate, on biosafety for education at all levels (in particular secondary schools), informal education and research institutes</p> <p>Include youth, women and indigenous peoples and local communities in developing biosafety education at all levels</p> <p>Take a certificate by participating in the upcoming module on public education and developing procedures and practices of public education and curricula template, as appropriate, as well as training/education action plan template</p>		<p>committees/ districts, academic institutions, researchers, scientists, principals and teachers, education inspectors, publishers of educational materials, professional organizations of teachers and/or curricula development institutions) -Relevant organizations and associations</p>
<p><b>Programme element 3. Public access to information</b></p>			
<p><b>Goal: To improve public access to information concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms</b></p>			
<p><b>Priority Area 6</b></p>	<p><b>Suggested activities</b></p>	<p><b>Time frame</b></p>	<p><b>Suggested actors</b></p>
<p><b>Improve tools and procedures for access to information</b></p>	<p>Define the public through stakeholder analysis and appropriate actions through situation analysis, including promoting the most inclusive stakeholder participation</p>	<p>Within 4 years</p>	<p>-Parties (e.g. focal points, ministers) -Media -Academia -SCBD -Relevant organizations</p>
	<p>Establish a process to handle requests for information</p>		
	<p>Set up a procedure to actively notify the public of information and means of public access to the Biosafety Clearing-House</p>		
	<p>Facilitate workshops on access to information in particular to ensure the participation of women, indigenous peoples and local communities, and ministries, on discussions related to laws and rights</p>		

	Make use of the summary of tools and checklist on access to information, <sup>32</sup> as appropriate		
	Regularly promoting up-to-date access to information of websites and traditional tools to a wider-audience		
	Promote access to information and best practices/awareness in particular to women and youth		
	Provide case studies in the Biosafety Clearing-House and through other means		
	Take a certificate by participating in the module on access to information and set up procedures for information upon request and active dissemination of information, including make use of the national action plan template and other resources		
	Use relevant tools and guidance materials produced by relevant organizations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Culture Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme, among others		
	Provide training of government officials and the public, including women and indigenous peoples and local communities, on the right to access to information and to incorporate related laws		
<b>Programme element 4. Public participation</b>			
<b>Goal: To promote public participation in decision-making regarding living modified organisms (best practices)</b>			
<b>Priority Area 7</b>	<b>Sub-activities</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Suggested actors</b>
<b>Mobilize the public and ensure gender-equality for a wider target audience to participate in the decision-making process</b>	Define the public through stakeholder analysis and appropriate actions through situation analysis, including promoting the inclusive stakeholder participation, with particular attention to women and indigenous peoples and local communities	Within 4 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Parties (e.g. focal points, local and national government)</li> <li>-Local and national organizations</li> <li>-Local leaders</li> <li>-Academia</li> <li>-Public</li> </ul>
	Use effective tools for public participation targeted in particular to marginalized groups and notify the public of these in a timely manner		
	Use effective mechanisms and procedures for public participation		
	Use local languages in public participation processes		
	Facilitate training on public participation, including for women and indigenous peoples and local communities		

<sup>32</sup> The checklist and the summary of tools are available at [http://bch.cbd.int/onlineconferences/portal\\_art23/pa\\_main.shtml](http://bch.cbd.int/onlineconferences/portal_art23/pa_main.shtml).

	<p>Enhance the incorporation of public inputs into decisions or make public criteria and reasons for limited incorporation of inputs</p>		<p>institutions -Media</p>
	<p>Enhance equal public participation in the decision-making process regarding LMOs, in particular ensuring participation of women and indigenous peoples and local communities</p>		
	<p>Take a certificate by participating in the module on public participation regarding LMOs and set in place tools, procedures and mechanism, including make use of the national action plan template and other resources</p>		
	<p>Use relevant guidance materials on public participation</p>		

**VIII/19. Use of the term “indigenous peoples and local communities”**

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

*Decides to apply, mutatis mutandis, decision XII/12 F of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity on the use of the terminology “indigenous peoples and local communities”.*



## II. ACCOUNT OF PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION

#### A. Background

1. Following the offer of the Government of Mexico, which was welcomed by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in its decision XII/34, the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was held in Cancun, Mexico, from 4 to 17 December 2016, in conjunction with the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

#### B. Attendance

2. All States were invited to participate in the meeting. The following Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety attended: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

3. The following States not party to the Cartagena Protocol were also represented: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, Cook Islands, Haiti, Holy See, Iceland, Israel, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Nepal, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Sudan, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, and United States of America.

4. For all other participants, see annex I to the report of the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/25).

### ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

5. The eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was opened at 3.35 p.m. on 4 December 2016, by Mr. Chun Kyoo Park, Director-General of the Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Korea, on behalf of Mr. Yoon Seong-kyu, Minister of Environment of the Republic of Korea and outgoing President of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

6. At the opening plenary session, in addition to the statement by Mr. Chun Kyoo Park, statements were made by Mr. Rafael Pacchiano Alamán, Minister of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico and President of the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, also serving as President of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena

Protocol on Biosafety, and of the second Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization; Mr. Ibrahim Thiaw, Deputy Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, outgoing Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity; and Ms. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Minister of Environment, Water and Forests of Romania and incoming Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

7. General statements were made by representatives of Saint Kitts and Nevis (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Bosnia and Herzegovina (on behalf of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe), Japan (on behalf of the Asian and Pacific Group), Chad (on behalf of the African Group), Australia (on behalf of a group of non-aligned countries) and the European Union and its 28 member States.

