UN environment programme

CBD

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/CP/MOP/10/5
12 September 2022

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
Tenth meeting – Part II
Montreal, Canada, 7-19 December 2022
Agenda item 8

MONITORING AND REPORTING (ARTICLE 33)

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Article 33 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety requires Parties to monitor the implementation of their obligations under the Protocol and to report on measures taken to implement the Protocol.

2. In decision BS-I/9, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol requested Parties to submit their reports every four years, twelve months prior to the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at which the reports would be considered, with an interim national report due two years after the entry into force of the Protocol.

3. To date, Parties to the Protocol have been requested to submit national reports as follows:

(a) An interim national report in 2005 (decision BS-I/9);

(b) A first national report in 2007 (decision BS-III/14);

(c) A second national report in 2011 (decision BS-V/14);

(d) A third national report in 2015 (decision BS-VII/14);

(e) A fourth national report in 2019 (decision CP-9/5).

4. This document provides, in section II, an update on the status of submission of fourth national reports. Section III of the document describes the preparation of the format for the fifth national report. Section IV contains elements for a draft decision. The proposed format for the fifth national report is contained in the annex to the document.

II. SUBMISSION OF FOURTH NATIONAL REPORTS

A. Number of reports received

5. In its decision CP-9/5, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted the reporting format for the fourth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. It requested Parties to submit to the Secretariat their fourth national report in an official language of the United Nations, 12 months prior to the tenth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, preferably online through the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH), or offline using the appropriate form, duly signed by the national focal point for the Cartagena Protocol.

6. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol encouraged Parties to respond to all questions in the reporting format and stressed the importance of the timely submission of the fourth national reports in order to facilitate the fourth assessment and review of the Cartagena Protocol and the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020 ("Strategic Plan for the Protocol").

7. Through notification 2019-019, dated 13 February 2019, the Executive Secretary invited Parties to submit their fourth national report by 1 October 2019. Notification 2019-055, dated 25 June 2019, reminded Parties to submit their fourth national report by 1 October 2019 and announced the availability of the online reporting format in a preview (or beta) version of the new BCH.[1] Information in the form of frequently asked questions (FAQ) and step-by-step instructions was made available in the six United Nations languages to assist Parties to publish their reports on the new BCH.[2]

8. As of 12 September 2022, of the 171 Parties that had an obligation to submit their fourth national report, a total of 135 Parties had submitted their national report through the Biosafety Clearing-House. This represents a submission rate of 79 per cent. This compares with submission rates of 65, 95 and 92 per cent for the first, second and third national reports respectively.

9. The regional breakdown of the number of Parties that had submitted their fourth national report is shown in the table below.

Regional breakdown of fourth national reports received by 12 September 2022

Regional groups *(Total number of Parties in each region)*	Number of Parties that submitted a complete fourth national report through the BCH	Regional submission rate
Africa (*49*)	41	84%
Asia and the Pacific (*48*)	30	63%
Central and Eastern Europe (*22*)	20	91%
Latin America and Caribbean (*31*)	23	74%
Western European and Others (*21*)	21	100%

10. A further five Parties submitted their fourth national report offline and the Secretariat is in contact with these Parties to facilitate their publication through the Biosafety Clearing-House, as is required under Article 20 of the Protocol.[3]

B. Access to funding from the Global Environment Facility

11. In its decision CP-9/4, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol recommended that the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to support for the implementation of the Protocol, invite the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to continue making funds available to support eligible Parties in fulfilling their reporting obligations under the Protocol, including the submission of fourth national reports. Consequently, the invitation to the GEF was included in decision 14/23 of the Conference of the Parties.

12. Through notification 2019-042, dated 1 May 2019, the Executive Secretary informed Parties that the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) was preparing a project for funding by GEF to assist eligible Parties in the preparation of their fourth national report and encouraged eligible Parties to submit a

[1] Further reminders were issued in notification 2019-074, dated 3 September 2019, and notification 2019-098, dated 4 November 2019.

[2] See for example, "Fourth National Report: Questions and Answers", https://bch.cbd.int/en/kb/tags/bch-announcement/Fourth-National-Report-Questions-and-Answers/619c55794f1f30000140ef1a.

[3] It may be noted that it is not possible to consider offline reports in the analysis document for the assessment and review.

letter of commitment to UNEP expressing their support for the project, signed by their GEF operational focal point.

13. Two medium-sized projects were submitted to the Global Environment Facility and were approved for implementation in September and October 2020 respectively. Ninety-seven Parties to the Cartagena Protocol were included in the projects.

14. As of 30 June 2022, UNEP had disbursed full funding for the preparation of the fourth national report to 38 Parties, and partial funding to 28 Parties. Funding disbursement is in process or is pending the finalization of small-scale funding agreements for a further 28 Parties while three Parties decided to forego the funds from the project as they had already submitted the fourth national report or had difficulties absorbing the resources. A total of 17 Parties included in the projects have not yet submitted their fourth national report.

C. Compliance Committee review of compliance by Parties with the obligation to report

15. The Compliance Committee, at its seventeenth meeting, held from 17 to 19 April 2020, reviewed compliance by Parties with the obligation to submit national reports.[4]

16. At the time of the Committee's meeting, 101 Parties had published their fourth national reports in the BCH. The Committee expressed its disappointment over the low number of fourth national reports that had been submitted and noted that the submission rate was lower than at a similar point in time following the deadlines for submission of the second and third national reports. The Committee considered a number of possible factors that might have contributed to the low number of fourth national reports submitted, including delayed access to financial support, lack of dedicated human resources at the national level, as well as a lack of priority for and awareness of biosafety issues. The Committee noted that improvements made to the format for the fourth national reports might have facilitated the preparation of the national reports, but it recognized that that had not led to the submission of a higher number of fourth national reports by the reporting deadline.

17. With regard to access to funding to support the preparation of national reports, the Committee stressed the importance of the timely availability of sufficient resources. In that context, the Committee considered the delay that eligible Parties faced in accessing GEF funding for the preparation of their fourth national report. The Committee noted that the approach to collect as many letters of commitment as possible before submitting the projects for approval by the GEF had created significant delays in accessing funding, in particular for those Parties that had submitted their letter of commitment in a timely manner.

18. The Committee requested the Secretariat to continue following up with Parties that had not yet submitted their fourth national report and made several recommendations to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, as presented in the report of the Compliance Committee on the work of its sixteenth and seventeenth meetings.[5]

III. PREPARATION FOR THE FIFTH NATIONAL REPORT

A. Synchronized reporting cycles

19. In its decision CP-9/5, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol accepted the invitation of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, contained in decision 14/27, and decided to have a synchronized reporting cycle commencing in 2023. This timeline was in line with the four-year cycle for the submission of national reports under the Protocol.

20. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation, at its third meeting, considered reporting under the Convention and adopted recommendation 3/11, including a recommended draft decision for consideration

[4] This section includes information provided in the report of the Compliance Committee on the work of its seventeenth meeting; see CBD/CP/CC/17/6, paras. 11 to 18.

[5] CBD/CP/MOP/10/2. Relevant recommendations have been incorporated in the suggestions for a decision in section IV.

by the Conference of the Parties at its fifteenth meeting. In the draft decision, the submission date for the seventh national report under the Convention appears within square brackets and is presented as alternatively June 2024 or June 2025.

21. In its recommendation 3/19, the Subsidiary Body recommended to the Conference of the Parties that it decide that, following its fifteenth meeting, meetings of the Conference of the Parties would be held every two years unless otherwise decided. This would mean the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties would be held in 2024; however, the text of this draft decision is in square brackets.

22. In light of these uncertainties, it will be necessary to continue monitoring closely the further planning of the reporting process under the Convention to maintain a synchronized reporting cycle.

B. Format for the fifth national report

1. Background to the development of the previous reporting formats, 2004 to 2018

23. The format for national reporting under the Cartagena Protocol has evolved over the past reporting cycles, with the necessary revisions made for each cycle. The format for the interim national report, the first national report, and the second national report (presented in decisions BS-I/9, BS-III/14 and BS-V/14 respectively) contained questions relating predominantly to the articles of the Protocol.

24. The Strategic Plan for the Protocol for the period 2011-2020 was adopted at the fifth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, through decision BS-V/16. At their sixth meeting, the Parties to the Protocol undertook the second assessment and review of the implementation of the Protocol. Further to decision BS-VI/15, a dedicated survey was undertaken to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan for the Protocol that could not be obtained from the second national reports or through other existing mechanisms.

25. The information obtained through the survey in combination with information provided through the analysis of the second national reports and other sources established the baseline for measuring progress in the implementation of the Protocol for subsequent assessment and review processes and for the evaluation of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol.

26. The questions from the survey were integrated into the reporting format for the third national report (welcomed in decision BS-VII/14). The third national reports were one of the key sources of information to carry out the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, which was combined with the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol.

27. In its decision CP-VIII/14, the meeting of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to develop a revised format for the fourth national reports with a view to ensuring that complete and accurate information was captured while striving to ensure the applicability of the baseline information, as established in decision BS-VI/15, in particular by improving the formulation of certain questions, eliminating redundancy, and adding questions that address mainstreaming of biosafety. An updated draft format for the fourth national report was prepared on this basis. In addition, questions concerning the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress were also included in the draft format for the fourth national report in light of the entry into force of the treaty in 2018. The format for the fourth national reports was reviewed and adopted by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties at its ninth meeting, in decision CP-9/5.

28. The fourth national reports provided one of the key sources of information for the analysis prepared for the fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol, presented in documents CBD/SBI/3/3 and CBD/SBI/3/3/Add.1 and in the update to the analysis to be provided.[6] The fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol will be considered by the Conference of the

[6] Document under preparation (see section II, para. 60, and annex, table B, of the report of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation on its third meeting, CBD/SBI/3/21).

Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, at its tenth meeting, on the basis of recommendation 3/2 from the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

2. Development of the format for the fifth national report

29. In its decision CP-9/7, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol decided to develop a post-2020 implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

30. A draft implementation plan was developed through a consultative process and submitted for consideration to Subsidiary Body on Implementation, at its third meeting. In its recommendation 3/4, the Subsidiary Body recommended that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, at its tenth meeting, adopt the implementation plan. It also recommended that the meeting of the Parties decide to conduct a midterm evaluation of the implementation plan in conjunction with the fifth assessment and review of the Protocol, and that it request the Executive Secretary to include questions designed to elicit information on the indicators of the implementation plan in the format for the fifth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.[7]

31. Against this background, the draft format for the fifth national report under the Protocol has been prepared for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties, at its tenth meeting. The draft format is presented in the annex to this document.

32. As part of the development of the draft format for the fifth national report and in anticipation of the adoption of the implementation plan, the format for the fourth national report was reviewed to identify which questions could be used to measure the indicators in the draft implementation plan and whether there were any indicators for which no corresponding question was available.

33. The review was carried out taking into consideration the need to limit changes to the wording of questions where possible, so that answers provided to these questions in the fourth national report can be used, as applicable, as a baseline to measure progress over time. Consequently, where the formulation of existing questions was substantively aligned with the indicators of the implementation plan, no changes were made to the wording of the question to ensure the comparability of information from the baseline with information in future national reports.[8]

34. As a result of the review, 18 questions have been added to the reporting format and several questions were revised, including eight which were adapted to obtain information on the indicators in the implementation plan for which no questions were available in the previous reporting format.

35. The review of the format for the fourth national report also considered whether some questions were no longer necessary and could be deleted. The review identified a number of questions used to measure indicators in the Strategic Plan for the Protocol but where these indicators have not been carried over to the implementation plan. Accordingly, these questions have not been included in the format for the fifth national report, helping to avoid the format becoming overly long.

36. The draft format for the fifth national report reflects some of the suggestions made by Parties in their fourth national reports on how to improve the reporting format (in particular from the responses provided to question 187). Input on the reporting format provided by the Liaison Group was also reflected.

[7] Also in recommendation 3/4, the Subsidiary Body recommended that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol decide to carry out the mid-term evaluation of the capacity-building action plan in conjunction with the mid-term evaluation of the implementation plan. The evaluation would draw upon information from questions in the reporting format related to capacity-building, among other sources.

[8] For example, question 14 in the fourth national reporting format, asking if Parties have introduced the necessary national measures for the implementation of the Protocol would be used to measure indicator A.1(a) of the implementation plan, which is formulated as follows "Percentage of Parties that have measures in place to implement the provisions of the Protocol".

37. The draft reporting format contains a new section on cooperation which contains questions related to the indicators on Goal B.4 of the draft implementation plan. Questions on cooperation in other parts of the reporting format have also been moved to this section.

38. In order to facilitate cross-referencing, a table has been developed that shows how the questions in the format for the fifth national report correspond to questions in the fourth national report. The table also specifies which indicator the question is intended to measure. The reference table is presented in document CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/3.

