



**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/CP/MOP/9/13
29 November 2018

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

Ninth meeting

Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, 17-29 November 2018

**REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE
PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY ON ITS NINTH 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 ninth meeting in Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, from 17 to 29 November 2018. It adopted 16 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	3
9/1.	Compliance	3
9/2.	Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (Article 20).....	5
9/3.	Capacity-building (Article 22).....	6
9/4.	Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources (Article 28).....	9
9/5.	Monitoring and reporting (Article 33)	10
9/6.	Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol (Article 35)	38
9/7.	Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020	39
9/8.	Review of experience in holding concurrently meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol.....	41
9/9.	Enhancing integration under the Convention and its Protocols with respect to biosafety-related provisions	43
9/10.	Procedure for avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in expert groups	44
9/11.	Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (Article 17)	45
9/12.	Transit and contained use of living modified organisms (Article 6)	47
9/13.	Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16)	48
9/14.	Socio-economic considerations (Article 26).....	51
9/15.	Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.....	53
9/16.	Programme of work and budget (Cartagena Protocol)	54
II.	ACCOUNT OF PROCEEDINGS	63
Item 1.	Opening of the meeting.....	64
Item 2.	Organizational matters	65
Item 3.	Report on the credentials of representatives to the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol	67
Item 4.	Reports of subsidiary bodies	68
Item 5.	Report of the Compliance Committee	68
Item 6.	Administration of the Protocol and budget for the trust funds	69
Item 7.	Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources (Article 28).....	70
Item 8.	Capacity-building (Article 22).....	70
Item 9.	Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (Article 20).....	71
Item 10.	Monitoring and reporting (Article 33) and assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 35)	72
Item 11.	Enhancing integration under the Convention and its Protocols with respect to biosafety-related provisions	73
Item 12.	Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives.....	73
Item 13.	Review of effectiveness of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols	74
Item 14.	Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020	75
Item 15.	Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16).....	76
Item 16.	Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (Article 17)	77
Item 17.	Transit and contained use of living modified organisms (Article 6)	77
Item 18.	Socio-economic considerations (Article 26)	78
Item 19.	Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.....	79
Item 20.	Other matters	79
Item 21.	Adoption of the report	79
Item 22.	Closure of the meeting.....	79

I. DECISIONS

9/1. 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,¹

1. *Reminds* Parties of their responsibility and obligation to take the necessary and appropriate legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol;
2. *Also reminds* Parties of their obligation to monitor the implementation of the obligations under the Protocol, in accordance with Article 33;
3. *Recalls* that Parties facing difficulties in complying with one or more obligations under the Protocol are encouraged to seek assistance from the Compliance Committee;
4. *Requests* Parties to collaborate fully when requested to provide information in relation to their compliance with obligations under the Protocol;
5. *Invites* Parties that have made progress in complying with certain obligations to share relevant information in the free-text fields in the reporting format for the fourth national report or through bilateral or regional cooperation on the circumstances that may have contributed to their progress;
6. *Encourages* Parties to use the free-text fields in the reporting format for the fourth national report to explain responses provided, and *invites* Parties that are facing challenges in complying with certain obligations to share information on the challenges encountered in the free-text fields in the reporting format for the fourth national report;
7. *Notes* with appreciation the efforts made by Parties to comply with their obligations under the Protocol to make information available to the Biosafety Clearing-House;
8. *Urges* Parties to make all required information available in the Biosafety Clearing-House in a timely manner, in particular risk assessments and final decisions relating to the first intentional transboundary movement of living modified organisms for intentional introduction into the environment, including living modified organisms intended for field trials;
9. *Reminds* Parties of the need to maintain up-to-date details of their national focal points on the Biosafety Clearing-House;
10. *Urges* Parties to coordinate at the national level to avoid inconsistency of information in the national reports and the Biosafety Clearing-House and *encourages* communication between national focal points and competent national authorities;
11. *Reminds* Parties of the importance of engaging constructively with all stakeholders, including with industry the public, indigenous peoples and local communities, and women for the effective implementation of the Protocol;
12. *Encourages* Parties to mainstream biosafety in their educational systems;
13. *Urges* Parties and *invites* other Governments to provide voluntary funds in support of those Parties requested by the Committee to develop and implement compliance action plans;
14. *Encourages* Parties to allocate funds to biosafety in national budgets, to the extent possible;

¹ CBD/CP/MOP/9/2.

15. *Notes* with regret that one Party has not submitted its national reports over multiple reporting cycles;

16. *Also notes* that the Compliance Committee and the Executive Secretary have contacted the Party referred to in paragraph 15 above on numerous occasions, in accordance with decision BS-V/1, including by offering support in preparing its reports;

17. *Requests* the Party referred to in paragraph 15 above, as a matter of urgency, to submit its third national report;

18. *Encourages* the Party referred to in paragraph 15 above to seek the assistance of the Compliance Committee in accordance with decision BS-V/1, should it require support in preparing its reports.

9/2. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (Article 20)

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

Noting with concern that important activities requested in decision [CP-VIII/2](#) have not been undertaken,

1. *Welcomes* the continued efforts by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations in supporting the implementation of the Biosafety Clearing-House and carrying out related capacity-building activities, and *invites* them to continue doing so with a view to further strengthening the role of the Biosafety Clearing-House in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

2. *Welcomes* the implementation of the United Nations Environment Programme–Global Environment Facility “Project for Sustainable Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House” (BCH III Project), and *invites* the United Nations Environment Programme to continue facilitating regional collaboration and capacity-building on the use of the Biosafety Clearing-House;

3. *Decides* that the Informal Advisory Committee on the Biosafety Clearing-House will hold at least one meeting, and informal online discussions as needed, and report on the outcomes of its work to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its tenth meeting;

4. *Endorses* the joint modalities of operation for the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention, the Biosafety Clearing-House and the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House, contained in the annex to decision 14/25 of the Conference of the Parties, which are complementary to the modalities of operation of the Biosafety Clearing-House adopted in decision [BS-I/3](#);

5. *Recalls* decision CP-VIII/2, and *requests* the Executive Secretary, as a matter of priority, to act upon the requests in decision CP-VIII/2 and, in particular:

(a) To allocate adequate and specific resources, both human and financial, for the management, improvement and maintenance of the Biosafety Clearing-House;

(b) To complete the migration of the Biosafety Clearing-House to its new platform and to continue collaborating with other biosafety databases and platforms;

(c) To continue making improvements to the central portal of the Biosafety Clearing-House and following up on the recommendations of the Informal Advisory Committee on the Biosafety Clearing-House at its tenth meeting;

(d) To facilitate the development, in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme through the BCH III Project, of training materials, including online training, based on the new platform and user interface;

6. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to submit to the Executive Secretary views on the changes made as a result of the migration and improvements referred to in paragraph 5 above, particularly with regard to the procedure for registering information, the tools for the analysis of search results, and the graphical representations of data, and *requests* the Executive Secretary to take these views into account for the further improvement of the Biosafety Clearing-House and to submit a report for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its tenth meeting;

7. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to explore how the Bioland Tool for National Clearing-House Mechanisms could be used to facilitate the exchange of information related to biosafety.

9/3. Capacity-building (Article 22)

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

Recalling decisions [BS-VI/3](#) and [CP-VIII/3](#),

1. *Takes note* of the progress report on the implementation of the short-term action plan (2017-2020) to enhance and support capacity-building for the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols;²

2. *Also takes note* of the status of implementation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2012-2020);³

3. *Urges* Parties, for the remaining period of the Framework and Action Plan, to prioritize and focus on, as appropriate, 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, and *takes note* of the importance of biosafety mainstreaming and sharing of information and experience for further strengthening national biosafety frameworks in the remaining period of the Framework and Action Plan and beyond;

4. *Also urges* Parties to prioritize, as appropriate, capacity-building activities on liability and redress as set out under focal area 4 of the Framework and Action Plan, in the remaining period of the Framework and Action Plan, in view of the recent entry into force of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress;

5. *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;

6. *Takes note* of the outcomes of the twelfth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building on Biosafety, *acknowledges* the need for a specific action plan for capacity-building for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol that is aligned with the specific follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and complementary to the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020 and *welcomes* the indicative schedule of activities for the development of the specific action plan contained in the annex to the present decision;

7. *Takes note* of decision 14/24, in which the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to commission a study, subject to the availability of resources, to provide an information base for the preparation of a long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020, *welcomes* the terms of reference for the study annexed to that decision, and *requests* that aspects relevant to the Cartagena Protocol be considered in the study;

8. *Invites* Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations to provide the Executive Secretary with views and suggestions on the possible elements of the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020 as well as possible elements of a specific action plan for capacity-building on biosafety, covering the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol;

9. *Also invites* Parties, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations to participate in the consultative workshops and online discussion forums on the draft long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020, in conjunction with the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

² The updated report is contained in information document CBD/COP/14/INF/10.

³ CBD/CP/MOP/9/3, sect. II.

10. *Requests* the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety⁴ at its thirteenth meeting to contribute to the development of (a) the draft action plan for capacity-building for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol and (b) the draft long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020, as appropriate, and, at its fourteenth meeting, to review the final draft of the action plan for capacity-building on biosafety, taking into account information provided in the fourth national reports under the Cartagena Protocol;

11. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To compile views and suggestions from Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations referred to in paragraph 8 above;

(b) To ensure an adequate level of participation of biosafety experts, including those with expertise on the Supplementary Protocol, during consultations throughout the development of the strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020;

(c) To submit (i) a draft action plan for capacity-building for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol and (ii) a draft long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020,⁵ for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting and for subsequent consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its tenth meeting;

12. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources and in collaboration with relevant organizations, to facilitate and support implementation of the priority capacity-building activities for supporting the implementation of the Protocol contained in the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2012-2020), as contained in annex I to decision BS-VI/3, and in accordance with 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

INDICATIVE SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

The process for preparing a specific action plan for capacity-building for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol that is aligned with the specific follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and complementary to the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020 will include the following activities, to be aligned with the timetable for the development of a follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020:

<i>Activity/Task</i>	<i>Timeframe</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
1. Invitation to Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations to the Cartagena Protocol to provide views and suggestions on possible elements of a specific action plan for capacity-building on biosafety, covering the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol, and compilation of this information by the Secretariat	Dec 2018 - Feb 2019	Secretariat; Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations

⁴ Formerly known as the Liaison Group on Capacity Building.

⁵ See decision 14/24, para. 1(d).

<i>Activity/Task</i>	<i>Timeframe</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
2. Contribution from the Liaison Group to the development of the draft action plan for capacity-building for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol, taking into account views and suggestions provided by Parties	Mar-Sept 2019	Liaison Group; Secretariat
3. Preparation of a draft action plan for capacity-building for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol	Oct-Dec 2019	Secretariat
4. Review of the draft action plan for capacity-building on biosafety by the Liaison Group, taking into account information provided in the fourth national reports under the Cartagena Protocol	Feb-Mar 2020	Liaison Group
5. Notification inviting views on the final draft action plan for capacity-building for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol and compilation of views by the Secretariat	Apr-May 2020	Secretariat; Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations
6. Consideration of the final draft action plan for capacity-building for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting	June 2020	Subsidiary Body on Implementation, third meeting
7. Consideration of the draft action plan by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for possible adoption, taking into account the recommendation of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation	October 2020	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, tenth meeting

9/4. Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources (Article 28)

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

1. *Urges* eligible Parties to prioritize biosafety projects during the programming of their national allocations under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) within the framework of the seventh replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, taking into account their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020,⁶ and the guidance of the Conference of the Parties to the financial mechanism;

2. *Recommends* that the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to support for the implementation of the Protocol and taking into account the recommendations of the Compliance Committee,⁷ invite the Global Environment Facility to continue making funds available:

(a) To assist eligible Parties that have not yet done so in fully putting in place measures to implement the Protocol;

(b) To support eligible Parties in fulfilling their reporting obligations under the Protocol, including the submission of fourth national reports;

(c) To support Parties in implementing compliance action plans regarding the achievement of compliance with the Protocol;

3. *Urges* eligible Parties to engage proactively with the Global Environment Facility, including through coordination with their operational focal point for the Global Environment Facility, to ensure that they are able to access available funds for biosafety;

4. *Welcomes* the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and *expresses its appreciation* to the countries that contributed to the seventh replenishment;

5. *Encourages* Parties to cooperate at the regional and subregional levels, and to request support from the Global Environment Facility for joint projects, in order to maximize synergies and opportunities for cost-effective sharing of resources, information, experiences and expertise.

⁶ Decision BS-V/16, annex I.

⁷ See CBD/CP/MOP/9/2.

