



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General

8 July 2026

Original: English

Subsidiary Body on Implementation

Seventh meeting

Nairobi, 4–12 August 2026

Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

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

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

Note by the Secretariat

I. Introduction

1. In accordance with Article 35 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol is required to undertake an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Protocol at least every five years. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties conducted the most recent assessment and review of the Protocol (the fourth) at its tenth meeting (decision [CP-10/7](#)).
2. In decisions [CP-10/3](#) and [CP-10/4](#), the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, respectively. It decided to conduct a midterm evaluation of the implementation plan in conjunction with the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and to conduct a midterm evaluation of the capacity-building action plan in conjunction with the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan.
3. In decision [CP-10/3](#), the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol requested the Executive Secretary to include in the reporting format for the fifth national report questions designed to elicit information on the indicators of the implementation plan and to analyse and synthesize that information to facilitate the midterm evaluation in conjunction with the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol, and to make this information available to the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol and, as appropriate, the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol.
4. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol requested the Liaison Group and the Compliance Committee, as appropriate, working in a complementary and non-duplicative manner, to contribute to the midterm evaluation of

* [CBD/SBI/7/1](#).

** The present document is being issued without formal editing, with the exception of the draft recommendation in section IV.

the implementation plan, and to submit their conclusions for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation. It requested that the Subsidiary Body on Implementation consider the information provided and the conclusions reached by the Liaison Group and the Compliance Committee and submit its findings and recommendations to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its twelfth meeting with a view to facilitating the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan.

5. Further to decisions [CP-10/3](#) and [CP-10/4](#), the Secretariat prepared an analysis of information relevant to the indicators of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan as compared with information from the baseline. This analysis is available as document [CBD/SBI/7/6/Add.1](#). A detailed explanation of the methodology used for the preparation of the analysis is provided in section II of that document.

6. The present note contains a summary of the process followed for the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan (sect. II), an overview of key highlights that emerged from the analysis (sect. III) and a draft recommendation (sect. IV).

II. Summary of contributions by the Compliance Committee under the Protocol and the Liaison Group on the Protocol to the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan

A. Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol

7. The Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol considered the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol at its twenty-first meeting, held from 10 to 12 June 2026.

8. The Compliance Committee conducted its deliberations on the basis of document [CBD/CP/CC/21/3](#), which provided an overview of key developments on, and support provided by the Committee towards, compliance by Parties and the resolution of compliance issues identified by the Committee concerning obligations on which the Committee had focused its efforts. The document drew on the analysis of information for the indicators ([CBD/SBI/7/6/Add.1](#)) which was also made available for reference.

9. In providing its contribution to the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol, the Compliance Committee focused on Goal A.4 of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol, including the associated objectives, indicators and capacity-building aspects. The Committee reviewed information presented for indicators under Goals A.1 to A.4 which address obligations under the Protocol that fall within the area of focus of the work of the Committee. The Committee also considered its own role in supporting Parties in complying with these obligations under the Protocol carried out in accordance with the procedures and mechanisms on compliance under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (decision [BS-I/7](#), annex).

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

11. The Committee noted that the development of biosafety legislation remained a challenge for several Parties, especially in some regions. Despite the efforts of the Committee and the, albeit limited, financial support made available in this regard, the Committee acknowledged that only

limited progress was observable in compliance by Parties with their obligation under Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Protocol. The Committee recognized that its efforts had contributed in some cases to the adoption of legislation or to the publication of measures and that, in other cases, it had led to renewed political attention and, in a few cases, to obtaining technical assistance for the development of biosafety legislation. The Committee agreed that further support and political will was required to ensure that compliance in this area improves, especially since the Parties that had still not adopted any biosafety measures were likely facing several other implementation challenges.

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

13. In relation to the obligation to submit national reports, the Committee recognized that its work had contributed to achieving high submission rates over time. The Committee noted its important work to facilitate the resolution of numerous individual cases of non-compliance with the reporting obligation.

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

15. The recommendation adopted by the Committee, as its contribution to the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Process and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol, is contained in annex I to the present note. The recommendation has informed the draft decision provided in section IV below.

B. Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol

16. The Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol considered the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol at its fifteenth meeting, held from 16 to 18 June 2026.