8. Further statements were made by representatives of the International Indigenous Forum for Biodiversity (IIFB), the CBD Alliance, the Network of the Indigenous Peoples-Solomons (NIPS) (also on behalf of the members of the Women's Caucus present at the meeting) and the Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN).

9. At the 2nd plenary session, on 5 December 2016, statements were made by Mr. Carlos Joaquín González, Governor of the state of Quintana Roo; Mr. Rafael Pacchiano Alamán, Minister of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico; Mr. Ibrahim Thiaw, Deputy Executive Director of UNEP; Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity; and Mr. Enrique Peña Nieto, President of Mexico.

10. Statements were also made by representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala, Jordan and Togo. One representative, supported by another, said that Parties should be given the opportunity to express their views after the regional groups, as the statements delivered by representatives of regional groups sometimes failed to capture the issues that individual Parties wished to raise.

11. Additional statements were made by representatives of FAO, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research (IAI) (on behalf of the third Science for Biodiversity Forum), the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON), the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF), the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), the United Nations University (UNU) and the Indigenous Women's Network.

12. A record of the opening statements is contained in the report of the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD/COP/13/25).

## **ITEM 2. ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING**

### **2.1 Adoption of the agenda**

13. At the opening session of the meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety adopted the following agenda, on the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Executive Secretary in consultation with the Bureau (UNEP/CBD/COP/BS/COP-MOP/8/1):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organization of the meeting:
  - 2.1 Adoption of the agenda;
  - 2.2 Election of substitute officers;

- 2.3 Organization of work.
3. Report on the credentials of representatives to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.
4. Report of the Compliance Committee.
5. Report of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.
  - 5.1 *Modus operandi* of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation
  - 5.2 Integration among the Convention and its Protocols
  - 5.3 Use of the term “indigenous peoples and local communities”
6. Capacity-building and the roster of biosafety experts:
  - 6.1. Report on the status of biosafety capacity-building activities and review of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building;
  - 6.2. Report on the use of the roster of biosafety experts.
7. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House.
8. Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources.
9. Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives.
10. Report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Protocol and on budgetary matters.
11. Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16).
12. Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (Article 17).
13. Transit and contained use of living modified organisms (Article 6).
14. Review of implementation and effectiveness of the Protocol:
  - 14.1 Monitoring and reporting (Article 33);
  - 14.2 Third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan.
15. Socio-economic considerations (Article 26).
16. Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.
17. Public awareness, education and participation (Article 23).
18. Other matters.
19. Adoption of the report.
20. Closure of the meeting.

## **2.2 Election of substitute officers**

14. In accordance with Article 29, paragraph 3, of the Protocol, the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention also serves as the Bureau of the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol. Accordingly, Mr. Rafael Pacchiano Alamán, Minister of the Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico who was elected, in accordance with rule 21 of the rules of procedure, as the President of the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention at the opening of the meeting held

on 4 December 2016, would also serve as the President of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.

15. In accordance with rule 21 of the rules of procedure, Mr. Rafael Pacchiano Alamán chaired the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.

16. On the proposal of the Bureau, it was agreed that Mr. Sergei Melnov (Belarus) would serve as Rapporteur for the meeting.

17. Any member of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties who was representing a Party to the Convention that was not a Party to the Protocol had to be substituted, consistent with Article 29, paragraph 3, of the Protocol, by a member to be elected by and from among the Parties to the Protocol. Accordingly, Mr. Norbert Norbert Bärlocher (Switzerland) served in the Bureau as a substitute for Ms. Tia Stevens of Australia.

18. In accordance with rule 21 of the rules of procedure of the Conference of the Parties, the Conference of the Parties elected ten representatives (vice presidents) to serve as members of the Bureau for a term of office commencing upon the closure of its thirteenth meeting and ending at the closure of its fourteenth meeting. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol elected, at its fifth plenary session held on 17 December 2016, Ms. Tone Solhaug of Norway as a substitute for Mr. Basil van Havre, the newly elected Bureau member from Canada.

### **2.3 Organization of work**

19. At the opening session of the meeting, on 13 October 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol approved the organization of work proposed in UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/1/Add.1 and the additional guidance provided in documents UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/1/Add.2 and Add.3. In accordance with established practice, the Conference of the Parties established two working groups to address the substantive items on its agenda and a budget contact group.

20. It was agreed that one of the working groups established by the Conference of the Parties would also serve as working group for the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and that the agenda item on the budget (item 15) would be referred to the budget contact group established by the Conference of the Parties. Accordingly, the meeting approved the two working groups. The Working Group for the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol would consider items 4, 5, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14.1, 14.2, 15, 16 and 17.

### **ITEM 3. REPORT ON THE CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE EIGHTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY**

21. Agenda item 3 was taken up at the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 4 December 2016. In accordance with rule 19 of the rules of procedure, the Bureau was to examine and report on the credentials of delegations. Accordingly, the President informed the meeting that the Bureau had designated Ms. Maria Luisa del Rio Mispireta (Peru), a Vice-President of the Bureau, to examine and report on credentials.