9/5. Monitoring and reporting (Article 33)

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

Recalling decision [CP-VIII/14](#), in which the Executive Secretary was requested 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, established in decision [BS-VI/15](#),

Welcoming the review by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its second meeting of the draft revised format for the fourth national report, as proposed by the Executive Secretary,⁸

Recognizing the importance of improving the alignment of national reporting under the Convention and its Protocols and of enhancing synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions and the Rio conventions as well as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development⁹ and reporting tools for the Sustainable Development Goals, and *noting* the progress made thus far in this respect,

1. *Welcomes* the additional third national reports submitted, and *urges* the Parties that have not yet submitted their third national report to do so as soon as possible;¹⁰

2. *Adopts* the reporting format annexed hereto, and *requests* Parties to use it for the fourth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

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

4. *Encourages* Parties to respond to all questions in the reporting format, and stresses the importance of the timely submission of fourth national reports in order to facilitate the fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020;¹¹

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

- (a) In an official language of the United Nations;
- (b) Twelve months prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, which will consider the report;
- (c) Preferably online through the Biosafety Clearing-House, or offline using the appropriate form that will be made available by the Secretariat for this purpose, duly signed by the national focal point for the Cartagena Protocol;

6. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue making available, in the online reporting tool, the option to view and select the answers provided in the previous national report submitted by the Party concerned;

7. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to continue to facilitate the offline submission of national reports;

⁸ See [CBD/SBI/2/22](#), sect. I, recommendation 2/13.

⁹ General Assembly resolution 70/1 of 25 September 2015.

¹⁰ Angola, Azerbaijan, Belize, Cabo Verde, Djibouti, Jordan, Libya, Montenegro, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Seychelles, State of Palestine and Syrian Arab Republic.

¹¹ Decision [BS-V/16](#), annex I.

8. *Recommends* to the Conference of the Parties, in adopting guidance to the financial mechanism, that it invite the Global Environment Facility to make available, in a timely manner, financial resources to eligible Parties to facilitate the preparation and submission of their fourth national reports under the Protocol;

9. *Accepts* the invitation of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, contained in decision 14/27, and *decides* to have a synchronized national reporting cycle commencing in 2023.

Annex

**UPDATED DRAFT FORMAT FOR THE FOURTH NATIONAL REPORT UNDER THE
CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY**

Origin of the report

1. **Country:** [**Type your text here**]

Contact person submitting the report

2. **Name:** [**Type your text here**]

3. **Title:** [**Type your text here**]

4. **Organization:** [**Type your text here**]

5. **Mailing address:** [**Type your text here**]

6. **Telephone:** [**Type your text here**]

7. **Fax:** [**Type your text here**]

8. **E-mail:** [**Type your text here**]

9. **Organizations/stakeholders who were consulted or participated in the preparation of this report:** [**Type your text here**]

Submission

10. **Date of submission:** [**day / month / year**]

11. **Time period covered by this report:** **From [month / year] to [month / year]**

Signature of the reporting officer¹²

¹² This document is a protected form in MS Word format to enable further processing of the information contained therein by the CBD Secretariat. Only text entries and checkboxes may be changed. Once you finish filling in the form, please save it and print this first page for signature. This form is also available in the BCH for electronic submission at: [LINK TO BE ADDED]

IMPORTANT: To facilitate the analysis of the information contained in this report, it is recommended that Parties submit the report online through the Biosafety Clearing-House or as an attachment to an e-mail in MS Word format, together with a scanned copy of the signed first 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.

20. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 2 in your country: [Type your text here]	
Article 5 – Pharmaceuticals	
21. Does your country regulate the transboundary movement, handling or use of living modified organisms (LMOs) which are pharmaceuticals to humans?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No
22. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 5 in your country: [Type your text here]	
Article 6 – Transit and contained use	
23. Does your country regulate the transit of LMOs?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No
24. Does your country regulate the contained use of LMOs?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
25. Has your country taken a decision concerning the import of LMOs for contained use?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
26. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 6 in your country: [Type your text here]	

Articles 7 to 10: Advance informed agreement (AIA) and intentional introduction of LMOs into the environment	
27. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No
28. When acting as the Party of export, has your country established legal requirements for the accuracy of information contained in the notification provided by the exporter?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (Party currently not exporting LMOs)
29. In the current reporting period, has your country received a notification regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

environment?	
30. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 29, did the notification(s) contain complete information (at a minimum the information specified in Annex I to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, always <input type="checkbox"/> In some cases only <input type="checkbox"/> No
31. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 29, has your country acknowledged receipt of the notification(s) to the notifier within ninety days of receipt?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, always <input type="checkbox"/> In some cases only <input type="checkbox"/> No
32. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 29, has your country informed of its decision(s): a. The notifier? b. The Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, always <input type="checkbox"/> In some cases only <input type="checkbox"/> No <hr/> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, always <input type="checkbox"/> In some cases only <input type="checkbox"/> No
33. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
34. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 33, how many LMOs has your country approved for import for intentional introduction into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more
35. If you answered <i>under question 34 that LMOs were approved</i> , have all these LMOs actually been imported into your country?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, always <input type="checkbox"/> In some cases only <input type="checkbox"/> No
36. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 33, what percentage of your country's decisions fall into the following categories?	<input type="checkbox"/> [%] Approval of the import/use of the LMO(s) without conditions <input type="checkbox"/> [%] Approval of the import/use of the LMO(s) with conditions <input type="checkbox"/> [%] Prohibition of the import/use of the LMO(s) <input type="checkbox"/> [%] Request for additional relevant information <input type="checkbox"/> [%] Inform the notifier that the period for communicating the decision has been extended

<p>37. If you answered <i>under question 36</i> that your country has taken a decision to <i>approve the import with conditions</i> or to <i>prohibit the import</i>, were the reasons provided?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, always <input type="checkbox"/> In some cases only <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>38. Here you may 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: [Type your text here]</p>	
<p>Article 11 – Procedure for living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (LMOs-FFP)</p>	
<p>39. 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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>40. 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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>41. In the current reporting period, how many decisions has your country taken <u>regarding domestic use</u>, including placing on the market, of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more</p>
<p>42. 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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>43. In the current reporting period, how many decisions has your country taken <u>regarding the import</u> of LMOs for direct use as food or feed, or for processing?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more</p>
<p>44. Here you may 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: [Type your text here]</p>	

54. In the current reporting period, has your country applied the simplified procedure?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
55. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 54, for how many LMOs has your country applied the simplified procedure?	<input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more
56. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 54, has your country informed the Parties through the BCH of the cases where the simplified procedure was applied?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, always <input type="checkbox"/> In some cases only <input type="checkbox"/> No
57. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 13 in your country: [Type your text here]	
Article 14 – Bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements and arrangements	
58. How many bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements relevant to biosafety has your country established with other Parties/non-Parties?	<input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more
59. If you answered <i>under question 58 that agreements or arrangements were established</i> , please provide a brief description of their scope and objective: [Type your text here]	
60. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 14 in your country: [Type your text here]	
Articles 15 & 16 – Risk assessment and risk management	
61. Does the domestic regulatory framework of your country require risk assessments of LMOs to be conducted?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
62. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 61, with regard to which LMOs does the requirement apply (select all that apply)?	<input type="checkbox"/> For imports of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment <input type="checkbox"/> For imports of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> For imports of LMOs for contained use <input type="checkbox"/> Other: [Please specify]
63. Has your country established a mechanism to conduct risk assessments prior to taking	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

<p>decisions regarding LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>64. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 63, does the mechanism include procedures to identify and/or train national experts to conduct risk assessments?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p><i>Capacity-building in risk assessment or risk management</i></p>	
<p>65. How many people in your country have been trained in risk assessment, risk management and monitoring of LMOs?</p> <p>a. Risk assessment:</p> <p>b. Risk management:</p> <p>c. Monitoring:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 to 49 <input type="checkbox"/> 50 to 99 <input type="checkbox"/> 100 or more</p> <p><i>Is this number adequate:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i></p> <hr/> <p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 to 49 <input type="checkbox"/> 50 to 99 <input type="checkbox"/> 100 or more</p> <p><i>Is this number adequate:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i></p> <hr/> <p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 to 49 <input type="checkbox"/> 50 to 99 <input type="checkbox"/> 100 or more</p> <p><i>Is this number adequate:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i></p>
<p>66. Is your country using training material and/or technical guidance for training in risk assessment and risk management of LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>67. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 66, is your country using the “Manual on Risk Assessment of LMOs” (developed by the CBD Secretariat) for training in risk assessment?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>68. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 66, is your country using the “Guidance on Risk Assessment of LMOs” (developed by the</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

<p>Online Forum and the AHTEG on Risk Assessment and Risk Management) for training in risk assessment?</p>	
<p>69. Does your country have specific needs for further guidance on specific topics of risk assessment of LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>70. 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?</p> <p>a. Detect:</p> <p>b. Identify:</p> <p>c. Assess the risk:</p> <p>d. Monitor:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <hr/> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <hr/> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <hr/> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p><i>Conducting risk assessment or risk management</i></p>	
<p>71. Has your country adopted or used any guidance documents for the purpose of conducting risk assessment or risk management, or for evaluating risk assessment reports submitted by notifiers?</p> <p>a. Risk assessment:</p> <p>b. Risk management:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <hr/> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>72. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 71, 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) for conducting risk assessment or risk management, or for evaluating risk assessment reports submitted by notifiers?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>73. Has your country adopted common approaches or methodologies to risk assessment in coordination with other countries?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>74. Has your country cooperated with other Parties with a view to identifying LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects on</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

<p>the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity?</p>	
<p>75. 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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>76. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 75, how many risk assessments were conducted?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 to 49 <input type="checkbox"/> 50 to 99 <input type="checkbox"/> More than 100</p>
<p>77. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 75, please indicate the scope of the risk assessments (select all that apply):</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> LMOs for contained use (in accordance with Article 3) <input type="checkbox"/> LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment for experimental testing or field trials <input type="checkbox"/> LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment for commercial purposes <input type="checkbox"/> LMOs for direct use as food <input type="checkbox"/> LMOs for direct use as feed <input type="checkbox"/> LMOs for processing <input type="checkbox"/> Other: [Please specify]</p>
<p>78. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 75, 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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, always <input type="checkbox"/> In some cases only <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>79. Has your country established appropriate mechanisms, measures and strategies to regulate and manage risks identified in the risk assessment of LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>80. 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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>81. 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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

[Type your text here]

Article 18 – Handling, transport, packaging and identification	
<p>91. Has your country taken measures to require that <i>LMOs that are subject to transboundary movement</i> are handled, packaged and transported under conditions of safety, taking into account relevant international rules and standards?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>92. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying LMOs-FFP, <i>in cases where the identity of the LMOs is not known</i>, clearly identifies that they <i>may contain LMOs</i> and are not intended for intentional introduction into the environment, as well as a contact point for further information?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>93. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying LMOs-FFP, <i>in cases where the identity of the LMOs is known</i>, clearly identifies that they <i>contain LMOs</i> and are not intended for intentional introduction into the environment, as well as a contact point for further information?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>94. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question(s) 91, 92 and/or 93, what type of documentation accompanying LMOs does your country require?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Documentation specific for LMOs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> As part of other documentation (not specific for LMOs)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: [Please specify]</p>
<p>95. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying <i>LMOs that are destined for contained use</i> clearly identifies them as <i>LMOs</i> and specifies any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information, including the name and address of the individual and institution to whom the LMO are consigned?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>96. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 95, what type of documentation does your country require for the identification of LMOs that are destined for contained use?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Documentation specific for LMOs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> As part of other documentation (not specific for LMOs)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: [Please specify]</p>
<p>97. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying <i>LMOs that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment of the Party of import</i>, clearly identifies them as <i>living modified</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

<p><i>organisms</i>; 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 this Protocol applicable to the exporter?</p>	
<p>98. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 97, what type of documentation does your country require for the identification of LMOs that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Documentation specific for LMOs <input type="checkbox"/> As part of other documentation (not specific for LMOs) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: [Please specify]</p>
<p>99. Does your country have available any guidance for the purpose of ensuring the safe handling, transport, and packaging of living modified organisms?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>100. Does your country have the capacity to enforce the requirements of identification and documentation of LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>101. How many customs officers in your country have received training in the identification of LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 to 49 <input type="checkbox"/> 50 to 99 <input type="checkbox"/> 100 or more</p> <p><i>Is this number adequate:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i></p>
<p>102. Has your country established procedures for the sampling and detection of LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>103. How many laboratory personnel in your country have received training in detection of LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 to 49 <input type="checkbox"/> 50 to 99 <input type="checkbox"/> 100 or more</p> <p><i>Is this number adequate:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i></p>
<p>104. Does your country have reliable access to laboratory facilities for the detection of LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

advance informed agreement procedure (Article 20, paragraph 3 (a))	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information not available
c. Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Article 14, paragraph 2, and Article 20, paragraph 3 (b))	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> 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))	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information not available
e. Decisions by a Party regarding transit of LMOs (Article 6, paragraph 1)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information not available
f. Decisions by a Party regarding import of LMOs for contained use (Article 6, paragraph 2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information not available
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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information not available
h. Information concerning cases of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25, paragraph 3)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH

	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information not available
i. Decisions regarding the importation of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment (Article 10, paragraph 3)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information not available
j. Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14, paragraph 4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information not available
n. Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12, paragraph 1)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but only partially available in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information not available
o. Cases where intentional transboundary movement may take place at the same time as the movement is notified to the Party of	<input type="checkbox"/> Information available and in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Information available but not in the BCH

129. In the reporting period, has your country initiated a process to access funds from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for building capacity in biosafety?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No
130. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 129, how would you characterize the process?	<input type="checkbox"/> Very easy <input type="checkbox"/> Easy <input type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Difficult <input type="checkbox"/> Very difficult
131. In the current reporting period, has your country undertaken activities for the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No
132. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 131, in which of the following areas were these activities undertaken (select all that apply)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Institutional capacity and human resources <input type="checkbox"/> Integration of biosafety in cross-sectoral and sectoral legislation, policies and institutions (mainstreaming biosafety) <input type="checkbox"/> Risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise <input type="checkbox"/> Risk management <input type="checkbox"/> Public awareness, participation and education in biosafety <input type="checkbox"/> Information exchange and data management, including participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House <input type="checkbox"/> Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration at subregional, regional and international levels <input type="checkbox"/> Technology transfer <input type="checkbox"/> Identification of LMOs, including their detection <input type="checkbox"/> Socioeconomic considerations <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation of the documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol <input type="checkbox"/> Handling of confidential information <input type="checkbox"/> Measures to address unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs <input type="checkbox"/> Scientific biosafety research relating to LMOs <input type="checkbox"/> Taking into account risks to human health <input type="checkbox"/> Liability and redress <input type="checkbox"/> Other: [Please specify]
133. In the current reporting period, has your country carried out a capacity-building needs assessment?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
134. Does your country still have capacity-building	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

<p>140. In the current reporting period, has your country cooperated with other States and international bodies in relation to public awareness, education and participation?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>141. Has your country established a mechanism to ensure public access to information on LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>142. Does your country have in place a national communication strategy on biosafety?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>143. Does your country have any awareness and outreach programmes on biosafety?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>144. Does your country currently have a national biosafety website?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>145. How many academic institutions in your country are offering biosafety education and training courses and programmes?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more</p> <p><i>Is this number adequate:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>146. How many educational materials and/or online modules on biosafety are available and accessible to the public in your country?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 to 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 to 24 <input type="checkbox"/> 25 to 99 <input type="checkbox"/> 100 or more</p> <p><i>Is this number adequate:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>147. Has your country established a mechanism to consult the public in the decision-making process regarding LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>148. Has your country informed the public about existing modalities for public participation in the decision-making process regarding LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to some extent: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

172. Which instruments are in place for the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol?	<input type="checkbox"/> One or more national laws: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> One or more national regulations: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> One or more sets of guidelines: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No instruments are in place
173. Does your country have administrative or legal instruments that require response measures to be taken: a. In case of damage resulting from LMOs? b. In case there is sufficient likelihood that damage will result if response measures are not taken?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
174. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 173a, do these instruments impose requirements on an operator (select all that apply)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the operator must inform the competent authority of the damage <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the operator must evaluate the damage <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the operator must take response measures <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, other requirements: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No
175. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 173a, do these instruments require the operator to take response measures to avoid damage?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
176. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 173a or 173b, do these instruments provide for a definition of “operator”?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
177. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 176, which of the following could be an ‘operator’ (select all that apply)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Permit holder <input type="checkbox"/> Person who placed the LMO on the market <input type="checkbox"/> Developer <input type="checkbox"/> Producer <input type="checkbox"/> Notifier <input type="checkbox"/> Exporter <input type="checkbox"/> Importer <input type="checkbox"/> Carrier <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier <input type="checkbox"/> Other: [Please specify]
178. Has a competent authority been identified for carrying out the functions set out in the Supplementary Protocol?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes: [Please specify] <input type="checkbox"/> No

<p>179. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 178, what measures may the competent authority take (select all that apply)?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Identify the operator that caused the damage</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluate the damage</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Determine response measures to be taken by operator</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Implement response measures</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Recover costs and expenses of the evaluation of the damage and the implementation of any response measures from the operator</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: [Please specify]</p>
<p>180. Does your country have measures in place to provide for financial security for damage resulting from LMOs?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>181. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 180, what type of financial security measures are in place (select all that apply)?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Requirement to provide evidence for secure source of funding</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory insurance</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Government schemes, including funds</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: [Please specify]</p>
<p>182. 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)?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, in a civil liability instrument</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, in court rulings</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, in other instruments: [Please specify]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>183. Have there been any occurrences of damage resulting from LMOs in your country?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes: [Please specify]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>184. If you answered <i>Yes</i> to question 183, have response measures been taken?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes: [Please specify]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>185. Here you may provide further details on any activities undertaken in your country towards the implementation of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress:</p> <p>[Type your text here]</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Other information</p>	
<p>186. 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.</p> <p>[Type your text here]</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Comments on reporting format</p>	
<p>187. Please use this field to provide any other information on difficulties that you have encountered in filling in this report.</p> <p>[Type your text here]</p>	

9/6. Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol (Article 35)

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

Recalling decision [BS-V/16](#), adopting the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020,

1. *Reiterates* its invitation to Parties, for the remaining period of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020, to consider prioritizing the operational objectives relating to the development of biosafety legislation, risk assessment, detection and identification of living modified organisms, and public awareness in view of their critical importance in facilitating the implementation of the Protocol;

2. *Decides* that the fourth assessment and review of the Cartagena Protocol will be combined with the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol for the period 2011-2020;

3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To continue making improvements to the online national report analyser tool to facilitate the compilation, aggregation and analysis of the data in the fourth national reports and other sources against related baseline data that was obtained during the second national reporting cycle;

(b) To analyse and synthesize information on the implementation of the Protocol using, inter alia, the fourth national reports as a primary source, the Biosafety Clearing-House and experience from capacity-building projects and the Compliance Committee, where appropriate, to facilitate the fourth assessment and review of the Protocol in conjunction with the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020, and make this information available to the Liaison Group and, as appropriate, the Compliance Committee;

4. *Requests* the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Compliance Committee, working in a complementary and non-duplicative manner, to contribute to 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, and to submit their conclusions for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation;

5. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting to consider the information provided and conclusions reached by the Liaison Group and the Compliance Committee, and to submit its findings and recommendations to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its tenth meeting with a view to facilitating 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.

9/7. Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020

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

1. *Takes note* of the proposed preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and *welcomes* decision 14/34 of the Conference of the Parties;

2. *Stresses* the importance of including biosafety in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as well as the necessity of developing a specific Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as a follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020;

3. *Also notes* the importance of the active involvement of biosafety experts, including those with expertise on the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, in the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

4. *Invites* Parties to participate in the process for developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

5. *Decides* to develop a specific Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety post-2020 that is anchored in and complementary to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and *requests* the Executive Secretary to facilitate the development of its elements;

6. *Also decides* that the specific Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol post-2020 will: (a) be developed as an implementation tool; (b) reflect the elements of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol for the period 2011-2020 that are still relevant; (c) include new elements reflecting lessons learned and new developments relevant to biosafety; (d) ensure sufficient flexibility to account for developments during the implementation period; and (e) comprise indicators that are simple and easily measurable to facilitate the review of progress in the implementation of the Protocol;

7. *Further decides* to expand the mandate and scope of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety, as outlined in the annex, include specific expertise on practical experience in implementing the Protocol and on biosafety issues, taking into account geographical representation and diverging views, and rename it “Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety”;

8. *Requests* the Liaison Group to contribute to the development of the relevant elements of the biosafety component in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, in consultation with the co-chairs of the Open-ended Working Group,¹⁵ and to the specific follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020 that is anchored in and complementary to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

9. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To facilitate and support the inclusion of the biosafety component in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(b) To work with the co-chairs of the Liaison Group and of the Open-ended Working Group to develop clear complementary timelines with regard to the contribution of the Parties to the Protocol, on the relevant elements on biosafety for the post 2020 global biodiversity framework;

(c) To convene dedicated sessions to discuss biosafety matters during global and regional consultation workshop(s) referred to in decision 14/34;

¹⁵ Decision 14/34, annex.

(d) To facilitate the participation of an adequate number of biosafety experts, including those with expertise on the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, in the development of the relevant elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including in the relevant consultation workshop(s);

(e) To compile submissions by Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations that provide views on (i) the structure and content of the follow up to the current Strategic Plan of the Cartagena Protocol for the period 2011-2020, i.e. the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol post-2020, and (ii) the relevant elements of the biosafety component of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(f) To convene online discussions of the Liaison Group, as appropriate, to consider the submissions referred to in paragraph 9(e)(ii) above to provide input to the development of the relevant elements of the biosafety component in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework;

(g) To prepare a draft of the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety post-2020 on the basis of the submissions referred to in paragraph 9(e)(i) above;

(h) To convene open-ended online discussions of Parties and other stakeholders on the draft of the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety post-2020 referred to in paragraph 9(g) above;

(i) To convene a face-to-face meeting of the Liaison Group, to be held in 2019, to (i) prepare a draft of the biosafety component in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with regard to issues related to the Cartagena Protocol, and (ii) review the draft of the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety post-2020 referred to in paragraph 9(g) above;

(j) To conduct a peer-review by Parties to the Cartagena Protocol of the draft of the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety post-2020;

(k) To submit the final draft of the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety post-2020 for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting;

10. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting to review a draft of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety post-2020 and to prepare a recommendation for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its tenth meeting.

Annex

**TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE LIAISON GROUP ON THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL
ON BIOSAFETY**

1. The Liaison Group shall provide the Executive Secretary with expert advice on: (a) ways and means to enhance the coordination and effective implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; and (b) overall strategic approaches as well as conceptual and practical operational measures for enhancing coordination of activities under the Protocol, including capacity-building initiatives, among other things.

2. Members of the Liaison Group shall be selected on the basis of their demonstrated expertise and experience with regard to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, taking into account geographical representation, gender balance, and a fair representation of relevant stakeholders.

9/8. Review of experience in holding concurrently meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol

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

Recalling decisions [BS-VII/9](#) and [CP-VIII/10](#),

Having reviewed the experience in holding concurrently meetings of the Conference of the Parties, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, using the criteria determined in decision CP-VIII/10, and taking into account the views of Parties, observers and participants at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, and through the surveys conducted after the meetings,

Recognizing that a further review will be undertaken at the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol,

1. *Notes with satisfaction that the concurrent meetings have allowed for increased integration among the Convention and its Protocols, and improved consultations, coordination and synergies among the respective national focal points;*

2. *Notes that most of the criteria were considered as being met or partially met, and that further improvements in the functioning of the concurrent meetings are desirable, in particular to improve the outcomes and effectiveness of the meetings of the Parties to the Protocols;*

3. *Reiterates the importance of ensuring 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 countries with economies in transition, in the concurrent meetings, and highlights, in this respect, the importance, in particular, of ensuring adequate participation of representatives in meetings of the Protocols by making funding available for such participation, including in intersessional meetings;*

4. *Requests the Executive Secretary to further develop the preliminary review of the experience in concurrent meetings, using the criteria referred to in decision CP-VIII/10, on the basis of the experience gained from the concurrent meetings of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting;*

5. *Requests the Bureau and the Executive Secretary, when finalizing the proposed organization of work for the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, to take into account the present decision, the information contained in the note by the Executive Secretary¹⁶ and the experience gained from the concurrent meetings of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the*

¹⁶ [CBD/SBI/2/16](#) and [Add.1](#).

Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol.

9/9. Enhancing integration under the Convention and its Protocols with respect to biosafety-related provisions

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

Recalling decision XIII/26 of the Conference of the Parties regarding possible ways and means to promote integrated approaches to issues at the interface between the biosafety-related provisions of the Convention and the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol,

Takes note of the proposed ways and means for enhanced integration, and *welcomes* decision 14/31 of the Conference of the Parties.