IV. SUGGESTED ELEMENTS OF A DRAFT DECISION

39. This section provides suggested elements for a draft decision for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. Section A of the draft decision addresses the fourth national reports and incorporates the relevant recommendations by the Compliance Committee as presented in the report of the Committee on the work of its sixteenth and seventeenth meetings (CBD/CP/MOP/10/2). Section B addresses the fifth national reports and related issues.

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

Recalling Article 33 and decision CP-9/5, in which Parties were requested to prepare and submit to the Secretariat their fourth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol,

Recalling decision CP-9/5, in which it accepted the invitation of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention contained in decision 14/27, and decided to have a synchronized national reporting cycle,

A. Fourth national reports on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol

1. *Welcomes* the 135 complete fourth national reports submitted through the Biosafety Clearing-House;[9]

2. *Expresses concern* about the low number of fourth national reports submitted;

3. *Also expresses concern* about delays in submitting the projects to the Global Environment Facility to support eligible Parties in the preparation of their fourth national reports, noting that such funding was not available before the deadline for the submission of fourth national reports, which is one of the factors that may have affected the submission rate;

4. *Urges* Parties that have not yet submitted their fourth national report to do so as soon as possible;[10]

5. *Notes with concern* that, of the Parties that have not yet submitted their fourth national report, some Parties have also not submitted their third national report;[11]

6. *Reminds* Parties of their obligation to publish their national reports on the Biosafety Clearing-House, in accordance with Article 20 of the Protocol;

---

[9] *Number up-to-date as of 12 September 2022. An update on any further reports received will be provided during part II of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.*

[10] Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Azerbaijan, Belize, Bolivia, Cabo Verde, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Fiji, Honduras, Jordan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mongolia, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago and Yemen. *[List to be updated as necessary at part II of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.]*

[11] Azerbaijan, Belize, Libya, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles and Syrian Arab Republic. *[List to be updated as necessary at part II of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.]*

7. *Encourages* Parties that have submitted their report in an offline format to ensure its publication on the Biosafety Clearing-House in coordination with the Secretariat, as necessary;

8. *Urges* Parties that have submitted an incomplete fourth national report to provide the missing information as soon as possible;

B. Fifth national reports on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol

9. *Welcomes* the draft format for the fifth national reports as contained in the annex to document CBD/CP/MOP/10/5, and requests the Executive Secretary:

(a) To make any necessary adjustments to the questions in light of the final text of the indicators of the post-2020 implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as adopted in decision CP-10/--;

(b) To make the final format available online through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

10. *Requests* Parties to use the final format for the preparation of their fifth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

11. *Invites* Parties to prepare their reports through a consultative process involving all relevant national stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities, as appropriate;

12. *Encourages* Parties to respond to all questions in the reporting format, and stresses the importance of the timely submission of fifth national reports in order to facilitate the mid-term evaluation of the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

13. *Requests* Parties and invites other Governments to submit to the Secretariat their fifth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety:

(a) In an official language of the United Nations;

(b) At the same time as the seventh national reports under the Convention are due;[12]

(c) Through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

14. *Requests* Parties experiencing challenges submitting their national report through the Biosafety Clearing-House to coordinate with the Secretariat to facilitate the publication of their national report in the Biosafety Clearing-House;

15. *Recommends* to the Conference of the Parties, in adopting guidance to the financial mechanism, that it invite the Global Environment Facility to make funds available in a timely manner to support eligible Parties in preparing their fifth national reports*;*

16. *Urges* eligible Parties to submit their letters of commitment to the implementing agency in a timely manner to ensure that projects to support the preparation of fifth national reports can be submitted to the Global Environment Facility for approval well before the deadline for the submission of the reports*;*

17. *Notes* decision 15/-- (on reporting) and decision 15/-- (on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework) by the Conference of the Parties and encourages Parties to the Cartagena Protocol to contribute to national processes for the preparation of the seventh national reports under the Convention, including by providing information related to targets relevant for biosafety.

[12] Decision 15/-- (reporting) of the Conference of the Parties.

Annex

FORMAT FOR THE FIFTH NATIONAL REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Article 33 of the Cartagena Protocol requires that Parties report on measures taken to implement the Protocol at intervals to be determined by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol. To facilitate the national reporting process, the format for the fifth national report has been developed.

The reporting format contains questions relating to the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. In addition, the format contains a series of questions relating to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress. While the latter questions are targeted at Parties to the Supplementary Protocol, Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that are not yet Party to the Supplementary Protocol are also invited to respond to these questions.

All questions marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory. Follow-up questions to mandatory questions are also mandatory, even though they are not marked with an asterisk. Non-mandatory questions also provide useful information on implementation of the Protocol and Parties are strongly encouraged to answer these questions.

In order to facilitate cross-referencing, a reference table has been developed that shows how the questions in the format for the fifth national report correspond to questions in the fourth national report. The table also specifies which indicator in the proposed post-2020 implementation plan for the Protocol the question is intended to measure. The reference table is presented in document CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/3.

Most questions are in a multiple-choice format requiring the selection of one or more boxes. Text fields are available as an option to Parties who wish to provide further details on the implementation of the various articles.

To facilitate completion of the national report, the online format allows the user to display the answer to the corresponding question from the fourth national report submitted, where available, by clicking on “show previous answer”.

The Executive Secretary welcomes any comments on the adequacy of the questions, challenges in completing the questions, and any further recommendation on how the reporting format could be improved. Space is provided at the end of the reporting format for including such comments.

It is recommended that Parties engage all relevant stakeholders in the preparation of the report in order to ensure a participatory and transparent approach, and the accuracy of the information requested. Given the time required to prepare, approve and submit a national report, Parties are encouraged to start preparing their reports well before the deadline.

Submission of the report

The offline format is meant to facilitate the data gathering process in preparation for the submission of the fifth national report on the Biosafety Clearing-House.

The fifth national report is to be submitted online through the Biosafety Clearing-House and in one of the six official languages of the United Nations at https://bch.cbd.int/en/register.

To be able to publish its report, each Party will need to have designated its national focal point for the Biosafety Clearing-House. Parties are also encouraged to use the opportunity of the preparation of their

fifth national report to verify that their national records in the Biosafety Clearing-House are complete and up-to-date.

In case of technical difficulties when uploading the national report in the Biosafety Clearing-House, Parties are invited to contact the Secretariat to seek a solution.