22. At the third plenary session of the meeting, on 9 December 2016, Ms. del Rio Mispireta informed the Conference of the Parties that 151 Parties were registered as attending the meeting. The Bureau had examined the credentials of the representatives of 133 Parties. The credentials of 125 delegations were in full compliance with the provisions of rule 18 of the rules of procedure. Those of 8 delegations did not fully comply with the provisions of rule 18, and a further 18 delegations had not presented their credentials to date.

23. At the fifth plenary session of the meeting, on 17 December 2016, Ms. del Rio Mispireta informed the Conference of the Parties that 152 Parties were registered as attending the meeting. The Bureau had examined the credentials of the representatives of 138 Parties. The credentials of 132 delegations were in full compliance with the provisions of rule 18 of the rules of procedure. Those of 6 delegations did not fully comply with the provisions of rule 18, and a further 14 delegations had not presented their credentials to date. Some heads of delegations had signed a declaration to the effect that they would submit their credentials, in the proper form and in their original version, to the Executive Secretary within 30 days of the closure of the meeting, and no later than 17 January 2017. In keeping with past practice, the Conference of the Parties agreed to the Bureau's proposal that those delegations that had yet to submit their credentials, or whose credentials did not fully comply with the provisions of rule 18, should be allowed to participate fully in the meeting on the provisional basis.

24. The President urged all delegations that had been requested to do so to present their credentials to the Executive Secretary no later than 17 January 2017.

25. By the date of issuance of the present report, credentials that were fully compliant with rule 18 of the rules of procedure had been received from the representatives of the following 141 Parties to the Protocol: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

#### **ITEM 4. REPORT OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE**

26. Agenda item 4 was taken up at the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 4 December 2016. In considering the item, the meeting had before it the report of the Compliance Committee (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/2).

27. The Chair of the Compliance Committee, Ms. Jimena Nieto Carrasco (Colombia), introduced the report of the committee (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/2) which contained a summary of the work of the committee and its actions during the intersessional period. She said that one of the key areas the committee had been working on was compliance with the monitoring and reporting obligation of the Parties. At the time of the committee's thirteenth meeting, from 24 to 26 February 2016, third national reports were due from 56 Parties, including 12 Parties that had accessed funds from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for the preparation of those reports. As of the present meeting third national reports were due from 38 Parties, including four that had accessed GEF funds. More information is available in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/14/Rev.1.

28. The Committee had been considering the issue of the submission of national reports over a number of reporting cycles and had recommended that Parties should be encouraged to seek assistance from the Secretariat or the Compliance Committee if they were experiencing difficulties preparing their national reports. As of the thirteenth meeting of the Committee, three Parties had not submitted either an

interim report, or a first, second or third national report. The Chair of the Compliance Committee had sent further letters to the foreign ministries of the countries concerned, with a copy to their national focal points, seeking an explanation and reminding them that the Committee would recommend that the Conference of the Parties serving as the eighth meeting of the Cartagena Protocol issue a caution to them, as provided for in section VI, paragraph 2(b), of the procedures and mechanisms on compliance under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Since then, two of the Parties submitted their third national reports, leaving only one Party with a report outstanding. Consequently, she recommended that the caution would not be issued to those two Parties.

29. At the 2nd session of the meeting, on 5 December 2016, the President drew attention to the need to elect ten new members to the Compliance Committee (two from each of the five regions) in order to replace those members whose term was due to expire at the end of 2016.

30. The President invited each region to nominate two people to serve on the Committee from the beginning of 2017. He reminded the meeting that outgoing members who had served two terms of office were not eligible for re-election.

31. Working Group I took up agenda item CP-4 at its 2nd meeting, on 6 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the report and recommendations of the Compliance Committee (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/2), which had been presented by the Chair of that Committee at the second plenary session, on 5 December 2016. The Working Group was requested to consider the Committee's recommendations on compliance, which were contained in paragraphs 1 to 6 of part A of the annex to document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/2.

32. Statements were made by representatives of: European Union and its 28 member States, Mexico, Republic of Korea and Switzerland.

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

34. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a draft decision for consideration by Working Group I, taking into account the views and comments made orally and further submitted in writing.

35. At its 10th meeting, on 12 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

36. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil and Colombia.

37. Working Group I agreed to defer its consideration of the draft decision, pending decisions on related matters that might have a bearing on the discussion.

38. At its 15th meeting, on 15 December 2016, Working Group I resumed its consideration of the draft decision submitted by the Chair.

39. Statements were made by representatives of: Brazil, China, Colombia, European Union and its 28 member States, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Pakistan, Switzerland and United Republic of Tanzania.

40. At its 18th meeting, on 16 December 2016, the Working Group gave further consideration to the draft decision.

41. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil and Colombia.

42. The Working Group approved the draft decision for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.19.

43. At the 3rd plenary session, on 9 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol received, from some of the regional groups, nominations for membership in the Compliance Committee to replace, as appropriate, those whose term expired by the end of 2016.

44. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol received, from the remaining regional groups, nominations for membership in the Compliance Committee.