9/10. Procedure for avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in expert groups

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

Recognizing the critical importance of taking decisions on the basis of the best available expert advice,

Recognizing also the need to avoid or manage, in a transparent manner, conflicts of interest by members of expert groups established from time to time to develop recommendations,

1. *Approves* the Procedure for Avoiding or Managing Conflicts of Interest in Expert Groups contained in the annex to decision 14/33;

2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to ensure the implementation, mutatis mutandis, of the Procedure for Avoiding or Managing Conflicts of Interest in Expert Groups with respect to the work of technical expert groups under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, in consultation with the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice or the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties, when acting as the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, as appropriate;

3. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to prepare a report on: (a) the implementation of the Procedure; and (b) relevant developments in avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in other multilateral environmental agreements, intergovernmental initiatives or organizations, and, if appropriate, propose updates and amendments to the current Procedure for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at a meeting held prior to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol;

4. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation to consider the report referred to in paragraph 3 above and to submit recommendations, as appropriate, for consideration by the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.

9/11. 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. *Acknowledges* that the lack of fully operational biosafety frameworks may impact the capacity of some Parties to implement provisions relating to Article 17;
2. *Takes note* of the draft training manual on detection and identification of living modified organisms¹⁷ as a tool for building capacities in this field;
3. *Encourages* Parties, in the context of Article 17, and in accordance with national legislation, to require the responsible operator¹⁸ to provide information or access, direct or indirect, to reference materials to enable the laboratory work on detection and identification of such organisms for regulatory purposes;
4. *Encourages* Parties and *invites* other Governments and relevant organizations to make funds available for training of laboratory personnel in the field of detection and identification of living modified organisms, and to continue participating in regional and subregional networks on the detection and identification of living modified organisms;
5. *Invites* Parties to submit to the Executive Secretary information on (a) their capacities and needs with regard to detection and identification of living modified organisms and (b) a list of laboratories, including information on the specific activities carried out by such laboratories;
6. *Invites* the Global Environment Facility and other relevant funding agencies to provide funds for regional projects, including projects aimed at building scientific capacity that could support countries' actions towards detection and identification of living modified organisms, and in particular that could promote North-South and South-South sharing of experiences and lessons;
7. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:
 - (a) To continue collecting information relevant to the detection and identification of living modified organisms and making it available in a user-friendly manner through the Biosafety Clearing-House;
 - (b) To review and finalize the manual on detection and identification of living modified organisms, ensuring consistency in language and scope with Article 17 of the Cartagena Protocol;
 - (c) To synthesize the information provided by Parties in response to paragraph 5 above for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties at its tenth meeting, and to reflect the information in the capacity-building action plan for the post-2020 framework, as appropriate;
8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources:
 - (a) To continue facilitating online discussions of the Network of Laboratories for the Detection and Identification of Living Modified Organisms and face-to-face meetings, as appropriate;
 - (b) To continue efforts to collaborate with relevant organizations and to build the capacity of developing countries in relation to the detection and identification of living modified organisms in the context of Article 17, in particular by focusing on regions that have not yet benefited from recent capacity-building activities in this regard.

¹⁷ As contained in CBD/CP/MOP/9/8/Add.1.

¹⁸ "Operator" means any person in direct and indirect control of the living modified organism which could, as appropriate and as determined by domestic law, include, inter alia, the permit holder, person who placed the living modified organism on the market, developer, producer, notifier, exporter, importer, carrier or supplier.

9/12. 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,

Recalling decisions [BS-V/2](#), paragraph 1(a), and [BS-VII/2](#), paragraph 2(b),

Also recalling decision [CP-VIII/17](#),

1. *Takes note* of the assessment by the Compliance Committee of information submitted by Parties on the Biosafety Clearing-House as decisions under contained use;¹⁹

2. *Reminds* Parties that:

(a) Article 3, paragraph (b) of the Protocol sets out the definition of contained use, namely “any operation, undertaken within a facility, installation or other physical structure, which involves living modified organisms that are controlled by specific measures that effectively limit their contact with, and their impact on, the external environment”;

(b) Intentional introduction into the environment can include introduction both for experimental or for commercial purposes;

(c) A field trial, confined field trial or experimental introduction is to be regarded as intentional introduction into the environment when the conditions specified in Article 3, paragraph b, of the Protocol are not met;

3. *Also reminds* Parties of their obligation under Article 20, paragraph 3(d), and *encourages* other Governments to publish in the Biosafety Clearing-House their final decisions regarding the importation or release of living modified organisms;

4. *Encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to cooperate, share experiences and promote capacity development to support the implementation of specific measures for contained use that effectively limit the contact of living modified organisms with, and their impact on, the external environment, in accordance with Article 3, paragraph (b), of the Protocol.

¹⁹ See CBD/CP/MOP/9/2.

9/13. Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16)

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

Recalling decisions [BS-VII/12](#) and [XII/24](#) recommending a coordinated approach on the issue of synthetic biology,

Reaffirming decision XII/24 of the Conference of the Parties urging Parties and inviting other Governments to take a precautionary approach, in accordance with the preamble of the Convention and with Article 14, when addressing threats of significant reduction or loss of biological diversity posed by organisms, components and products resulting from synthetic biology, in accordance with domestic legislation and other relevant international obligations,

1. *Notes* the availability of numerous guidance documents and other resources to support the process of risk assessment, but *recognizes* the gaps and needs identified by some Parties;
2. *Recognizes* the divergence of views among Parties on whether or not additional guidance on specific topics of risk assessment is needed;
3. *Also recognizes* that, as there could be potential adverse effects arising from organisms containing engineered gene drives, before these organisms are considered for release into the environment, research and analysis are needed, and specific guidance may be useful, to support case-by-case risk assessment;
4. *Notes* the conclusions of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Synthetic Biology that, given the current uncertainties regarding engineered gene drives, the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples and local communities might be warranted when considering the possible release of organisms containing engineered gene drives that may impact their traditional knowledge, innovation, practices, livelihood and use of land and water;
5. *Calls for* broad international cooperation, knowledge sharing and capacity-building to support, inter alia, Parties in assessing the potential adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity from living modified fish and other living modified organisms produced through new developments in modern biotechnology, including living modified organisms developed through genome editing and living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives, taking into account risks to human health, the value of biodiversity to indigenous peoples and local communities, and relevant experiences of individual countries in performing risk assessment of such organisms in accordance with annex III of the Cartagena Protocol;
6. *Decides* to establish a process for the identification and prioritization of specific issues regarding risk assessment of living modified organisms for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol with a view to developing further guidance on risk assessment on the specific issues identified, taking into account annex I;
7. *Also decides* to consider, at its tenth meeting, whether additional guidance materials on risk assessment are needed for (a) living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives, and (b) living modified fish;
8. *Further decides* to establish an Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment, composed of experts selected in accordance with the consolidated modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice,²⁰ in accordance with the terms of reference contained in annex II;

²⁰ [Decision VIII/10](#), annex III.

9. *Decides* to extend the online forum on risk assessment and risk management in order to assist the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment;

10. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, and relevant organizations to submit to the Executive Secretary information relevant to the work of the online forum and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group;

11. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources:

(a) To commission a study informing the application of annex I to (i) living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives and (ii) living modified fish, to facilitate the process referred to in paragraph 6 above, and present it to the open-ended online forum and Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management;

(b) To collect and synthesize relevant information to facilitate the work of the online forum and the ad hoc technical expert group;

(c) To assist the lead moderator of the online forum in convening discussions and reporting on the results of the discussions;

(d) To convene a face-to-face meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment;

12. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice to make a recommendation as to whether additional guidance materials on risk assessment are needed for (a) living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives, and (b) living modified fish for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its tenth meeting.

Annex I

Identification and prioritization of specific issues of risk assessment of living modified organisms that may warrant consideration

The process for recommending specific issues of risk assessment for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety should include a structured analysis to evaluate whether the specific issues fulfil the following criteria:

(a) They are identified by Parties as priorities, taking into account the challenges to risk assessment, particularly for developing country Parties and countries with economies in transition;

(b) They fall within the scope and objective of the Cartagena Protocol;

(c) They pose challenges to existing risk assessment frameworks, guidance and methodologies, for example, if the issue at hand has been assessed with existing risk assessment frameworks but poses specific technical or methodological challenges that require further attention;

(d) The challenges in addressing the specific issue are clearly described;

and considering, inter alia:

(e) The specific issues concerning living modified organisms that:

(i) Have the potential to cause adverse effects on biodiversity, in particular those that are serious or irreversible, taking into account the urgent need to protect specific aspects of biodiversity, such as an endemic/rare species or a unique habitat or ecosystem, taking into account risks to human health and the value of biological diversity to indigenous peoples and local communities;

(ii) May be introduced into the environment either deliberately or accidentally;

- (iii) Have the potential to disseminate across national borders;
- (iv) Are already, or are likely to be, commercialized or in use somewhere in the world;

and consider a stock-taking exercise to determine if resources on similar issues have been developed by national, regional and international bodies and, if so, whether such resources may be revised or adapted to the objective of the Cartagena Protocol, as appropriate.

Annex II

Terms of reference for the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment

The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment, taking into account the work undertaken by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Synthetic Biology, shall:

- (a) Review the study referred to in paragraph 11(a) of decision CP-9/13, and perform an analysis on (i) living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives and (ii) living modified fish, according to annex I, and supported by the data in the study;
- (b) Consider the needs and priorities for further guidance and gaps in existing guidance identified by Parties in response to decision CP-VIII/12 with regard to specific topics of risk assessment and prepare an analysis;
- (c) Make recommendations on (i) the need for guidance to be developed on risk assessment of living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives and living modified fish, and (ii) any adjustments to annex I of decision CP-9/13;
- (d) Prepare a report for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice with a view to enabling the Subsidiary Body to prepare a recommendation for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its tenth meeting.

9/14. 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](#), [BS-VII/13](#) and [CP-VIII/13](#),

Recalling that, in accordance with Article 26, paragraph 1, Parties, in reaching a decision on import under the Protocol or under its domestic measures implementing the Protocol, may take into account, consistent with their international obligations, socio-economic considerations arising from the impact of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, especially with regard to the value of biological diversity to indigenous and local communities,

Acknowledging that nothing contained in the voluntary “Guidance on the Assessment of Socio-Economic Considerations in the Context of Article 26 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety” can be interpreted or used to support non-tariff barriers to trade, or to justify breaches of international human rights law obligations, in particular of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities,

Recognizing that trade and environment agreements should be mutually supportive with a view to achieving sustainable development,

Emphasizing that the Protocol shall not be interpreted as implying a change in the rights and obligations of a Party under any existing international agreements,

Understanding that the above recital is not intended to subordinate the Protocol to other international agreements,

Recalling that the Guidance is intended to be used on a voluntary basis,

1. *Takes note* of the “Guidance on the Assessment of Socio-Economic Considerations in the Context of Article 26 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety”,²¹

2. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and other stakeholders, as appropriate, to use and submit preliminary experiences using the voluntary Guidance, as well as examples of methodologies and applications of socio-economic considerations in the light of the elements of the voluntary Guidance, preferably in the form of case studies;

3. *Establishes* an online forum on socio-economic considerations through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

4. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to (a) compile the information submitted in response to paragraph 2 above, (b) organize moderated discussions of the online forum to comment on and add views to review the compilation of submissions, (c) select, in consultation with the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, two rapporteurs to summarize the work of the moderated online discussions and prepare a report;

5. *Extends* the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-economic Considerations to review the outcomes of the online forum in accordance with the terms of reference in the annex, and *requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to convene a face-to-face meeting of the Group;

6. *Decides* to consider, at its tenth meeting, the outcomes of the process outlined above.

²¹ As contained in CBD/CP/MOP/9/10, annex.

Annex

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE AD HOC TECHNICAL EXPERT GROUP ON
SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS**

The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-economic Considerations shall:

(a) Review the submissions in response to paragraph 2 of decision CP-9/14 and the outcomes of the moderated online discussions and use this information to supplement the voluntary Guidance, by indicating for which stage in the assessment process, as outlined in the voluntary Guidance, the information might be relevant;

(b) Based on this review, prepare a report on its work and submit it for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its tenth meeting.