Only when not technically feasible to submit the national report through the Biosafety Clearing-House, the fifth national report may be submitted by sending the completed offline format to the Secretariat (secretariat@cbd.int). For the report to be considered complete, all mandatory questions must be answered, and the country must include a scanned copy of the last page with the signature of the national focal point for the Biosafety Clearing-House. Reports submitted in an offline format may not be considered in some processes under the Protocol, in particular the assessment and review process under Article 35 of the Protocol.

The deadline for the submission of the fifth national report will be announced through a notification issued by the Executive Secretary, in accordance with the guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

FORMAT FOR THE FIFTH NATIONAL REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Preparation and submission of the report	
1. Country:*	**[Country name]**
2. Organizations/stakeholders who were consulted or participated in the preparation of this report:*	**[Text entry]**
3. Date of submission:*	**[day / month / year]**
4. Time period covered by this report:*	**From [month / year] to [month / year]**
5. If your country is not a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, is there any national process in place towards becoming a Party?	☐ Yes ☐ No
6. Please use the space below to provide any further details: **[Text entry]**	

Article 2 – General provisions *Article 2 requires each Party to take the necessary and appropriate legal, administrative and other measures to implement its obligations under the Protocol*	
7. Has your country introduced the necessary national measures for the implementation of the Protocol?*	☐ National measures are fully in place ☐ National measures are partially in place ☐ Only temporary measures have been introduced ☐ Only draft measures exist ☐ No measures have yet been taken

8. Which specific instruments are in place for the implementation of national biosafety measures (select all that apply)?*	☐ One or more national biosafety laws ☐ One or more national biosafety regulations ☐ One or more sets of biosafety guidelines ☐ Other laws, regulations or guidelines that indirectly apply to biosafety ☐ No instruments are in place **[Please provide further information on the instruments in place]**
9. Has your country integrated biosafety in national sectoral and cross-sectoral strategies, action plans, programmes, policies or legislation?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
10. Does your country have resources for biosafety from national budgets?*	☐ Yes └ Are these resources adequate: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ No
11. Does your country have qualified staff to administer functions directly related to biosafety?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
12. If you answered *Yes* to question 11, how many qualified staff members are in place whose functions are directly related to biosafety?	☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9 ☐ 10 or more *Is this number adequate:* ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No*
13. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 2 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 5 – Pharmaceuticals	
14. Does your country regulate the transboundary movement, handling or use of living modified organisms (LMOs) which are pharmaceuticals for humans?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
15. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 5 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 6 – Transit and contained use	
16. Does your country regulate the transit of LMOs?*	☐ Yes

	☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
17. Does your country regulate the contained use of LMOs?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
18. Has your country taken a decision concerning the import of LMOs for contained use?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
19. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 6 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Articles 7 to 10: Advance informed agreement (AIA) and intentional introduction of LMOs into the environment	
20. Has your country established legal requirements for exporters under its jurisdiction to notify in writing the competent national authority of the Party of import prior to the intentional transboundary movement of an LMO that falls within the scope of the AIA procedure?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
21. Has your country established legal requirements for the accuracy of information contained in the notification provided by exporters under its jurisdiction?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
22. In the current reporting period, has your country received a notification regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
23. If you answered *Yes* to question 22, did the notification(s) contain complete information (at a minimum the information specified in Annex I to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety)?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
24. If you answered *Yes* to question 22, has your country acknowledged receipt of the notification(s) to the notifier within ninety days of receipt?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
25. If you answered *Yes* to question 22, has your country informed the following of its decision(s):	

a. The notifier?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
b. The Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
26. In the current reporting period, has your country taken a decision in response to the notification(s) regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment?*	☐ Yes └ Please specify how many: [number] ☐ No
27. If you answered *Yes* to question 26, what percentage of your country's decisions fall into the following categories?	[%] Approval of the import/use of the LMO(s) without conditions [%] Approval of the import/use of the LMO(s) with conditions └ Were the reasons for the conditions provided? ☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No [%] Prohibition of the import/use of the LMO(s) └ Were the reasons for the prohibition provided? ☐ Yes ☐ In some cases only ☐ No [%] Request for additional relevant information [%] Inform the notifier that the period for communicating the decision has been extended
28. If you answered *Yes* to question 26, how many LMOs has your country approved for import for intentional introduction into the environment?	☐ None ☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9 ☐ 10 or more
29. If you answered under question 28 that LMOs were approved, have these LMOs actually been imported into your country?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No

30. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Articles 7 to 10 in your country, including measures in case of lack of scientific certainty on potential adverse effects of LMOs for intentional introduction to the environment:

[Text entry]

Article 11 – Procedure for living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (LMOs-FFP)	
31. Does your country have law(s), regulation(s) or administrative measures for decision-making regarding domestic use, including placing on the market, of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
32. Has your country established legal requirements for the accuracy of information to be provided by the applicant regarding the domestic use, including placing on the market, of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
33. In the current reporting period, how many decisions has your country taken regarding domestic use, including placing on the market, of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing?*	☐ None ☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9 ☐ 10 or more
34. Does your country have law(s), regulation(s) or administrative measures for decision-making regarding the import of LMOs for direct use as food or feed, or for processing?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
35. In the current reporting period, how many decisions has your country taken regarding the import of LMOs for direct use as food or feed, or for processing?*	☐ None ☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9 ☐ 10 or more

36. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 11 in your country, including measures in case of lack of scientific certainty on potential adverse effects of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing:

[Text entry]

Article 12 – Review of decisions	
37. Has your country established a mechanism for the review and change of a decision regarding	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify]

an intentional transboundary movement of LMOs?*	☐ No
38. In the current reporting period, has your country reviewed and/or changed a decision regarding an intentional transboundary movement of an LMO?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
39. If you answered *Yes* to question 38, how many decisions were reviewed and/or changed?	☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9 ☐ 10 or more
40. If you answered *Yes* to question 38, were any of the reviews triggered by a request from the Party of export or the notifier?	☐ Yes ☐ No
41. If you answered *Yes* to question 40, did your country provide a response within ninety days setting out the reasons for the decision?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
42. If you answered *Yes* to question 38, were any of the reviews initiated by your country as the Party of import?	☐ Yes ☐ No
43. If you answered *Yes* to question 42, did your country, within thirty days, set out the reasons for the decision and inform:	
a. The notifier?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
b. The BCH?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
44. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 12 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 13 – Simplified procedure	
45. Has your country established a mechanism for the application of the simplified procedure regarding an intentional transboundary movement of LMOs?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
46. In the current reporting period, has your country applied the simplified procedure?*	☐ Yes ☐ No