45. The meeting then elected by acclamation the following nominees to serve as members of the Compliance Committee from the beginning of 2017: (a) Africa: Mr. Rigobert Ntep (Cameroon) and Mr. Dorington O. Ogoyi (Kenya); (b) Asia and the Pacific: Mr. Mohamed Ali Zarie Zare (Islamic Republic of Iran) and Mr. Letchumanan Ramatha (Malaysia); (c) Central and Eastern Europe: Ms. Shirin Karryyeva (Turkmenistan) and Ms. Dubravka Stepic (Croatia); (d) Latin America and the Caribbean: Ms. Jimena Nieto (Colombia) and Mr. Malachy Dottin (Grenada); (e) Western European and Others Group (WEOG): Mr. Andreas Heissenberger (Austria) and Mr. Casper Linnestad (Norway).

46. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.19 as decision CP-VIII/1.

## **ITEM 5. REPORT OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION**

47. Agenda item 5 was taken up by Working Group I at its 6th meeting, on 7 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the report of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation ([UNEP/CBD/COP/13/6](#)).

### **5.1 Modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation**

48. Working Group I took up agenda item 5.1 at its 6th meeting, on 7 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it recommendation 1/9 contained in the report of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/14).

49. Statements were made by representatives of: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the European Union and its 28 member States, India, Morocco, Norway, Senegal (on behalf of the African Group) and Switzerland.

50. Further statements were made by representatives of IIFB and the Indigenous Women Biodiversity Network (IWBN).

51. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views and comments made verbally and further submitted in writing.

52. At its 9th meeting, on 9 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair and approved it for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.2.

53. At the 3rd plenary session, on 9 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.2 as decision CP-VIII/9.

### **5.2 Integration among the Convention and its Protocols**

54. Working Group I took up agenda item 5.2 at the 6th meeting, on 7 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it recommendation 1/11 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and a draft decision on the matter in document UNEP/CBD/COP/13/2/Rev.1.

55. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, India and Mexico, following which the Chair said that she would prepare a revised draft decision for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views expressed orally and comments received in writing.

56. At its 10th meeting, on 12 December 2016, Working Group I considered the revised draft decision submitted by the Chair and approved it for transmission to the plenary.

57. At the 4th plenary session, on 13 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.3 as decision CP-VIII/10.

### **5.3 Use of the term “indigenous peoples and local communities”**

58. Working Group I took up agenda item 5.3 at its 9th meeting, on 9 December 2016, and agreed that the Chair should prepare a draft decision on the basis of recommendation 1/12 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, which stated that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety should consider the possibility of applying, *mutatis mutandis*, decision XII/12 F of the Conference of the Parties on the use of the terminology “indigenous peoples and local communities”.

59. At its 10th meeting, on 12 December 2016, the Working Group considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

60. The draft decision was approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.9.

61. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.9 as decision CP-VIII/19.

## **ITEM 6 CAPACITY-BUILDING AND THE ROSTER OF BIOSAFETY EXPERTS**

### **6.1 Report on the status of biosafety capacity-building activities and review of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-building**

62. Working Group I took up agenda item 6.1 at its 4th meeting, on 7 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the summary report on the status of capacity-building under the Protocol, including an overview of activities undertaken by Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and the Secretariat relating to the implementation of the Framework and Action Plan on Capacity-building and suggestions for improving its implementation and effectiveness (UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/8/3).

63. Statements were made by representatives of: Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, European Union and its 28 member States, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Philippines, Republic of Korea and Uruguay.

64. A statement was also made by a representative of Argentina.

65. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views and comments made verbally and further submitted in writing.

66. At its 12th meeting, on 13 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

67. Statements were made by representatives of: Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, Nepal, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania.

68. The Chair proposed that the draft decision should be considered further after conclusion of the joint discussions on the structural components of the annex by the representatives of Parties to the Nagoya Protocol and Parties to the Cartagena Protocol with the contact group on capacity-building already established in the context of discussions under agenda item 12 of the Conference of the Parties.



69. At its 13th meeting, on 14 December 2016, Working Group I heard a report by the co-chairs of the contact group.
70. At its 18th meeting, on 16 December 2016, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair.
71. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil, the European Union and its 28 member States, Mexico, Norway and Switzerland.
72. It was agreed that the structure of the annex would be aligned with that of the annex in draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/13/L.3.
73. Following the exchange of views, the revised draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.18.
74. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.18 as decision CP-VIII/3.

## **6.2 Report on the use of the roster of biosafety experts**

75. Working Group I took up agenda item 6.2 at its 5th meeting, on 7 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the report on the status and operations of the roster of experts (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/3/Add.1).
76. Statements were made by representatives of Bangladesh, Brazil, Cambodia, Colombia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, European Union and its 28 member States, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Paraguay and Uganda.
77. A further statement was made by a representative of Argentina.
78. A statement was made by a representative of IWBAN.
79. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views and comments made verbally and further submitted in writing.
80. At its 12th meeting, on 13 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.
81. Statements were made by representatives of: El Salvador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mexico, New Zealand, Paraguay and Uganda.
82. Working Group I resumed consideration of the draft decision at its 13th meeting, on 14 December 2016.
83. A statement was made by a representative of New Zealand.
84. Working Group I approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.5.
85. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.5 as decision CP-VIII/4.