9/15. 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 serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress,*²²

1. *Welcomes* the entry into force of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;
2. *Congratulates* those Parties that have deposited their instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the Supplementary Protocol and urges them to take the necessary steps for its implementation;
3. *Urges* all Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety that have not yet done so to deposit their instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the Supplementary Protocol as soon as possible;
4. *Welcomes* the activities undertaken to facilitate the entry into force and implementation of the Supplementary Protocol and the support provided by donors in this regard;
5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of funds from the Voluntary Trust Fund, to continue undertaking further awareness-raising and capacity-building activities and to provide support to Parties in implementing the Supplementary Protocol at the domestic level;
6. *Requests* Parties to the Supplementary Protocol to designate a competent authority to perform the functions set out in Article 5 of the Supplementary Protocol, and to make the contact information of its competent authority available on the Biosafety Clearing-House;
7. *Requests* Parties to the Supplementary Protocol and *invites* other Governments to report on their measures to implement the Supplementary Protocol by responding to the questions related to the Supplementary Protocol in the format for the fourth national report under the Cartagena Protocol, as contained in the annex to decision CP-9/5;
8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to undertake a comprehensive study, subject to the availability of funds from the Voluntary Trust Fund, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Supplementary Protocol at its next meeting, addressing:
 - (a) The modalities of financial security mechanisms;
 - (b) An assessment of the environmental, economic and social impacts of such mechanisms, in particular on developing countries;
 - (c) An identification of the appropriate entities to provide financial security;
9. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to create the appropriate common format in the Biosafety Clearing-House to enable Parties to share the contact information of their competent authorities pursuant to Article 5 of the Supplementary Protocol.

²² In accordance with article 14, paragraph 1, of the Supplementary Protocol and subject to paragraph 2 of Article 32 of the Convention, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol shall serve as the meeting of the Parties to the Supplementary Protocol. Consequently, the present decision has been taken by Parties to the Supplementary Protocol.

9/16. Programme of work and budget (Cartagena Protocol)

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

Recalling its decision [VIII/7](#), and decision [XIII/32](#) of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as decision [NP-2/13](#) of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing,

Also recalling decision [III/1](#), which specifies that budget proposals should be circulated 90 days before meetings of the Conference of the Parties,

Further recalling resolution 2/18 of the United Nations Environment Assembly on the relationship between the United Nations Environment Programme and the multilateral environmental agreements for which it provides the secretariat,

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;

2. *Also decides* to share all costs for Secretariat services among the Convention, the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya Protocol on a ratio of 74/15/11 for the biennium 2019-2020;

3. *Approves* a core (BG) programme budget for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety of 2,842,300 United States dollars for the year 2019 and of 2,984,300 United States dollars for the year 2020, representing 15 per cent of the integrated budget of 18,949,900 United States dollars for the year 2019 and 19,895,200 United States dollars for the year 2020 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 2019 and 2020 as contained in table 2 below;²³

5. *Acknowledges* the funding estimates for the Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities of the Cartagena Protocol for the period 2019-2020 included in table 3 of decision 14/37 of the Conference of the Parties;

6. *Decides* to apply, *mutatis mutandis*, paragraphs 3 to 5 and 7 to 50 of decision 14/37 of the Conference of the Parties.

²³ Refer to footnote in table 2. As per United Nations General Assembly resolution 70/245.

Table 1a. Integrated biennium budget for the Trust Funds of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols 2019-2020

	<i>2019 (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>	<i>2020 (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>	<i>Total (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>
A. Governing and subsidiary bodies	1 889.0	2 484.0	4 373.0
B. Executive direction and management	2 634.5	2 669.8	5 304.3
C. Programme of work	9 309.4	9 243.1	18 552.5
D. Administrative support	2 886.0	3 093.7	5 979.7
Subtotal	16 718.9	17 490.6	34 209.5
Programme support costs	2 173.5	2 273.8	4 447.2
Working Capital Reserve	56.6	130.7	187.4
Total	18 949.0	19 895.1	38 844.1
Cartagena Protocol share of the integrated budget (15%)	2 842.4	2 984.3	5 826.7
<u>Less:</u> Contribution from host country	(184.4)	(213.5)	(397.9)
<u>Less:</u> Use of reserves for extraordinary meetings	(127.1)	(94.9)	(222.0)
<u>Less:</u> Use of reserves from previous years	(129.5)	(129.5)	(259.0)
Net total (amount to be shared by Parties)	2 401.4	2 546.4	4 947.8
	<i>2019 (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>	<i>2020 (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>	<i>Total (Thousands of United States dollars)</i>
I. Programmes:			
Office of the Executive Secretary	3 534.0	3 444.8	6 978.8
ABS and BS Protocols	2 322.6	2 375.9	4 698.5
Science, Society and Sustainable Futures Division	3 912.3	3 909.0	7 821.3
Implementation Support Division	3 105.0	3 708.2	6 813.2
II. Administration, Finance and Conference Services	3 845.0	4 052.6	7 897.6
Subtotal	16 718.9	17 490.5	34 209.4
Programme support costs	2 173.4	2 273.9	4 447.2
III. Working Capital Reserve	56.6	130.8	187.5
Total	18 948.9	19 895.2	38 844.1
Cartagena Protocol share of the integrated budget (15%)	2 842.4	2 984.3	5 826.7
<u>Less:</u> Contribution from host country	(184.4)	(213.5)	(397.9)
<u>Less:</u> Use of reserves for extraordinary meetings	(127.1)	(94.9)	(222.0)
<u>Less:</u> Use of reserves from previous years	(129.5)	(129.5)	(259.0)
Net total (amount to be shared by Parties)	2 401.4	2 546.4	4 947.8

Table 1b. Integrated biennium budget for the Trust Funds of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Protocols 2019-2020 (by object of expenditure)

<i>Object of expenditure</i>	<i>2019</i>	<i>2020</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>(Thousands of United States dollars)</i>		
A. Staff costs	11 453.9	11 626.6	23 080.5
B. Bureau meetings	150.0	215.0	365.0
C. Travel on official business	400.0	400.0	800.0
D. Consultants/ Subcontractors	50.0	50.0	100.0
E. Public awareness material/communications	50.0	50.0	100.0
F. Temporary assistance/overtime	100.0	100.0	200.0
G. Training	5.0	5.0	10.0
H. Translation of CHM website/website projects	65.0	65.0	130.0
I. Meetings ^{1/2/3}	1 569.0	2 119.0	3 688.0
J. Expert meetings	170.0	150.0	320.0
K. Extraordinary meetings on post-2020 ^{4/}	750.0	560.0	1 310.0
L. Rent and associated costs ^{5/}	1 229.5	1 423.4	2 652.9
M. General operating expenses	726.6	726.6	1 453.2
Sub-total (I)	16 719.0	17 490.6	34 209.6
II Programme support costs (13%)	2 173.5	2 273.8	4 447.2
Sub-total (I + II)	18 892.4	19 764.4	38 656.8
III Working Capital Reserve	56.6	130.8	187.3
Grand Total (II + III)	18 949.0	19 895.1	38 844.1
Cartagena Protocol share of the integrated budget (15%)	2 842.3	2 984.3	5 826.6
<u>Less</u> contribution from host country ^{5/}	(184.4)	(213.5)	(397.9)
<u>Less</u> use of reserves for extraordinary meetings ^{4/}	(127.1)	(94.9)	(222.0)
<u>Less</u> use of reserves from previous years	(129.5)	(129.5)	(258.9)
Net total (amount to be shared by Parties)	2 401.3	2 546.4	4 947.7

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

- Eleventh meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions.
- Twenty-third and twenty-fourth meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific Technical and Technological Advice.
- Third meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.
- Fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention / Tenth meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol / Fourth meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol held concurrently.

2/ SBSTTA-23 (3 days), Art. 8(j)-11 (3 days) back-to-back in 2019. SBSTTA-24 (6days), SBI-3 (5 days) back-to-back in 2020.

3/ Budget for COP-15/COP-MOP 10 and COP-MOP 4 divided equally between both years of the biennium.

4/ Two stand-alone meetings of the Extraordinary meetings, 5 days each, plus 2 days extension for SBSTTA-23

5/ Indicative.

Table 2. Contributions to the Trust Fund for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the biennium 2019-2020²⁴

Party	Scale of assessments 2016-2018	Scale with 22% ceiling, no least developed country paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2019	Contribution due as of 1 January 2020	Total 2019- 2020
Afghanistan	0.006	0.009	209	221	430
Albania	0.008	0.012	278	295	573
Algeria	0.161	0.233	5 598	5 936	11 534
Angola	0.010	0.010	240	255	495
Antigua and Barbuda	0.002	0.003	70	74	143
Armenia	0.006	0.009	209	221	430
Austria	0.720	1.042	25 034	26 546	51 580
Azerbaijan	0.060	0.087	2 086	2 212	4 298
Bahamas	0.014	0.020	487	516	1 003
Bahrain	0.044	0.064	1 530	1 622	3 152
Bangladesh	0.010	0.010	240	255	495
Barbados	0.007	0.010	243	258	501
Belarus	0.056	0.081	1 947	2 065	4 012
Belgium	0.885	1.281	30 771	32 629	63 400
Belize	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Benin	0.003	0.004	104	111	215
Bhutan	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0.012	0.017	417	442	860
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.013	0.019	452	479	931
Botswana	0.014	0.020	487	516	1 003
Brazil	3.823	5.535	132 922	140 951	273 874
Bulgaria	0.045	0.065	1 565	1 659	3 224
Burkina Faso	0.004	0.006	139	147	287
Burundi	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Cabo Verde	0.001	0.001	35	37	72

²⁴ As per United Nations General Assembly resolution 70/245. A revised scale of assessments for the triennium will be applied, when released, to calculate assessed contributions for the biennium 2019-2020 (see <https://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2019/ntf-2019-016-budget-cp-en.pdf>).

Party	Scale of assessments 2016-2018	Scale with 22% ceiling, no least developed country paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2019	Contribution due as of 1 January 2020	Total 2019- 2020
Cambodia	0.004	0.006	139	147	287
Cameroon	0.010	0.014	348	369	716
Central African Republic	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Chad	0.005	0.007	174	184	358
China	7.921	11.469	275 406	292 042	567 448
Colombia	0.322	0.466	11 196	11 872	23 068
Comoros	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Congo	0.006	0.009	209	221	430
Costa Rica	0.047	0.068	1 634	1 733	3 367
Cote d'Ivoire	0.009	0.013	313	332	645
Croatia	0.099	0.143	3 442	3 650	7 092
Cuba	0.065	0.094	2 260	2 397	4 656
Cyprus	0.043	0.062	1 495	1 585	3 080
Czechia	0.344	0.498	11 961	12 683	24 644
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.005	0.007	174	184	358
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.008	0.010	240	255	495
Denmark	0.584	0.846	20 305	21 532	41 837
Djibouti	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Dominica	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Dominican Republic	0.046	0.067	1 599	1 696	3 295
Ecuador	0.067	0.097	2 330	2 470	4 800
Egypt	0.152	0.220	5 285	5 604	10 889
El Salvador	0.014	0.020	487	516	1 003
Eritrea	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Estonia	0.038	0.055	1 321	1 401	2 722
Eswatini	0.002	0.003	70	74	143
Ethiopia	0.010	0.010	240	255	495
European Union		2.500	60 033	63 659	123 692
Fiji	0.003	0.004	104	111	215
Finland	0.456	0.660	15 855	16 812	32 667

Party	Scale of assessments 2016-2018	Scale with 22% ceiling, no least developed country paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2019	Contribution due as of 1 January 2020	Total 2019- 2020
France	4.859	7.035	168 943	179 148	348 091
Gabon	0.017	0.025	591	627	1 218
Gambia	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Georgia	0.008	0.012	278	295	573
Germany	6.389	9.251	222 140	235 558	457 698
Ghana	0.016	0.023	556	590	1 146
Greece	0.471	0.682	16 376	17 365	33 742
Grenada	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Guatemala	0.028	0.041	974	1 032	2 006
Guinea	0.002	0.003	70	74	143
Guinea-Bissau	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Guyana	0.002	0.003	70	74	143
Honduras	0.008	0.012	278	295	573
Hungary	0.161	0.233	5 598	5 936	11 534
India	0.737	1.067	25 625	27 173	52 797
Indonesia	0.504	0.730	17 524	18 582	36 106
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.471	0.682	16 376	17 365	33 742
Iraq	0.129	0.187	4 485	4 756	9 241
Ireland	0.335	0.485	11 648	12 351	23 999
Italy	3.748	5.427	130 315	138 186	268 501
Jamaica	0.009	0.013	313	332	645
Japan	9.680	14.016	336 565	356 895	693 460
Jordan	0.020	0.029	695	737	1 433
Kazakhstan	0.191	0.277	6 641	7 042	13 683
Kenya	0.018	0.026	626	664	1 289
Kiribati	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Kuwait	0.285	0.413	9 909	10 508	20 417
Kyrgyzstan	0.002	0.003	70	74	143
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.003	0.004	104	111	215
Latvia	0.050	0.072	1 738	1 843	3 582