47. If you answered *Yes* to question 46, for how many LMOs has your country applied the simplified procedure?	☐ 1 to 5 ☐ 5 or more
48. If you answered *Yes* to question 46, has your country informed the Parties through the BCH of the cases where the simplified procedure was applied?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
49. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 13 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 14 – Bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements and arrangements	
50. How many bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements relevant to biosafety has your country established with other Parties/non-Parties?	☐ None ☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9 ☐ 10 or more
51. If you answered under question 50 that *agreements or arrangements were established*, please provide a brief description of their scope and objective: **[Text entry]**	
52. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 14 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Articles 15 & 16 – Risk assessment and risk management	
53. Does the domestic regulatory framework of your country require risk assessments of LMOs to be conducted?*	☐ Yes └ To which LMOs does this requirement apply (select all that apply): ☐ For imports of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment ☐ For imports of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing ☐ For decisions regarding domestic use, including placing on the market, of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movements for direct use as food or feed, or for processing ☐ For imports of LMOs for contained use ☐ Other: [Please specify] ☐ No

54. Has your country established a mechanism to conduct risk assessments prior to taking decisions regarding LMOs?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
Conducting risk assessment or risk management	
55. In the current reporting period, has your country conducted any kind of risk assessment of LMOs, including for contained use, field trials, commercial purposes, direct use as food, feed, or for processing?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
56. If you answered *Yes* to question 55, how many risk assessments were conducted?	☐ 1 to 9 ☐ 10 to 49 ☐ 50 to 99 ☐ More than 100
57. If you answered *Yes* to question 55, please indicate the scope of the risk assessments (select all that apply):	☐ LMOs for contained use (in accordance with Article 3) ☐ LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment for experimental testing or field trials ☐ LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment for commercial purposes ☐ LMOs for direct use as food ☐ LMOs for direct use as feed ☐ LMOs for processing ☐ Other: [Please specify]
58. If you answered *Yes* to question 55, were risk assessments conducted for all decisions taken on LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment or on domestic use of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only [Please specify] ☐ No
59. If you answered *Yes* to question 55, have you considered:*	
a. other available scientific evidence, as referred to in Article 15 of the Protocol?	☐ Yes, in all cases ☐ In some cases ☐ No

b. relevant traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities?[1]	☐ Yes, in all cases ☐ In some cases ☐ No
60. If you answered *Yes* or *In some cases* to question 59(b), was this information considered in a scientifically sound and transparent manner?[2]*	☐ Yes ☐ No
61. Has your country established appropriate mechanisms, measures and strategies to regulate and manage risks identified in the risk assessment of LMOs?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent ☐ No
62. Has your country taken appropriate measures to prevent unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs including such measures as requiring a risk assessment to be carried out prior to the first release of a LMO?[3] *	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent ☐ No
63. Has your country taken measures to ensure that any LMO, whether imported or locally developed, undergoes an appropriate period of observation that is commensurate with its life-cycle or generation time before it is put to its intended use?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
64. Has your country established a mechanism for monitoring potential effects of LMOs released into the environment?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
65. Does your country have measures to identify LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
66. Has your country had access to or used any resource materials, including guidance documents, for the purpose of conducting risk assessment or risk management, or for evaluating risk assessment reports submitted by notifiers?*	
a. Risk assessment:	☐ Yes ☐ No
b. Risk management:	☐ Yes ☐ No

[1] To be updated in line with the final text of indicator A.5(c) of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol.

[2] To be updated in line with the final text of indicator A.5(c) of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol.

[3] See footnote 7 for the operational definition of unintentional transboundary movement.

67. If you answered *Yes* to question 66(a) or (b), is your country using the "Guidance on Risk Assessment of LMOs" (developed by the Online Forum and the AHTEG on Risk Assessment and Risk Management)[4] for conducting risk assessment or risk management, or for evaluating risk assessment reports submitted by notifiers?	☐ Yes ☐ No
68. Does your country have specific needs for further guidance on specific topics of risk assessment of LMOs?*	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No
Capacity-building in risk assessment or risk management	
69. Does your country have the capacity to detect, identify, assess the risk of and/or monitor LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking into account risks to human health?*	
a. Detect:	☐ Yes ☐ No
b. Identify:	☐ Yes ☐ No
c. Assess the risk:	☐ Yes ☐ No
d. Monitor:	☐ Yes ☐ No
70. In the current reporting period, how many people in your country have been trained in risk assessment, risk management and monitoring of LMOs?*	
a. Risk assessment:	☐ None ☐ 1 to 9 ☐ 10 to 49 ☐ 50 to 99 ☐ 100 or more *Is this number adequate:* ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No*
b. Risk management:	☐ None ☐ 1 to 9 ☐ 10 to 49 ☐ 50 to 99

[4] Document UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/8/8/Add.1.

	☐ 100 or more *Is this number adequate:* ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No*
c. Monitoring:	☐ None ☐ 1 to 9 ☐ 10 to 49 ☐ 50 to 99 ☐ 100 or more *Is this number adequate:* ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No*
71. Is your country using training material and/or technical guidance for training in risk assessment and risk management of LMOs?*	☐ Yes └ Which materials/guidance are being used: ☐ Manual on risk assessment of LMOs developed by the CBD Secretariat[5] ☐ Guidance on risk assessment of LMOs developed by the Online Forum and the AHTEG on Risk Assessment and Risk Management[6] ☐ Other materials/guidance: [Please specify] ☐ No
72. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Articles 15 and 16 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 17 – Unintentional transboundary movements[7] and emergency measures	
73. Has your country established measures to notify affected or potentially affected States, the Biosafety Clearing-House and, where appropriate, relevant international organizations in case of a release under its jurisdiction that leads, or may lead, to an unintentional transboundary movement?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
74. In the current reporting period, how many releases of LMOs occurred under your country's jurisdiction that led, or may have	☐ None ☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9

[5] Document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/7/INF/6.

[6] Document UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/8/8/Add.1.