## **ITEM 7 OPERATION AND ACTIVITIES OF THE BIOSAFETY CLEARING-HOUSE**

86. Working Group I took up agenda item 7 at its 5th meeting, on 7 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the operations and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/4) and an information document

summarizing the outcomes of the tenth meeting of the Informal Advisory Committee on the Biosafety Clearing-House (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/1).

87. At the 6th meeting of Working Group I, on 7 December 2016, statements were made by representatives of: Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, European Union and its 28 member States, Guatemala, India, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Paraguay, Philippines, Republic of Korea and Swaziland (on behalf of the African Group).

88. A further statement was made by a representative of Argentina.

89. A statement was made by a representative of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

90. Statements were made by representatives of IIFB, IWBN and Public Research and Regulation Initiative (PRRI).

91. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views and comments made verbally and further submitted in writing.

92. At its 14th meeting, on 14 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

93. Statements were made by representatives of: Bangladesh, Costa Rica, European Union and its 28 member States, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Paraguay, Republic of Korea and United Republic of Tanzania.

94. Working Group I approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.11.

95. At the 5th plenary session of its meeting, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.11 as decision CP-VIII/2.

## **ITEM 8 MATTERS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM AND RESOURCES**

96. At its 3rd meeting, on 6 December 2016, Working Group I took up agenda item 8, in conjunction with agenda item 11 of the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and heard presentations by a representative of GEF and members of the expert team established to prepare a report on a full assessment of the funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for GEF-7. The presentations are summarized under agenda item 11 in the report of the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

97. Resuming consideration of the item at its 4th meeting, on 7 December 2016, Working Group I had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on matters related to the financial mechanism (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/5); the report of the GEF Council, including guidance with respect to biosafety (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.1); a note by the Executive Secretary transmitting the report of the expert team on a full assessment of the funds needed for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols for the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility, including an executive summary (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.2); and the full report (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/INF/16); a note by the Executive Secretary on the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.3); and submissions received from other biodiversity-related conventions pursuant to paragraph 2 of decision XII/30 (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/12/Add.4).

98. Statements concerning the financial mechanism of the Protocol were made by representatives of: Antigua and Barbuda, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Colombia, Cuba, European Union and its 28 member States, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Malawi,

Maldives, Mexico, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and Zambia.

99. Statements were also made by representatives of: Argentina and Chile.

100. At its 15th meeting, on 15 December 2016, the Working Group considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

101. The draft decision was approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.12.

102. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.12 as decision CP-VIII/5.

#### **ITEM 9. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS, CONVENTIONS AND INITIATIVES**

103. Working Group I took up agenda item 9 at its 5th meeting, on 8 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/6).

104. Statements were made by representatives of: Brazil, Colombia, European Union and its 28 member States, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uganda (on behalf of the African Group).

105. A statement was made by a representative of FAO (also on behalf of the secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention).

106. Additional statements were made by representative of the Global Industry Coalition, IIFB (also on behalf of IWBN) and the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture.

107. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views and comments made verbally and further submitted in writing.

108. At its 13th meeting, on 13 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

109. Statements were made by representatives of: Brazil, Colombia, European Union and its 28 member States, Gambia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Paraguay, South Africa and Uruguay.

110. Following the exchange of views, the draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.4.

111. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.4 as decision CP-VIII/6.

#### **ITEM 10 REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROTOCOL AND ON BUDGETARY MATTERS**

112. Agenda item 10 was taken up at jointly by the Conference of the Parties and each of the Protocols at the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 4 December 2016. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties had before it the report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Protocol (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/7); the report on the functional review of the Secretariat (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/7/Add.2); the proposed budget for the programme of work of the

Convention on Biological Diversity, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-Sharing for the period 2017-2020 (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/16); and a note by the Executive Secretary on the programme and subprogramme activities and resources required (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/16/Add.1). It also had before it, as an information document, the report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Convention and the budget for the Trust Funds of the Convention, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and the Nagoya protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/13).

113. The Executive Secretary said that, as a result of the functional review of the Secretariat, and the integrated approach to its work, the Secretariat was presenting, for the first time, an integrated budget covering the three instruments of the Convention on Biological Diversity: the Convention, the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya Protocol. Although the budget was integrated, the decisions on the relevant components of the budget for each instrument would be adopted by the Parties to the individual instruments. The functional review of the Secretariat had been completed in 2016 and had led to a new hybrid structure of the Secretariat, put in place in April 2016, the aim of which was to improve efficiency through cross-sectoral coordination and integration of Secretariat activities. The new organizational design would break down silos within the Secretariat, optimize the use of human resources, find innovative ways for staff to work across subjects and ensure managerial responsibility for cross-cutting teams. With the new structure, the Secretariat sought to fill certain gaps by revising the job descriptions of staff members.

114. The documents reported on the status of income of the eight trust funds of the Convention and its Protocols from 2015 to 2016, the status of staffing of the Secretariat, the steps taken during the biennium to enhance the efficiency and performance of the Secretariat. They also gave the indicators of achievement and performance for the programme budgets.

115. The documents also reported on administrative arrangements, including the delegation of authority from the Executive Director of UNEP to the Executive Secretary. Other issues reported on included the contribution of the host country to the Secretariat, the change in the modality for the payment of expenses related to office space, the efforts of the Secretariat to provide Parties with improved conference servicing, the efforts the Secretariat to improve the impact of capacity-building and the implications of the change of the United Nations to the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) and the new Enterprise Resource Planning tool (UMOJA).