Party	Scale of assessments 2016-2018	Scale with 22% ceiling, no least developed country paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2019	Contribution due as of 1 January 2020	Total 2019- 2020
Lebanon	0.046	0.067	1 599	1 696	3 295
Lesotho	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Liberia	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Libya	0.125	0.181	4 346	4 609	8 955
Lithuania	0.072	0.104	2 503	2 655	5 158
Luxembourg	0.064	0.093	2 225	2 360	4 585
Madagascar	0.003	0.004	104	111	215
Malawi	0.002	0.003	70	74	143
Malaysia	0.322	0.466	11 196	11 872	23 068
Maldives	0.002	0.003	70	74	143
Mali	0.003	0.004	104	111	215
Malta	0.016	0.023	556	590	1 146
Marshall Islands	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Mauritania	0.002	0.003	70	74	143
Mauritius	0.012	0.017	417	442	860
Mexico	1.435	2.078	49 894	52 907	102 801
Mongolia	0.005	0.007	174	184	358
Montenegro	0.004	0.006	139	147	287
Morocco	0.054	0.078	1 878	1 991	3 868
Mozambique	0.004	0.006	139	147	287
Myanmar	0.010	0.010	240	255	495
Namibia	0.010	0.014	348	369	716
Nauru	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Netherlands	1.482	2.146	51 528	54 640	106 168
New Zealand	0.268	0.388	9 318	9 881	19 199
Nicaragua	0.004	0.006	139	147	287
Niger	0.002	0.003	70	74	143
Nigeria	0.209	0.303	7 267	7 706	14 972
Niue	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Norway	0.849	1.229	29 519	31 302	60 821
Oman	0.113	0.164	3 929	4 166	8 095
Pakistan	0.093	0.135	3 234	3 429	6 662

Party	Scale of assessments 2016-2018	Scale with 22% ceiling, no least developed country paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2019	Contribution due as of 1 January 2020	Total 2019- 2020
Palau	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Panama	0.034	0.049	1 182	1 254	2 436
Papua New Guinea	0.004	0.006	139	147	287
Paraguay	0.014	0.020	487	516	1 003
Peru	0.136	0.197	4 729	5 014	9 743
Philippines	0.165	0.239	5 737	6 083	11 820
Poland	0.841	1.218	29 241	31 007	60 248
Portugal	0.392	0.568	13 629	14 453	28 082
Qatar	0.269	0.389	9 353	9 918	19 271
Republic of Korea	2.039	2.952	70 894	75 177	146 071
Republic of Moldova	0.004	0.006	139	147	287
Romania	0.184	0.266	6 398	6 784	13 181
Rwanda	0.002	0.003	70	74	143
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Saint Lucia	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Samoa	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Saudi Arabia	1.146	1.659	39 845	42 252	82 098
Senegal	0.005	0.007	174	184	358
Serbia	0.032	0.046	1 113	1 180	2 292
Seychelles	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Slovakia	0.160	0.232	5 563	5 899	11 462
Slovenia	0.084	0.122	2 921	3 097	6 018
Solomon Islands	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Somalia	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
South Africa	0.364	0.527	12 656	13 420	26 076
Spain	2.443	3.537	84 941	90 072	175 013
Sri Lanka	0.031	0.045	1 078	1 143	2 221
State of Palestine	0.007	0.010	243	258	501
Sudan	0.010	0.010	240	255	495
Suriname	0.006	0.009	209	221	430

Party	Scale of assessments 2016-2018	Scale with 22% ceiling, no least developed country paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2019	Contribution due as of 1 January 2020	Total 2019- 2020
Sweden	0.956	1.384	33 239	35 247	68 486
Switzerland	1.140	1.651	39 637	42 031	81 668
Syrian Arab Republic	0.024	0.035	834	885	1 719
Tajikistan	0.004	0.006	139	147	287
Thailand	0.291	0.421	10 118	10 729	20 847
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.007	0.010	243	258	501
Togo	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Tonga	0.001	0.001	35	37	72
Trinidad and Tobago	0.034	0.049	1 182	1 254	2 436
Tunisia	0.028	0.041	974	1 032	2 006
Turkey	1.018	1.474	35 395	37 533	72 928
Turkmenistan	0.026	0.038	904	959	1 863
Uganda	0.009	0.010	240	255	495
Ukraine	0.103	0.149	3 581	3 798	7 379
United Arab Emirates	0.604	0.875	21 001	22 269	43 270
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4.463	6.462	155 174	164 548	319 722
United Republic of Tanzania	0.010	0.010	240	255	495
Uruguay	0.079	0.114	2 747	2 913	5 659
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	0.571	0.827	19 853	21 052	40 906
Viet Nam	0.058	0.084	2 017	2 138	4 155
Yemen	0.010	0.010	240	255	495
Zambia	0.007	0.010	243	258	501
Zimbabwe	0.004	0.006	139	147	287
Total	67.363	100	2 401 320	2 546 370	4 947 690

I. ACCOUNT OF PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

1. Following an offer from the Government of Egypt, which was welcomed by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in decision XIII/33, and in accordance with of Article 29, paragraph 6, of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol was held in Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt, from 17 to 29 November 2018, concurrently with the fourteenth 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 attended:

Afghanistan	Côte d'Ivoire	Italy
Albania	Democratic People's	Jamaica
Algeria	Republic of Korea	Japan
Angola	Democratic Republic of the	Jordan
Antigua and Barbuda	Congo	Kenya
Armenia	Denmark	Kiribati
Austria	Djibouti	Kuwait
Azerbaijan	Dominican Republic	Kyrgyzstan
Bahrain	Ecuador	Lao People's Democratic
Bangladesh	Egypt	Republic
Belarus	El Salvador	Latvia
Belgium	Eritrea	Lebanon
Belize	Estonia	Lesotho
Benin	Eswatini	Liberia
Bhutan	Ethiopia	Libya
Bolivia (Plurinational State	European Union	Lithuania
of)	Fiji	Luxembourg
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Finland	Madagascar
Botswana	France	Malawi
Brazil	Gabon	Malaysia
Bulgaria	Gambia (the)	Maldives
Burkina Faso	Georgia	Mali
Burundi	Germany	Malta
Cabo Verde	Ghana	Marshall Islands
Cambodia	Greece	Mauritania
Cameroon	Grenada	Mauritius
Central African Republic	Guatemala	Mexico
Chad	Guinea	Mongolia
China	Guinea-Bissau	Morocco
Colombia	Guyana	Mozambique
Comoros	Honduras	Myanmar
Congo	Hungary	Namibia
Costa Rica	India	Netherlands
Croatia	Indonesia	New Zealand
Cuba	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Nicaragua
Cyprus	Iraq	Niger
Czechia	Ireland	Nigeria

Norway	Saudi Arabia	Tonga
Oman	Senegal	Trinidad and Tobago
Palau	Serbia	Tunisia
Panama	Seychelles	Turkey
Papua New Guinea	Slovakia	Turkmenistan
Paraguay	Slovenia	Uganda
Peru	Solomon Islands	Ukraine
Philippines	Somalia	United Arab Emirates
Poland	South Africa	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Portugal	Spain	Ireland
Qatar	Sri Lanka	United Republic of Tanzania
Republic of Korea	State of Palestine	Uruguay
Republic of Moldova	Sudan	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Romania	Suriname	Viet Nam
Rwanda	Sweden	Yemen
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Switzerland	Zambia
Saint Lucia	Syrian Arab Republic	Zimbabwe
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Tajikistan	
Samoa	Thailand	
	Togo	

3. The following States not party to the Cartagena Protocol were also represented: Andorra; Argentina; Canada; Chile; Cook Islands; Equatorial Guinea; Haiti; Holy See; Iceland; Israel; Liechtenstein; Micronesia (Federated States of); Monaco; Nepal; Russian Federation; Sao Tome and Principe; Sierra Leone; Singapore; South Sudan; Tuvalu; and United States of America.

4. For all other participants, see annex I to the report of the Conference of the Parties on its fourteenth meeting (CBD/COP/14/14).

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

5. The ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol was opened at 11:00 a.m. on 17 November 2018 by Mr. José Octavio Tripp Villanueva, Ambassador of Mexico to Egypt, on behalf of Mr. Rafael Pacchiano Alamán, Minister of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico and outgoing President of the Conference of the Parties, who also served as President of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.

6. Opening statements were made by Ms. Yasmine Fouad, Minister of Environment of Egypt and President of the Conference of the Parties at its fourteenth meeting, also serving as President of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol; Ms. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity; Ms. Maria Fernanda Espinosa, President of the United Nations General Assembly, via video; and Mr. Abdel Fattah El-Sisi, President of Egypt.

7. In her statement, the President referred to the outcomes of the high-level segment, including the Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration: Investing in Biodiversity for People and Planet. The Sharm El-Sheikh Declaration was issued as document CBD/COP/14/12 and the report on the high-level segment as document CBD/COP/14/12/Add.1.

8. Two video presentations were screened, the first prepared by the Government of Mexico on mainstreaming biodiversity and the second by the Government of Egypt on biodiversity and its vital connection with the survival of humanity. There was also a performance by schoolchildren on the importance of biodiversity.

9. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018, statements were made by Ms. Amina Mohammed, Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations, via video, and Ms. Corli Pretorius, Deputy Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) World Conservation Monitoring Centre.

10. Representatives viewed two films, one by the National Geographic Society and the other by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), as well as a video message from Mr. Paul McCartney.

11. General statements were made by representatives of Argentina (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Canada (on behalf of a group of non-aligned countries), the European Union and its 28 member States, Belarus (on behalf of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe), Rwanda (on behalf of the African Group) and Malaysia (on behalf of the Group of Like-minded Megadiverse Countries).

12. Statements were also made by representatives of the Indigenous Women's Biodiversity Network (IWBN), the International Indigenous Forum for Biodiversity (IIFB), the CBD Alliance and the Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN) and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).

13. The opening statements are summarized in annex II to the report of the Conference of the Parties on its fourteenth meeting.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1 Election of the President and substitute officers

Election of the President

14. Subject to paragraph 3 of Article 29 of the Cartagena Protocol, the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties also serves as the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol. Accordingly, Ms. Fouad, who had been elected President of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, also served as the President of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.

Election of substitute officers

15. Article 29, paragraph 3, of the Cartagena Protocol stipulated that 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 must be substituted by a member elected by and from among the Parties to the Protocol. The Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting had elected 10 members of the Bureau to serve until the closure of the fourteenth meeting. Subsequently, at its eighth meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had elected substitute Bureau members for those regions where the Conference of the Parties Bureau member was representing a Party to the Convention that was not a Party to the Protocol. Subsequently, two representatives had been replaced by the Party concerned. Thus, in addition to the President, the Bureau for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol comprised:

- Mr. Mohamed Ali ben Temessek (Tunisia)
- Mr. Samuel Ndayiragije (Burundi)
- Ms. Elvana Ramaj (Albania)
- Ms. Elena Makeyeva (Belarus)
- Mr. Randolph Edmead (Saint Kitts and Nevis)
- Ms. Clarissa Nina (Brazil)
- Mr. Hayo Haanstra (Netherlands)
- Mr. Gaute Voigt-Hanssen (Norway)
- Ms. Gwendalyn K. Sisor (Palau)
- Mr. Monyrak Meng (Cambodia)

16. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018, it was agreed that, on the proposal of the Bureau, Mr. Monyrak Meng (Cambodia) would serve as Rapporteur for the meeting.

17. At its 4th plenary session, on 22 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties elected 10 representatives to serve as members of the Bureau for a term of office commencing upon the closure of its fourteenth meeting and ending at the closure of its fifteenth meeting. As all 10 members elected were from countries that were also Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, those members would also serve as the Bureau for the tenth Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol without the need for substitute members.

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

18. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the following agenda, on the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Executive Secretary in consultation with the Bureau (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organization of the meeting.
3. Report on the credentials of representatives to the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.
4. Reports of subsidiary bodies.
5. Report of the Compliance Committee.
6. Administration of the Protocol and budget for the trust funds.
7. Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources (Article 28).
8. Capacity-building (Article 22).
9. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (Article 20).
10. Monitoring and reporting (Article 33) and assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 35).
11. Enhancing integration under the Convention and its Protocols with respect to biosafety-related provisions.
12. Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives.
13. Review of effectiveness of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols.
14. Preparation for the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2011-2020).
15. Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16).
16. Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (Article 17).
17. Transit and contained use of living modified organisms (Article 6).
18. Socio-economic considerations (Article 26).
19. Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.
20. Other matters.
21. Adoption of the report.
22. Closure of the meeting.

2.3. Organization of work

19. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol decided to organize its work as set out in

annex II to the proposed organization of work (CBD/COP/14/1/Add.2) and endorsed the establishment of the two working groups by the Conference of the Parties.

Parallel events and awards

20. During the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, three award ceremonies took place. In addition, multiple related events were held in parallel with the meeting. More information on those award ceremonies and parallel events can be found in annex IV to the report of the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

ITEM 3. REPORT ON THE CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE NINTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL

21. Agenda item 3 was taken up at the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018. 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. Elena Makeyeva (Belarus), a Vice-President of the Bureau, to examine and report on credentials.