[7] In accordance with the operational definition adopted in decision CP-VIII/16, "'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."

led, to an unintentional transboundary movement?*	☐ 10 or more
75. If you answered *under question 74* that a *release occurred*, has your country notified affected or potentially affected States, the Biosafety Clearing-House and, where appropriate, relevant international organizations?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
76. In the current reporting period, how many times has your country become aware of an unintentional transboundary movement into its territory?*	☐ None ☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9 ☐ 10 or more
77. Does your country have the capacity to take appropriate measures in response to unintentional transboundary movements?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
78. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 17 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 18 – Handling, transport, packaging and identification	
79. Has your country taken measures to require that LMOs that are subject to transboundary movement are handled, packaged and transported under conditions of safety, taking into account relevant international rules and standards?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
80. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying LMOs-FFP, *in cases where the identity of the LMOs is not known*, clearly identifies that they *may contain LMOs* and are not intended for intentional introduction into the environment, as well as a contact point for further information?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
81. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying LMOs-FFP, *in cases where the identity of the LMOs is known*, clearly identifies that they *contain LMOs* and are not intended for intentional introduction into the environment, as well as a contact point for further information?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
82. If you answered *Yes* or *Yes, to some extent* to question(s) 79, 80 and/or 81, what type of documentation accompanying LMOs does your country require?	☐ Documentation specific to LMOs ☐ As part of other documentation (not specific to LMOs)

	☐ Other: [Please specify]
83. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying *LMOs that are destined for contained use* clearly identifies them as *LMOs*, and specifies any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, as well as the contact point for further information, including the name and address of the individual and institution to whom the LMO are consigned?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
84. If you answered *Yes* or *Yes, to some extent* to question 83, what type of documentation does your country require for the identification of LMOs that are destined for contained use?	☐ Documentation specific to LMOs ☐ As part of other documentation (not specific to LMOs) ☐ Other: [Please specify]
85. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying *LMOs that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment of the Party of import* clearly identifies them as *living modified organisms*; specifies the identity and relevant traits and/or characteristics, any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information and, as appropriate, the name and address of the importer and exporter; and contains a declaration that the movement is in conformity with the requirements of the Cartagena Protocol applicable to the exporter?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
86. If you answered *Yes* or *Yes, to some extent* to question 85, what type of documentation does your country require for the identification of LMOs that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment?*	☐ Documentation specific LMOs ☐ As part of other documentation (not specific to LMOs) ☐ Other: [Please specify]
87. Does your country have the capacity to enforce the requirements of identification and documentation of LMOs?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
88. In the current reporting period, how many customs officers in your country have received training in the identification of LMOs?*	☐ None ☐ 1 to 9 ☐ 10 to 49 ☐ 50 to 99 ☐ 100 or more *Is this number adequate:* ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No*

89. Has your country established procedures for the sampling and detection of LMOs?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
90. Does your country have access to and use resource materials and detection methods to detect and identify LMOs?*	
a. *access to* resource materials and detection methods to detect and identify LMOs?	☐ Yes ☐ No
b. *use* of resource materials and detection methods to detect and identify LMOs?	☐ Yes ☐ No
91. Does your country have access to and use tools to detect and identify LMOs?*	
a. *access to* tools?	☐ Yes ☐ No
b. *use* of tools?	☐ Yes ☐ No
92. Does your country have access to and use certified reference materials necessary to detect and identify LMOs?*	
a. *access to* certified reference materials?	☐ Yes ☐ No
b. *use* of certified reference materials?	☐ Yes ☐ No
93. How many laboratory personnel in your country have received training in detection of LMOs?*	☐ None ☐ 1 to 9 ☐ 10 to 49 ☐ 50 to 99 ☐ 100 or more *Is this number adequate:* ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No*
94. Does your country have reliable access to technical infrastructures, such as laboratories for the detection and identification of LMOs?*	
a. technical infrastructure for *detection* of LMOs?	☐ Yes ☐ No
b. technical infrastructure for *identification* of LMOs?	☐ Yes ☐ No

95. How many laboratories in your country are certified for LMO detection?*	☐ None ☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9 ☐ 10 to 49 ☐ 50 or more
96. If you answered under question 95 that *certified laboratories exist in your country*, how many of them are currently operating in the field of the detection of LMOs?	☐ None ☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9 ☐ 10 to 49 ☐ 50 or more
97. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 18 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 19 – Competent national authorities and national focal points	
98. In case your country has designated more than one competent national authority, has your country established a mechanism for the coordination of their actions prior to taking decisions regarding LMOs?*	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable, no competent national authority was designated ☐ Not applicable, only one competent national authority was designated
99. Has your country established adequate institutional capacity to enable the competent national authority(ies) to perform the administrative functions required by the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
100. Has your country undertaken initiatives to strengthen collaboration among national focal points, competent national authority(ies) and other institutions on biosafety-related matters?*	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No
101. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 19 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 20 – Information-sharing and the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)	
102. Please provide an overview of the status of the mandatory information provided by your country to the BCH by specifying for each category of information whether it is available[8] and whether it has been submitted to the BCH:	
a. Existing legislation, regulations and guidelines for implementing the Protocol, as well as information required by Parties for the advance informed agreement procedure (Article 20, paragraph 3(a))*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
b. Legislation, regulations and guidelines applicable to the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11, paragraph 5)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
c. Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Article 14, paragraph 2, and Article 20, paragraph 3 (b))*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
d. Contact details for competent national authorities (Article 19, paragraphs 2 and 3), national focal points (Article 19, paragraphs 1 and 3), and emergency contacts (Article 17, paragraph 3(e))*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
e. Decisions regarding transit of LMOs (Article 6, paragraph 1)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
f. Decisions regarding import of LMOs for contained use (Article 6, paragraph 2)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available

[8] The option *information not available* should be selected for example in cases where the information does not exist in your country.

g. Notifications regarding the release under your country's jurisdiction that leads, or may lead, to an unintentional transboundary movement of a LMO that is likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17, paragraph 1)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
h. Information concerning cases of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25, paragraph 3)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
i. Decisions regarding the importation of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment (Article 10, paragraph 3)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
j. Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14, paragraph 4)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
k. Decisions regarding the domestic use of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11, paragraph 1)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
l. Decisions regarding the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing that are taken under domestic regulatory frameworks (Article 11, paragraph 4) or in accordance with Annex III to the Protocol (Article 11, paragraph 6)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
m. Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11, paragraph 6)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available

n. Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12, paragraph 1)*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
o. Cases where intentional transboundary movement may take place at the same time as the movement is notified to your country (Article 13, paragraph 1(a))*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
p. LMOs exempted from the advance informed agreement procedure (Article 13, paragraph 1(b))*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
q. Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information regarding products thereof (Article 20, paragraph 3(c))*	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information not available
103. Please provide a brief explanation if you answered that the information is available *but not in the BCH* or *only partially available in the BCH* to any item under question 102: **[Text entry]**	
104. Has your country established a mechanism for the coordination among the BCH national focal point, the Cartagena Protocol national focal point, and the competent national authority(ies) for making information available to the BCH?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
105. In the current reporting period, has your country used the information available in the BCH in its decision-making processes on LMOs?*	☐ Yes, always ☐ Yes, in some cases ☐ No ☐ Not applicable (no decisions were taken)
106. In the current reporting period, has your country experienced difficulties accessing or using the BCH?*	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No