116. The proposed budget of the Convention and the two Protocols for the period 2017-2018 (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/23) presented two scenarios. One scenario implied a 5 per cent nominal increase in the budget over the present biennium, with a request for additional staff to work on the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing, the Gender Plan of Action, marine biodiversity, communication, and risk assessment. That meant a total of four new Professional posts and one General Service post, and the upgrading of several current posts in the Secretariat. The second scenario called for zero nominal increase in the 2015-2016 budget and included the removal of the proposed posts for marine biodiversity and communication. Given that those posts were considered essential for the work of the Secretariat, they would be included in the voluntary budget if the second scenario was chosen. That scenario also implied that the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice would meet only once during the biennium and that the length of the meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Inter-sessional Working Group on Article 8j and Related Provision of the Convention on Biological Diversity would be reduced and would be held back-to-back-to-back with the twenty-first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. The second budget scenario also implied the removal of funding for participants' travel from the core budget.

117. A representative of the European Union and its 28 member States welcomed the documents submitted by the Secretariat on its work programme and budget and agreed with the simultaneous discussion of those issues under the Convention and its Protocols. The European Union looked forward to

achieving a streamlined programme of work for the Secretariat that concentrated on activities that facilitated work by the Parties to achieve the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and implement the Strategic Plan. That programme, however, had to be based on a budget that was affordable for all, an issue that had become more important with the introduction of the new accounting system across the United Nations. Arrears in contributions now directly affected resources, and the European Union was concerned by the fact that many countries had not paid their assessed contributions in full. The budget decisions had to emphasize prompt payment.

118. The European Union also supported the integrated approach taken by the Secretariat, which would remove the incentive to work in silos. That approach, however, required that contributions be shared fairly among countries that were Parties to all the instruments and those that were not. The functional review should be addressed in the decisions on the budget and not as a separate matter. He underscored the importance of adopting realistic budgets for the Convention and its Protocols, consistent with the agreed strategic priorities, functions and the programme of work, for effective implementation.

119. The Conference of the Parties agreed that, in accordance with established practice, an open-ended contact group on the budget should be established and proposed that Mr. Spencer Thomas (Grenada) should chair the group.

120. At the 3rd plenary session, on 9 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties heard an interim progress report by the chair of the open-ended contact group on the budget.

121. At the 4th plenary session, on 13 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties heard an interim progress report by the chair of the open-ended contact group on the budget.

122. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered a draft decision submitted by the chair of the open-ended contact group on the budget.

123. Draft decision UNEP/CBD/COP/13/L.30 was adopted as decision XIII/32.

124. At the same session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol was informed that the open-ended contact group had concluded its negotiations. The group had prepared an integrated budget for the Convention and its two Protocols.

125. A draft decision on the budget, based on the outcome of the negotiations and contained in document UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.15, was introduced by the President. The Conference of the Parties adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.15 as decision CP-VIII/7.

#### **ITEM 11. RISK ASSESSMENT AND RISK MANAGEMENT (ARTICLES 15 AND 16)**

126. Working Group I took up agenda item 11 at its 8th meeting, on 8 December 2016.

127. Mr. Helmut Gaugitsch, Chair of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on Risk Assessment and Risk Management, outlined the Group's work, including in collaboration with the Open-ended Online Expert Forum on Risk Assessment and Risk Management, to revise and improve the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms, as described in the AHTEG reports contained in documents UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/3 and INF/12, and in the report of the Online Forum contained in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/2.

128. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it, in addition to those three information documents, a note by the Executive Secretary on risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16) (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/8); guidance on risk assessment of living modified organisms (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/8/Add.1); an outline of guidance on risk assessment of living modified fish (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/8/Add.2); an outline of guidance on risk assessment of living modified organisms developed through synthetic biology (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/8/Add.3); and a

detailed account of actions taken on individual suggestions from testing of the guidance (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/4).

129. Statements were made by representatives of: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union and its 28 member States, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Thailand, Togo, Uganda and Uruguay.

130. Statements were also made by representatives of: Argentina and Canada.

131. An additional statement was made by a representative of FAO (also on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention).

132. Further statements were made by representatives of La Via Campesina, PRRI, the South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme and the Third World Network (also on behalf of ECOROPA).

133. Following the exchange of views, the Chair established a contact group, co-chaired by Mr. Gaugitsch (Austria) and Ms. Wadsanayi Mandivenyi (South Africa), to continue discussion of the unresolved issues.

134. At its 10th meeting, on 12 December 2016, Working Group I heard a report by the co-chairs of the contact group.

135. At its 15th meeting, on 15 December, Working Group I heard a further report by the co-chairs of the contact group.

136. At its 17th meeting, on 16 December 2016, the Working Group heard a report by the co-chairs of the contact group and considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

137. Statements were made by representatives of: Brazil, Costa Rica, European Union and its 28 member States, Gambia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Switzerland and Uganda.

138. The Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.14.

139. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.14, as orally amended, as decision CP-VIII/12.