22. At the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 22 November 2018, Ms. Makeyeva informed the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that 162 Parties were registered as attending the meeting. The Bureau had examined the credentials of the representatives of 139 Parties that were attending the meeting. The credentials of 124 delegations were in full compliance with rule 18 of the rules of procedure. Those of 15 delegations did not fully comply with rule 18 and a further 23 delegations had not presented their credentials to date.

23. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 29 November 2018, Ms. Makeyeva informed the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that 162 Parties were registered as attending the meeting. The Bureau had examined the credentials of the representatives of 145 Parties. The credentials of 134 delegations were in full compliance with the provisions of rule 18 of the rules of procedure, those of 11 delegations did not fully comply with the provisions of rule 18, and a further 17 delegations had not presented their credentials. More information is available in document CBD/COP/14/INF/49.

24. A number of 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 29 December 2018. In keeping with past practice, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol 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 a provisional basis.

25. The President expressed the hope that all delegations that had been requested to present their credentials to the Executive Secretary would do so no later than 29 December 2018. Following the end of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, credentials from an additional 11 Parties were received.

26. 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 following 145 Parties: Algeria; Angola; Antigua and Barbuda; Armenia; Austria; Azerbaijan; Bahrain; Bangladesh; Belarus; Belgium; Belize; Benin; Bolivia; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Botswana; Brazil; Bulgaria; Burkina Faso; Burundi; Cabo Verde; Cambodia; Cameroon; Central African Republic; Chad; China; Colombia; Costa Rica; Cote d'Ivoire; Croatia; Cuba; Czechia; Democratic People's Republic of Korea; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Ecuador; Egypt; El Salvador; Eritrea; Estonia; Eswatini; Ethiopia; European Union; Fiji; Finland; France; Gabon; Gambia; Georgia; Germany; Ghana; Greece; Grenada; Guatemala; Guinea; Guinea-Bissau; Guyana; Honduras; Hungary; India; Indonesia; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Italy; Jamaica; Japan; Kenya; Kiribati; Kuwait;

Lao People's Democratic Republic; Latvia; Lesotho; Liberia; Lithuania; Luxembourg; Madagascar; Malawi; Malaysia; Maldives; Malta; Marshall Islands; Mauritania; Mauritius; Mexico; Mongolia; Morocco; Mozambique; Myanmar; Namibia; Netherlands; New Zealand; Nicaragua; Niger; Nigeria; Norway; Oman; Palau; Panama; Papua New Guinea; Paraguay; Peru; Philippines; Poland; Portugal; Qatar; Republic of Korea; Republic of Moldova; Romania; Rwanda; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Samoa; Saudi Arabia; Senegal; Serbia; Seychelles; Slovakia; Slovenia; Solomon Islands; South Africa; Spain; Sri Lanka; State of Palestine; Sudan; Suriname; Sweden; Switzerland; Syrian Arab Republic; Tajikistan; Thailand; Togo; Tonga; Trinidad and Tobago; Tunisia; Turkey; Uganda; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United Republic of Tanzania; Ukraine; Uruguay; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); Viet Nam; Yemen; Zambia; and Zimbabwe.

ITEM 4. REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY BODIES

27. Agenda item 4 was taken up at the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had before it the reports of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice on its twenty-second meeting (CBD/SBSTTA/22/12) and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (CBD/SBI/2/22) on its second meeting.

28. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol took note of the reports of intersessional meetings of subsidiary bodies and agreed to consider the recommendations contained in the reports under the relevant agenda items.

ITEM 5. REPORT OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

29. Agenda item 5 was taken up at the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018.

30. Ms. Clare Hamilton, Chair of the Compliance Committee, reported on the work of the Compliance Committee at its fourteenth and fifteenth meetings (CBD/CP/MOP/9/2). She informed the Parties that, since the Committee's fifteenth meeting, the Comoros, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Myanmar, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkmenistan had all submitted their third national reports and should therefore be removed from the list of Parties in the monitoring and reporting section of the recommendation. She also informed the Parties that, in assessing the decisions submitted to the Biosafety Clearing-House under contained use, the Committee had noted that some records made available under contained use were not fully in accordance with Article 6 of the Cartagena Protocol, with some of those records relating rather to intentional introduction into the environment; more information on the issue was provided in the note by the Executive Secretary on transit and contained use of living modified organisms (CBD/CP/MOP/9/9).

31. With respect to the recommended caution, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had before it an information document to assist it in its consideration (CBD/CP/MOP/9/INF/2). Among other things, the document provided an overview of the numerous activities undertaken by the Committee leading up to the recommendation to caution individual Parties for failing to submit their national reports. Ms. Hamilton emphasized that the decision to recommend a caution had been made following lengthy discussion and bearing in mind that the Committee's efforts to address the issue on numerous occasions had not resulted in the submission of the national reports by those Parties. She added that the global community had created the Cartagena Protocol believing its measures to be important, and that its successful operation depended on the sharing of accurate information. In view of the submission by Turkmenistan of its third national report, Ms. Hamilton indicated that Turkmenistan could be removed from the caution portion of the Committee's recommendation.

32. Following Ms. Hamilton's report, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties agreed to consider the Committee's recommendations in the working groups under the relevant agenda items. Agenda item 5 was referred to Working Group I for further consideration of the

Committee's recommendations contained in section A of the annex to its report and also contained in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.2).

33. Working Group I took up agenda item 5 at its 6th meeting, on 21 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on the recommendations contained in the report of the Compliance Committee (CBD/CP/MOP/9/2) and a note by the Executive Secretary on the activities undertaken by the Compliance Committee with regard to the obligation to submit national reports leading up to the recommendation to caution individual Parties (CBD/CP/MOP/9/INF/2).

34. Ms. Hamilton introduced the documents. She said that the annex to the report of the Compliance Committee contained, in section A, the general recommendations of the Committee as well as its recommendation with respect to specific cases of non-compliance and, in section B, the recommendation to caution four Parties for failure to submit national reports over multiple reporting cycles. Since the publication of the report, Greece, the Marshall Islands and Turkmenistan had submitted their third national reports and consequently should be removed from the list of Parties to be cautioned for failing to submit those reports. She also said, with respect to the nomination of members of the Committee, that the original intention had been to have a balance between technical experts and legal experts. Currently, there remained only two legal experts on the Compliance Committee, and she urged the Parties to take that into consideration when nominating members to be elected to the Committee.

35. Statements were made by representatives of Colombia, Georgia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Group), India, Indonesia, Jordan, Mexico and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

36. The Chair said that he would prepare a revised draft decision, taking into consideration the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.

37. At its 10th meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair, which it approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.11.

38. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties elected the following as members of the Compliance Committee:

Mr. Gado Zaki Mahaman (Niger)
Mr. Achmad Gusman Siswandi (Indonesia)
Mr. Martin Batic (Slovenia)
Mrs. Georgina Catacora-Vargas (Plurinational State of Bolivia)
Mr. Michelangelo Lombardi (Italy)

39. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties considered CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.11.

40. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.11 as decision CP-9/1 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 6. ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROTOCOL AND BUDGET FOR THE TRUST FUNDS

41. Agenda item 6 was taken up at the 2nd session of the meeting, on 17 November 2018. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had before it the report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Convention and the Cartagena and Nagoya protocols for the biennium 2017–2018, including the budget for the trust funds (CBD/COP/14/3), the proposed budget for the programme of work of the Convention and the Cartagena and Nagoya protocols for the biennium 2019–2020 (CBD/COP/14/4), as well as elements of a draft decision on the matter (CBD/COP/14/2) and an information document on the administration of the Convention and the budget for the trust funds of the Convention and the Cartagena and Nagoya protocols (CBD/COP/14/INF/17).

42. A statement was made by the representative of Japan.
43. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol took note of the reports and decided to establish a contact group on the budget with a mandate to review the matter and prepare a draft budget for the programme of work for the biennium 2019–2020 for the consideration of the Parties. The contact group would be chaired by Mr. Spencer Thomas (Grenada), would be open to all Parties and would meet informally at the invitation of its chair, with meetings advertised in advance in the daily calendar of meetings.
44. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol heard progress reports from the chair of the open-ended contact group on the budget at the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 22 November 2018, and at the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 25 November 2018.
45. At the 8th plenary session, on 29 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol took up draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.17, on the budget for the integrated programme of work of the Secretariat.
46. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision as decision CP 9/16 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 7. MATTERS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM AND RESOURCES (ARTICLE 28)

47. Working Group I took up agenda item 7 at its 3rd meeting, on 19 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it the report of the Council of GEF (CBD/COP/14/7) and a note by the Executive Secretary summarizing relevant information regarding GEF support for biosafety (CBD/CP/MOP/9/12). It also had before it a draft decision set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.2).
48. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, India and Mexico.
49. At its 4th meeting, on 19 November 2018, the Working Group resumed its consideration of the item.
50. Statements were made by representatives of the Republic of Korea, South Africa, Uganda (on behalf of the African Group) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).
51. The Chair said he would prepare a revised draft decision on the matter, taking into account the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.
52. At its 9th meeting, on 22 November 2018, the Working Group considered the revised draft decision prepared by the Chair and approved it for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.3.
53. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties considered CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.3.
54. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.3 as decision CP-9/4 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 8. CAPACITY-BUILDING (ARTICLE 22)

55. Working Group I took up agenda item 8 at its 4th meeting, on 19 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on capacity-building (CBD/CP/MOP/9/3); the report of the Liaison Group on Capacity-building for Biosafety at its twelfth meeting (CBD/CP/LG-CB/12/3); a synthesis of submissions on the status of implementation of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CBD/CP/MOP/9/INF/1); and a progress report on the implementation of the

Short-term Action Plan to Enhance and Support Capacity-Building for the Implementation of the Convention and its Protocols (CBD/COP/14/INF/10). It also had before it a draft decision set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.2). Paragraphs 1 and 7 to 11 of the draft decision had been taken from recommendation SBI-2/8, part III, while paragraphs 2 to 6 and 12 to 13 had been drawn from the conclusions set out in the report of the Liaison Group.

56. Statements were made by representatives of the Central African Republic, Colombia, the European Union and its 28 member States, India, Kenya, New Zealand, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, South Africa and Thailand.

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

58. A statement was made by a representative of the Third World Network.

59. The Chair said that he would prepare a revised draft decision, taking into account the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.

60. At its 10th meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair, which it approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.10.

61. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.10.

62. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.10 as decision CP-9/3 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 9. OPERATION AND ACTIVITIES OF THE BIOSAFETY CLEARING-HOUSE (ARTICLE 20)

63. Working Group I took up agenda item 9 at its 4th meeting, on 19 November 2018. In considering the item, it had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (CBD/CP/MOP/9/4), to which was annexed the joint modalities of operation for the central clearing-house mechanism, the Biosafety Clearing-House and the Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House, as detailed in the annex to the note by the Executive Secretary. The Working Group also had before it a draft decision reproduced from the note by the Executive Secretary, which was set out in the compilation of draft decisions contained in document CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.1.

64. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, India, Jordan, Norway, South Africa and Thailand.

65. A statement was also made by a representative of Canada.

66. The Working Group resumed its consideration of the agenda item at its 5th meeting, on 20 November 2018.

67. Statements were made by representatives of Bahrain, Côte d'Ivoire, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Jordan, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Peru, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania.

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

69. A statement was also made by a representative of the International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA).

70. Following the discussion, the Chair said that he would prepare a revised draft decision for consideration by the Working Group.

71. At its 10th meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair.

72. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States and Mexico.

73. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.8.

74. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.8.

75. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.8 as decision CP-9/2 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 10. MONITORING AND REPORTING (ARTICLE 33) AND ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROTOCOL (ARTICLE 35)

Fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol for the period 2011–2020

76. Working Group I took up the first aspect of agenda item 10 at its 5th meeting, on 20 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on recommendation SBI-2/12, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.2).

77. The Working Group considered the revised draft decision prepared by the Chair at its 9th meeting, on 22 November 2018.

78. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.6.

79. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.6 as decision CP-9/6.

Monitoring and reporting, including a revised draft format for the fourth national report

80. Working Group I took up the second aspect of agenda item 10 at its 5th meeting, on 20 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision, based on recommendations SBI-2/11 and SBI-2/13, and recommendations presented in the report of the Compliance Committee (document CBD/CP/MOP/9/2, annex, section D, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.2), including a revised draft format for the fourth national report. It also had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the revised draft format (CBD/CP/MOP/9/5) and an information note to assist in cross-referencing questions in the updated draft format for the fourth national report to corresponding questions from the format for the third national report (CBD/CP/MOP/9/INF/5).