107. Does your country have a national biosafety clearing-house?*	☐ Yes: [Please provide website address] ☐ No
108. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 20 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 21 – Confidential information	
109. Has your country established procedures to protect confidential information received under the Protocol?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
110. Does your country allow the notifier to identify information that is to be treated as confidential?*	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
111. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 21 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 22 – Capacity-building	
112. Does your country have predictable and reliable funding for its capacity-building needs for the effective implementation of the Protocol?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
113. Has your country received external support for the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
114. If you answered *Yes* or *Yes, to some extent* to question 113, how was this support made available?	☐ Bilateral channels ☐ Regional channels ☐ Multilateral channels
115. Has your country provided support to other Parties in the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety?*	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No
116. If you answered *Yes* to question 115, how was this support made available?	☐ Bilateral channels ☐ Regional channels ☐ Multilateral channels

117. In the current reporting period, has your country used its GEF STAR allocation for biosafety activities?*	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
118. In the current reporting period, has your country undertaken activities for the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
119. If you answered *Yes* or *Yes, to some extent* to question 118, in which of the following areas were these activities undertaken (select all that apply)?*	☐ Institutional capacity and human resources ☐ Integration of biosafety in cross-sectoral and sectoral legislation, policies and institutions (mainstreaming biosafety) ☐ Risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise ☐ Risk management ☐ Public awareness, participation and education in biosafety ☐ Information exchange and data management, including participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House ☐ Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration at subregional, regional and international levels ☐ Technology transfer ☐ Identification of LMOs, including their detection ☐ Socioeconomic considerations ☐ Implementation of the documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol ☐ Handling of confidential information ☐ Measures to address unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs ☐ Scientific biosafety research relating to LMOs ☐ Taking into account risks to human health ☐ Liability and redress ☐ Other: [Please specify]
120. If you answered *Yes* or *Yes, to some extent* to question 118, did your country use capacity-building materials, including online resources, for the development and/or strengthening of capacity-building?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
121. In the current reporting period, has your country carried out a capacity-building needs assessment?*	☐ Yes ☐ No

122. Does your country still have capacity-building needs?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
123. If you answered *Yes* to question 122, which of the following areas still need capacity-building (select all that apply)?	☐ Institutional capacity and human resources ☐ Integration of biosafety in cross-sectoral and sectoral legislation, policies and institutions (mainstreaming biosafety) ☐ Risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise ☐ Risk management ☐ Public awareness, participation and education in biosafety ☐ Information exchange and data management, including participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House ☐ Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration at subregional, regional and international levels ☐ Technology transfer ☐ Sampling, detection and identification of LMOs ☐ Socioeconomic considerations ☐ Implementation of the documentation requirements for handling, transport, packaging and identification ☐ Handling of confidential information ☐ Measures to address unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs ☐ Scientific biosafety research relating to LMOs ☐ Taking into account risks to human health ☐ Liability and redress ☐ Other: [Please specify]
124. If you answered *Yes* to question 122, has your country prioritized its capacity-building needs?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
125. Does your country have in place a functional national mechanism for coordinating biosafety capacity-building initiatives?	☐ Yes ☐ No
126. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 22 in your country, including further details about your experience in accessing GEF funds: **[Text entry]**	

Article 23 – Public awareness and participation	
127. Is biosafety public awareness, education and/or participation addressed in legislation or policy in your country?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No

128. Has your country established a mechanism to ensure public access to information on LMOs?*	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No
129. Has your country established a mechanism to facilitate and promote public participation, including consultation, in the decision-making process regarding LMOs?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
130. Has your country informed the public about existing modalities for public participation in the decision-making process regarding LMOs?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
131. In the current reporting period, how many times has your country consulted the public in the decision-making process regarding LMOs?*	☐ None (decisions taken without consultation) ☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 or more ☐ Not applicable (no decisions were taken)
132. In the current reporting period, has your country made the results of decisions regarding LMOs available to the public?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
133. Has your country informed the public about the means to access the Biosafety Clearing-House?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
134. Has biosafety been addressed or integrated in educational and training programmes in your country?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
135. Does your country have in place a national communication strategy on biosafety?*	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No
136. Does your country have any awareness and outreach programmes on biosafety?*	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No
137. Does your country currently have a national biosafety website?*	☐ Yes: [Please provide website address] ☐ No
138. In the current reporting period, has your country accessed resource materials for facilitating and promoting public awareness, education and participation in biosafety?*	☐ Yes ☐ No

139. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 23 in your country:

[Text entry]

Article 24 – Non-Parties	
140. Has your country entered into any bilateral, regional, or multilateral agreement(s) with non-Parties regarding transboundary movements of LMOs?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
141. In the current reporting period, has your country imported LMOs from a non-Party?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
142. In the current reporting period, has your country exported LMOs to a non-Party?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
143. If you answered *Yes* to question 141 and/or 142, were the transboundary movements of LMOs consistent with the objective of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety?	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No
144. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 24 in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Article 25 – Illegal transboundary movements[9]	
145. Has your country adopted domestic measures aimed at preventing and/or penalizing transboundary movements of LMOs carried out in contravention of its domestic measures to implement the Cartagena Protocol?*	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] ☐ No
146. In the current reporting period, how many cases of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs has your country become aware of?*	☐ None ☐ 1 to 4 ☐ 5 to 9 ☐ 10 or more
147. If you indicated under question 146 that your country became aware of *cases of illegal transboundary movements*, has the origin of the LMO(s) been established?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, some cases ☐ No

[9] In accordance with the operational definition adopted in decision CP-VIII/16, "'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".

148. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 25 in your country:

[Text entry]

Article 26 – Socio-economic considerations	
149. Does your country have any specific approaches or requirements that facilitate how socioeconomic considerations should be taken into account in LMO decision-making?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
150. Has your country used materials[10] for taking socioeconomic considerations into account?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
151. In the current reporting period, have socioeconomic considerations arising from the impact of LMOs been taken into account in decision-making?*	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☐ Not applicable (no decisions were taken)

152. Please use the space below to provide further details on the implementation of Article 26 in your country:

[Text entry]

Article 28 – Financial mechanism and resources	
153. In the current reporting period, how much funding (in the equivalent of US dollars) has your country mobilized to support implementation of the Cartagena Protocol beyond the regular national budgetary allocation?*	☐ None ☐ 1 to 4,999 USD ☐ 5,000 to 49,999 USD ☐ 50,000 to 99,999 USD ☐ 100,000 to 499,000 USD ☐ 500,000 USD or more

[10] To be updated in line with the final text of indicator A.9(b) of the post-2020 implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol.