## **ITEM 12. UNINTENTIONAL TRANSBOUNDARY MOVEMENTS AND EMERGENCY MEASURES (ARTICLE 17)**

140. Working Group I took up agenda item 12 at its 8th meeting, on 8 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on unintentional transboundary movements, emergency measures and detection and identification of living modified organisms (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/9/Rev.1); the report of the Workshop of the Network of Laboratories for the Detection and Identification of Living Modified Organisms (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/5); a manual on the detection and identification of living modified organisms (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/6); and the reports of the capacity-building workshops undertaken during the intersessional period (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/7); as well as suggested clarifications on what constituted unintentional transboundary movements in contrast with illegal transboundary movements (UNEP/CBD/BS/CC/13/5).

141. Statements were made by representatives of: Guatemala, Malaysia, Mexico and Thailand.

142. Working Group I resumed consideration of the item at its 9th meeting, on 9 December 2016.

143. Statements were made by representatives of: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, European Union and its 28 member States, Honduras, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kenya, Paraguay, Peru, South Africa, Uganda and Uruguay.

144. Further statements were made by representatives of: Argentina and Canada.

145. Additional statements were made by representatives of: IIFB (also on behalf of IWBNI), PRRI and Third World Network (also on behalf of the Federation of German Scientists, ECOROPA and Econexus).

146. Following the exchange of views, the Working Group agreed to establish a group of Friends of the Chair, facilitated by Ms. Jimena Nieto Carrasco (Colombia), to continue discussion on the unresolved issues.

147. At its 14th meeting, on 14 December 2016, Working Group I heard a report from the facilitator of the group of Friends of the Chair.

148. At its 16th meeting, on 16 December 2016, Working Group I heard a further report from the facilitator, who said that the group of the Friends of the Chair had come to an agreement on operational definitions of the terms “unintentional transboundary movement” and “illegal transboundary movement”. She thanked the group for its spirit of compromise and requested that the Working Group respect their hard work and not reopen the discussion on the definitions.

149. Working Group I considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair.

150. Statements were made by the representatives of: Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, the European Union and its 28 member States, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Mexico, Mauritania, Moldova, Morocco, Paraguay and the United Republic of Tanzania.

151. Several Parties expressed concern at the publication of guidance and manuals while they were still under discussion and before their adoption by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, when that was required. Interventions were made requesting the Secretariat to refrain from issuing hard copies of such guidance and such manuals before their adoption and one Party requested that the Secretariat clarify the procedures that needed to be followed for the publication of that kind of material.

152. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.16.

153. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.16 as decision CP-VIII/16.

### **ITEM 13. TRANSIT AND CONTAINED USE OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS (ARTICLE 6)**

154. Working Group I took up agenda item 13 at its 9th meeting, on 9 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on transit and contained use of living modified organisms (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/10).

155. Statements were made by representatives of: Brazil, European Union and its 28 member States, India, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, New Zealand and Republic of Korea.

156. A statement was also made by a representative of Argentina.

157. Following the discussion, the Chair said that she would prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views and comments made verbally and further submitted in writing.

158. At its 16th meeting, on 16 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

159. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil, Colombia, European Union and its 28 member States, Gambia, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), New Zealand, Switzerland and United Republic of Tanzania.

160. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.17.

161. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.17 as decision CP-VIII/17.

## **ITEM 14. REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROTOCOL**

### **14.1 Monitoring and reporting (Article 33)**

162. Working Group I took up agenda item 14.1 at its 2nd meeting, on 6 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on monitoring and reporting (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/11); an analysis of information contained in the third national reports (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/11/Add.1).

163. A representative of the Secretariat recalled that, in its decision BS-VII/14 on monitoring and reporting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had adopted a revised reporting format to be used by Parties in preparing their third national reports, and had encouraged Parties to respond to all the questions to facilitate the third assessment and review of the Cartagena Protocol. In its decision BS-VII/5 on the financial mechanism and resources, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had recommended that the Conference of the Parties should invite the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to fund eligible Parties to prepare their third national reports on implementation of the Protocol. GEF had subsequently made those funds available. Since the issuance of document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/11, eight additional reports had been received, from Bahrain, Barbados, Guinea, Luxembourg, Mozambique, Oman, Pakistan and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

164. Statements were made by representatives of: Colombia, Ecuador, European Union and its 28 member States, Mexico, New Zealand, Philippines and South Africa (on behalf of the African Group).

165. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views and comments made verbally and further submitted in writing.

166. At its 11th meeting, on 12 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

167. A statement was made by a representative of the European Union and its 28 member States.

168. Working Group I approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.6.

169. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.6, as orally amended, as decision CP-VIII/14.



## 14.2 Third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan

170. Working Group I took up agenda item 14.2 at its 2nd meeting, on 6 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and the mid-term review of the Strategic Plan (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12), which contained a recommendation for a draft decision; a comparative analysis of data from the third reporting cycle in relation to the baseline data on the status of implementation (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.1); an update of the comparative analysis of data from the third reporting cycle in relation to the baseline data on the status of implementation (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/8); and recommendation 1/3 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (see UNEP/CBD/COP/13/6).

171. A representative of the Secretariat recalled that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had decided to reconsider the need to establish a subsidiary body at its eighth meeting and that document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/12/Add.2 addressed that issue by providing an update on the review of the operations and experience gained from the work of ad hoc technical expert groups established under the Cartagena Protocol and which contained suggested elements for a draft decision.