81. Statements were made by representatives of Colombia, Egypt, Eswatini, the European Union and its 28 member States, India, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Oman, State of Palestine, Switzerland and Uganda.

82. Further statements were made by representatives of the Cornell University Alliance for Science and ISAAA.

83. The Chair said that he would prepare a revised draft decision, taking consideration the views expressed orally and submitted in writing and with an updated footnote to reflect recent submissions of national reports.

84. At its 9th meeting, on 22 November 2018, the Working Group considered the revised draft decision prepared by the Chair.

85. A representative of the Secretariat drew attention to a section of text that required amendment to reflect earlier comments.

86. A statement was made by a representative of the European Union and its 28 member States.
87. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.5.
88. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.5 as decision CP-9/5 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 11. ENHANCING INTEGRATION UNDER THE CONVENTION AND ITS PROTOCOLS WITH RESPECT TO BIOSAFETY-RELATED PROVISIONS

89. Working Group I took up agenda item 11 at its 6th meeting, on 21 November 2018, in conjunction with agenda item 13 of the Conference of the Parties and agenda item 13 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on recommendation SBI-2/14 set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.2).
90. Statements were made by representatives of Colombia, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Malawi, Morocco and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).
91. A statement was also made by a representative of Argentina.
92. A further statement was made by a representative of ISAAA.
93. The Chair said that he would prepare a revised draft decision, taking into consideration the views expressed orally and submitted in writing.
94. At its 12th meeting, on 28 November 2018, Working Group I considered a revised draft decision submitted by its Chair.
95. Statements were made by representatives of Colombia and the European Union and its 28 member States.
96. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/COP/14/L.14.
97. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties considered CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.14.
98. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.14 as decision CP-9/9 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 12. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS, CONVENTIONS AND INITIATIVES

99. Working Group I took up agenda item 12 at its 6th meeting, on 21 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary providing an update on cooperative activities between the Secretariat and other conventions, international organizations and initiatives relevant to the implementation of the Protocol (CBD/CP/MOP/9/6).
100. A statement was made by a representative of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).
101. The Working Group took note of the information contained in document CBD/CP/MOP/9/6.

ITEM 13. REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES UNDER THE CONVENTION AND ITS PROTOCOLS

Review of experience in holding concurrent meetings under the Convention and its protocols

102. Working Group I took up the first aspect of agenda item 13 at its 6th meeting, on 21 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on part A of recommendation SBI-2/15, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.2).

103. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, Honduras, India, Jordan, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Switzerland and Uganda (on behalf of the African Group).

104. Statements were also made by representatives of Argentina and Canada.

105. Further statements were made by representatives of the J. Craig Venter Institute, the Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI) and Third World Network (on behalf of the Corporate Europe Observatory, EcoNexus, ETC Group, Friends of the Earth International and Pro Natura).

106. At its 10th meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised draft decision submitted by the Chair, which it approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.9.

107. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.9.

108. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.9 as decision CP-9/8 (for the text, see chap. I).

Procedure for avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in expert groups

109. Working Group I took up the second aspect of agenda item 13 at its 6th meeting, on 21 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on part B of recommendation SBI-2/15, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.2), and a summary of views submitted by Parties and observers on the procedures for avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in expert groups (CBD/COP/14/INF/3).

110. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, Honduras, India, Jordan, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Switzerland and Uganda (on behalf of the African Group).

111. Statements were also made by representatives of Argentina and Canada.

112. Further statements were made by representatives of the J. Craig Venter Institute, PRRI and the Third World Network (on behalf of the Corporate Europe Observatory, EcoNexus, ETC Group, Friends of the Earth International and Pro Natura).

113. Following the exchange of views, the Chair established a group of friends of the Chair to continue discussion of the unresolved issues.

114. At its 12th meeting, on 28 November 2018, Working Group I considered a revised draft decision submitted by its Chair.

115. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States and Switzerland.

116. The Working Group approved the revised draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.15.

117. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.15.

118. Following oral corrections by the Secretariat, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.15 as decision CP-9/10 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 14. PREPARATION FOR THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 AND THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY 2011-2020

119. Agenda item 14 was taken up at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 20 November 2018, in conjunction with agenda item 17 of the Conference of the Parties and agenda item 16 of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol. In considering the item, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on preparations for the development of a follow-up to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011–2020 (CBD/CP/MOP/9/7), and a draft decision based on recommendation SBI-2/19 and additional elements from document CBD/CP/MOP/9/7, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.2).

120. Statements were made by representatives of Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia (on behalf of the Group of Like-minded Megadiverse Countries), Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba (on behalf of the small island developing States), the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Palau (on behalf of the Pacific island countries), Panama, the Philippines, South Africa (on behalf of the African Group), Saint Kitts and Nevis (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Sudan, Switzerland, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

121. Statements were also made by representatives of Argentina, Canada and Nepal.

122. Additional statements were made by representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) (also on behalf of the International Treaty on Plant and Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture), the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women) and the secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (on behalf of the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions).

123. Further statements were made by representatives of BirdLife International (also on behalf of Conservation International, GYBN, the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), Rare, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), The Nature Conservancy, The Pew Charitable Trusts, and WWF); Friends of the Earth International (also on behalf of EcoNexus, the European Network for Ecological Reflection and Action (ECOROPA), Forests of the World, Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (FARN) and the Global Forest Coalition), the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observations Network (GEO BON), GYBN, the International Committee for Food Sovereignty, IIFB, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS) and WWF.

124. Based on the views expressed, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties agreed to establish a contact group, chaired by Ms. Charlotta Sörqvist (Sweden) and Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda), to discuss the preparatory process for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

125. At the 4th plenary session of the meeting, on 22 November 2018, the chair of the contact group reported on the progress made in the contact group.

126. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol heard another report by the chair of the contact group.

127. The representative of Norway informed the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that, subject to parliamentary approval, Norway would donate \$350,000 for regional workshops in Africa, Latin America and Caribbean and Asia and the Pacific as its contribution to further discussion on the post-2020 framework. He also said that Norway would provide travel support to delegates from developing countries attending the ninth Trondheim Conference on Biodiversity, to be held in July 2019.

128. At the 6th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol resumed consideration of the draft decision on the matter.

129. A statement was made by a representative of South Africa.

130. The draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for formal adoption as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.16.

131. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.16.

132. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.16 as decision CP-9/7 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 15. RISK ASSESSMENT AND RISK MANAGEMENT (ARTICLES 15 AND 16)

133. Working Group II took up agenda item 15 at its 1st meeting, on 18 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a draft decision based on recommendation SBSTTA-22/2, set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/9/1/Add.2), as well as a progress report on capacity-building activities on risk assessment of living modified organisms (CBD/CP/MOP/9/INF/3).

134. Statements were made by the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the European Union and its 28 member States, Guatemala, Malawi (on behalf of the Africa Group), New Zealand and Thailand.

135. At its 2nd meeting, on 18 November 2018, the Working Group resumed its consideration of the item.

136. Statements were made by representatives of Belarus, Brazil, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Eswatini, Gabon, Ghana, Honduras, India, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Uganda, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

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

138. Further statements were made by representatives of the Centre for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North (CSIPN) (also on behalf of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB)), PRRI, Target Malaria and Youth Biotech.

139. The Working Group resumed consideration of the item at its eighth session, on 22 November 2018. It was agreed that, given the close relation of some elements in the draft decision on risk assessment and risk management with those in the draft decision on synthetic biology being considered by the Conference of the Parties, a contact group chaired by Mr. Horst Korn (Germany), who was also chairing the contact group on synthetic biology, would be established to resolve the text in square brackets in the draft decision.

140. At its 17th meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Working Group approved a revised version of the draft decision on risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16) for transmission to plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.13.

141. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.13.

142. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.13 as decision CP-9/13 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 16. UNINTENTIONAL TRANSBOUNDARY MOVEMENTS AND EMERGENCY MEASURES (ARTICLE 17)

143. Working Group II took up agenda item 16 at its 2nd meeting, on 18 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a summary report on the activities undertaken in response to decision CP-VIII/16 (CBD/CP/MOP/9/8), including a draft decision; a revised version of the draft manual training manual on detection and identification of living modified organisms (CBD/CP/MOP/9/8/Add.1); and a summary of capacity-building activities on the detection and identification of living modified organisms (CBD/CP/MOP/9/INF/4).

144. Statements were made by representatives of Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Ecuador, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Namibia, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand and Uruguay.

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

146. Following the exchange of views, 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 submitted in writing.

147. At its 7th meeting, on Wednesday 21 November, the Working Group considered the revised draft decision submitted by the Chair.

148. Statements were made by representatives of Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, the European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, Honduras, Indonesia, Mexico, Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Uganda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

149. A further statement was delivered by a representative of Argentina.

150. The Working Group agreed to hold informal discussions on unresolved text.

151. At its 8th meeting, on 22 November 2018, the Working Group resumed consideration of the revised draft decision, including the amendments proposed based on the informal discussions.

152. Statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, Panama, Paraguay and Uganda.

153. Following the exchange of views, the draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.2.

154. At the 5th plenary session of the meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.2, as orally amended, as decision CP-9/11 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 17. TRANSIT AND CONTAINED USE OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS (ARTICLE 6)

155. Working Group II took up agenda item 17 at its 2nd meeting, on 18 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a document containing a summary of the assessment on information registered in the Biosafety Clearing House under contained use carried out by

the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol; a compilation of submissions on the contained use of living modified organisms received from Parties to the Protocol and other Governments; and suggested elements for a draft decision (CBD/CP/MOP/9/9).

156. Statements were made by representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Ecuador, te European Union and its 28 member States, Gabon, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo and Uganda.

157. A statement was also made by a representative of the Third World Network.

158. 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 expressed orally and submitted in writing and possibly in consultation with interested Parties.

159. At its 10th meeting, on 25 November 2018, the Working Group considered the draft decision submitted by the Chair.

160. Statements were made by representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Gabon, Honduras, Mexico, Panama and Switzerland.

161. Following the exchange of views, the draft decision, as orally amended, was approved for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.7.

162. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.7.

163. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.7 as decision CP-9/12 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 18. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (ARTICLE 26)

164. Working Group II took up agenda item 18 at its 2nd meeting, on 18 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a document providing a summary of the face-to-face meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-economic Considerations, held in Ljubljana from 9 to 13 October 2017, and elements of a draft decision (CBD/CP/MOP/9/10). The full report of the meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group was set out in document CBD/CP/SEC/AHTEG/2017/1/3.

165. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, the European Union and its 28 member States, Honduras, Kenya, Mexico, Norway, the Philippines and South Africa.

166. The Working Group resumed consideration of the item at its 3rd meeting, on 19 November 2018.

167. Statements were made by representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guatemala, India, Japan, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

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

169. Statements were also made by representatives of IIFB, ISAAA, La Via Campesina and PRRI.

170. The Working Group agreed to establish a contact group, chaired by Nathalie Campos Reales (Mexico), to pursue the discussion.

171. At its 17th meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Working Group considered a revised version of the draft decision and approved it for transmission to plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.12.

172. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.12.

173. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.12 as decision CP-9/14 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 19. NAGOYA – KUALA LUMPUR SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS

174. Working Group II took up agenda item 19 at its 2nd meeting, on 18 November 2018. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary containing an overview of the current status of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, a summary of the activities carried out by the Secretariat to raise awareness and support the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol, an outline of the next steps to be taken after its entry into force, and elements of a draft decision (CBD/CP/MOP/9/11).

175. Statements were made by representatives of the European Union and its 28 member States, Mexico and Tajikistan.

176. 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 expressed orally and submitted in writing.

177. At its 7th meeting, on 21 November 2018, the Working Group began its consideration of a draft decision submitted by the Chair.

178. Statements were made by representatives of Brazil and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

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

180. At its 8th meeting, on 22 November 2018, the Working Group resumed consideration of the draft decision.

181. Comments were made by representatives of Brazil, Cuba, Gabon, the European Union and its 28 member States, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.

182. Comments were also made by representatives of Argentina.

183. The Working Group agreed to hold informal discussions regarding text on which agreement had not been reached.

184. Following the informal discussions, the Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.4.

185. At the 7th plenary session of the meeting, on 28 November 2018, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.4.

186. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.4 as decision CP-9/15 (for the text, see chap. I).

ITEM 20. OTHER MATTERS

187. No other matters were considered.

ITEM 21. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

188. The present report was adopted at the 8th plenary session of the meeting, on 29 November 2018, on the basis of the draft report presented by the Rapporteur (CBD/CP/MOP/9/L.1), and on the understanding that the Rapporteur would be entrusted with its finalization.

ITEM 22. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

189. The President declared the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol closed at 9 p.m. on 29 November 2018.