Article 33 – Monitoring and reporting *Article 33 requires Parties to monitor the implementation of its obligations under the Cartagena Protocol and to report to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on measures taken to implement the Protocol*	
154. Does your country have in place a system to monitor and enforce the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol?*	☐ Yes ☐ No

Cooperation *Goal B.4 of the post-2020 implementation plan[11] addresses cooperation and coordination on biosafety issues at the national, regional and international levels. Questions related to this goal are presented below, including questions related to cooperation under different provisions of the Protocol.*	
155. In the current period, has your country cooperated with other Parties in:*	
a. exchange of scientific, technical and institutional knowledge;	☐ Yes ☐ No
b. identifying LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity? (Article 16(5)).	☐ Yes ☐ No
c. research and information exchange on any socioeconomics impacts of LMOs? (Article 26(2))	☐ Yes └ Does this include research and information exchange on socioeconomic impacts of LMOs on indigenous peoples and local communities? ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No* ☐ No
d. public awareness, education and participation? (Article 23(1)(a))	☐ Yes ☐ No
e. strengthening capacities for the implementation of the Protocol?	☐ Yes ☐ No
156. In the current reporting period, has your country engaged in bilateral, regional or multilateral activities for the implementation of the Protocol?*	☐ Yes ☐ No
157. Does your country have mechanisms in place for involving indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant stakeholders from different sectors in the implementation of the Protocol?*	

[11] As presented in recommendation 3/4 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

a. mechanisms for involving *indigenous peoples and local communities*	☐ Yes ☐ No
b. mechanisms for involving *relevant stakeholders from different sectors*	☐ Yes ☐ No
158. Please use the space below to provide further details on biosafety cooperation in your country: **[Text entry]**	

Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress *Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that are not yet Party to the Supplementary Protocol are also invited to respond to the questions below*	
159. Is your country a Party to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress?	☐ Yes ☐ No └ Is there any national process in place towards becoming a Party to the Supplementary Protocol? ☐ Yes: [Please provide further information] ☐ No
160. Has your country introduced the necessary measures for the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol?	☐ National measures are fully in place ☐ National measures are partially in place ☐ Only temporary measures have been introduced ☐ Only draft measures exist ☐ No measures have yet been taken
161. Which instruments are in place for the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol (select all that apply)?	☐ One or more national laws ☐ One or more national regulations ☐ One or more sets of guidelines ☐ No instruments are in place [Please provide further information on the instruments in place]
162. Does your country have administrative or legal instruments that require response measures to be taken:	
a. In case of damage resulting from LMOs?	☐ Yes ☐ No
b. In case there is sufficient likelihood that damage will result if response measures are not taken?	☐ Yes ☐ No

163. If you answered *Yes* to question 162a, do these instruments impose requirements on an operator (select all that apply)?	☐ Yes, the operator must inform the competent authority of the damage ☐ Yes, the operator must evaluate the damage ☐ Yes, the operator must take response measures ☐ Yes, other requirements: [Please specify] ☐ No
164. If you answered *Yes* to question 162a, do these instruments require the operator to take response measures to avoid damage?	☐ Yes ☐ No
165. If you answered *Yes* to question 162a or 162b, do these instruments provide for a definition of "operator"?	☐ Yes ☐ No
166. If you answered *Yes* to question 165, which of the following could be an 'operator' (select all that apply)?*	☐ Permit holder ☐ Person who placed the LMO on the market ☐ Developer ☐ Producer ☐ Notifier ☐ Exporter ☐ Importer ☐ Carrier ☐ Supplier ☐ Other: [Please specify]
167. Has a competent authority been identified for carrying out the functions set out in the Supplementary Protocol?	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No
168. If you answered *Yes* to question 167, what measures may the competent authority take (select all that apply)?	☐ Identify the operator that caused the damage ☐ Evaluate the damage ☐ Determine response measures to be taken by operator ☐ Implement response measures ☐ Recover costs and expenses of the evaluation of the damage and the implementation of any response measures from the operator ☐ Other: [Please specify]
169. Does your country have measures in place to provide for financial security for damage resulting from LMOs?	☐ Yes ☐ No

170. If you answered *Yes* to question 169, what type of financial security measures are in place (select all that apply)?	☐ Requirement to provide evidence of a secure source of funding ☐ Mandatory insurance ☐ Government schemes, including funds ☐ Other: [Please specify]
171. Does your country have rules and procedures on civil liability that address damage resulting from LMOs, or has such damage been recognized in court rulings (select all that apply)?	☐ Yes, in a civil liability instrument ☐ Yes, in court rulings ☐ Yes, in other instruments: [Please specify] ☐ No
172. Have there been any occurrences of damage resulting from LMOs in your country?	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No
173. If you answered *Yes* to question 172, have response measures been taken?	☐ Yes: [Please specify] ☐ No
174. Please use the space below to provide further details on any activities undertaken in your country towards the implementation of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress: **[Text entry]**	

Other information
175. Please use this field to provide any other information on issues related to national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the Supplementary Protocol, including any obstacles or impediments encountered: **[Text entry]**

Comments on reporting format
176. Please use this field to provide any information on difficulties that you have encountered in filling in this report, and suggestions for its improvement. **[Text entry]**

Biosafety Clearing-House Record Validation	
To facilitate the analysis of the information contained in this report, Parties are urged to complete and submit the report online through the Biosafety Clearing-House at https://bch.cbd.int/en/register. ***In case of technical difficulties, please contact the Secretariat. The complete report may then be submitted as an attachment to an e-mail in MS Word format, together with a scanned copy of this page, to the Secretariat at: secretariat@cbd.int.*** ***Please do not send this report via fax or postal mail or in electronic formats other than MS Word.***	
Date:*	<YYYY-MM-DD>
Country:*	<Country name>
Name of the Biosafety Clearing-House national focal point:*	<Text entry>
I hereby confirm that the above information is correct and agree to its inclusion in the Biosafety Clearing-House.	
Signature of the BCH national focal point:*	