172. Statements were made by representatives of: Bangladesh, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, European Union and its 28 member States, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Peru, South Africa (on behalf of the African Group), Uganda and Yemen.

173. A statement was made by a representative of Argentina.

174. Additional statements were made by representatives of: PRRI and the International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA).

175. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare two draft decisions, one on subsidiary bodies (Article 30) and another on the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan, for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views and comments made verbally and further submitted in writing.

### *Subsidiary bodies*

176. At its 10th meeting, on 12 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision on subsidiary bodies (Article 30), submitted by the Chair.

177. A statement was made by a representative of United Republic of Tanzania.

178. Working Group I approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.7.

179. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.7 as decision CP-VIII/8.

### *Third assessment and review of effectiveness of the Protocol and the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan*

180. At its 14th meeting, on 14 December 2016, Working Group I took up a draft decision on the third assessment and review of effectiveness of the Protocol and the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan, submitted by the Chair.

181. Statements were made by representatives of: Brazil, China, Costa Rica, European Union and its 28 member States, Paraguay, Switzerland and United Republic of Tanzania.

182. At its 18th meeting, on 16 December 2016, the Working Group resumed consideration of the draft decision on the third assessment and review of effectiveness of the Protocol and the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan.

183. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil and Colombia.

184. The Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.20.

185. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.20 as decision CP-VIII/15.

#### **ITEM 15. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (ARTICLE 26)**

186. Working Group I took up agenda item 15 at its seventh meeting, on 8 December 2016. In considering the item, the Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on socio-economic considerations (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/13).

187. Statements were made by representatives of: Bangladesh, Cuba, European Union and its 28 member States, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Peru, Philippines, South Africa (on behalf of the African Group), Uganda and Uruguay.

188. Working Group I continued its discussion of the agenda item at its 8th meeting, on 8 December 2016.

189. Statements were made by representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Mauritania, Namibia and Togo.

190. A statement was also made by a representative of Argentina.

191. Additional statements were made by representatives of IIFB, ISAAA, La Via Campesina, PRRI and the Third World Network (also on behalf of ECOROPA).

192. At its 14th meeting, on 14 December 2016, Working Group I took up a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

193. A statement was made by a representative of Philippines.

194. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/2/L.10.

195. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.10 as decision CP-VIII/13.

#### **ITEM 16. NAGOYA-KUALA LUMPUR SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS**

196. Working Group I took up agenda item 16 at its 8th meeting, on 8 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/14).

197. Statements were made by representatives of: Cambodia, Colombia, European Union and its 28 member States, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Senegal, Togo and Uganda.

198. A statement was also made by a representative of Argentina.

199. A further statement was made by a representative of IIFB (also on behalf of IWBN).

200. Following the discussion, the Chair said that she would prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views expressed.

201. At its 10th meeting, on 12 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

202. Statements were made by representatives of: Colombia, Costa Rica, European Union and its 28 member States, Norway and Togo.

203. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.8.

204. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.8 as decision CP-VIII/11.

#### **ITEM 17. PUBLIC AWARENESS, EDUCATION AND PARTICIPATION (ARTICLE 23)**

205. Working Group I took up agenda item CP-17 at its 5th meeting, on 7 December 2016. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on public awareness, education and participation (Article 23) (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/15); the reports of the two joint Aarhus Convention/Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety round tables on public awareness, access to information and public participation regarding living modified organisms and genetically modified organisms (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/9); summaries and recommendations of online discussions on public participation and access to information on living modified organisms (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/10); and reports of capacity-building workshops on public awareness, education and participation concerning living modified organisms (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/INF/11).

206. Ms. Birgit Winkel, rapporteur of the Joint Aarhus Convention/Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety round tables on public awareness, access to information and public participation regarding living modified organisms and genetically modified organisms, delivered a statement on behalf of Ms. Ella Behlyarova, Secretary of the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

207. Statements were made by representatives of: Brazil, Cambodia, European Union and its 28 member States, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Mexico, Namibia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, South Africa (on behalf of the African Group), Thailand and Uganda.

208. A further statement was made by a representative of Argentina.

209. Statements were also made by representatives of: the European Network for Ecological Reflection and Action (ECOROPA), IIFB, ISAAA and PRRI.

210. Following the discussion, the Chair said that she would prepare a text for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views and comments made verbally and further submitted in writing.

211. At its 15th meeting, on 15 December 2016, Working Group I considered a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

212. Statements were made by the representatives: of Brazil, Bolivia (the Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of Congo, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, Guatemala, India, Mexico, New Zealand, Paraguay, South Africa, Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

213. Following the exchange of views, the draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.13.

214. At the 5th plenary session, on 17 December 2016, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted draft decision UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.13 as decision CP-VIII/18.

**ITEM 18. OTHER MATTERS**

215. No other matters were discussed.

**ITEM 19. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

216. The present report was adopted at the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 18 December 2016, on the basis of the draft report presented by the Rapporteur (UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.1) and the report of Working Group I (UNEP/CBD/CP/COP-MOP/8/L.1/Add.1).

**ITEM 20. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

217. The President declared the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol closed at 5 a.m. on 18 December 2016.

---