17. The Liaison Group conducted its deliberations based on document [CBD/CP/LG/15/2](#), which provided an overview of progress made in achieving the Goals of the implementation plan and capacity-building action plan and related objectives. The document also examined capacity-related developments and needs in relation to the Goals of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol. For each Goal, the document contained a description of progress towards the Goal as well as elements for consideration. The document drew on the analysis of information for the indicators ([CBD/SBI/7/6/Add.1](#)), which was also made available for reference.

18. The Liaison Group was invited to consider all Goals of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol, with the exception of Goal A.4, which had been considered by the Compliance Committee. The Liaison Group was invited to provide advice to the Executive Secretary on noteworthy developments and achievements and to provide input on elements for draft recommended actions to strengthen implementation. The Liaison Group was also invited to provide advice on capacity-related developments and trends relevant to the Goals.

19. The Group concluded that there were positive trends towards the Goals of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan, demonstrating progress towards implementation of the Protocol. The Group recognized that capacity needs continue to exist and that further efforts and support to Parties are needed.

20. The contribution to the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Process and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the

Cartagena Protocol developed by the Liaison Group is provided in annex II to the present note. The observations have informed the draft decision provided in section IV below.

III. Overview of key highlights from the fifth assessment and review of the Protocol and midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and capacity-building action plan

21. The implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol include 10 goals addressing the core elements of Protocol implementation and four cross-cutting goals aimed at strengthening the enabling environment and support for implementation.

22. The high rate of submission of national reports enabled the inclusion of fifth national reports from almost three quarters of Parties¹ in the analysis, which provided a robust information base for the fifth assessment and review of the Cartagena Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and capacity-building action plan.

23. Implementation of the Protocol continues to advance with progress made towards a number of the goals. At the same time, however, further efforts will be needed if Parties are to achieve in full, by 2030, the goals of the implementation plan and capacity-building action plan and the outcomes that would result therefrom.

24. Progress was seen in many of the core areas that are fundamental to implementation of the Protocol, such as adopting measures and setting up institutional arrangements, exchanging information through the Biosafety Clearing-House, conducting risk assessment, and accessing infrastructure for the detection and identification of living modified organisms. Even in these areas, important gaps and needs remain. For example:

(a) Nearly 1 in 10 Parties have no measures or only draft or temporary measures to implement the Protocol;

(b) Just over a third of Parties consider their current domestic staffing levels on biosafety to be sufficient;

(c) Ongoing technological developments mean capacities on risk assessment, risk management, detection and identification require continuous updating.

25. These gaps and needs could be supported through actions under the enabling environment goals on capacity-building and mobilization of resources. Progress on these two enabling environment goals was limited, so further activities in these areas would be beneficial over the next four years.

26. The progress achieved by Parties in implementing the Cartagena Protocol is expected to contribute directly to the achievement of Target 17 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. In turn, the integration of biosafety within the Framework is expected to strengthen the development and implementation of biosafety measures globally, reinforcing the effective implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.

IV. Recommendation

27. The draft decision set out below has been prepared on the basis of the action elements of the contributions made by the Compliance Committee at its twenty-first meeting and the Liaison Group at its fifteenth meeting, as contained in annexes I and II to the present note. The extrabudgetary resources required to implement the requests to the Executive Secretary made in the draft decision

¹ The reports of 123 Parties were included in the analysis. See document [CBD/SBI/7/6/Add.1](#) for a more detailed description of the methodology.

are described in the meeting documents for the relevant areas of work and are therefore not outlined in the present note.

28. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation may wish to adopt a recommendation along the following lines:

The Subsidiary Body on Implementation

Recommends that, at its twelfth meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety² adopt a decision along the following lines:

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol

1. *Recognizes* the progress made in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and towards the achievement of the goals of the implementation plan³ and the capacity-building action plan⁴ for the Protocol, while noting that important gaps persist and that biosafety capacity-building and dedicated and predictable resources for the topic remain priorities;

2. *Calls upon* Parties to accelerate their efforts to implement the Cartagena Protocol and use as guidance the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan, as well as the findings from the fifth assessment and review of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and capacity-building action plan for the Protocol;

3. *Recognizes* the importance of Target 17 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework⁵ for furthering the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, and acknowledges the *Global Report on Collective Progress in the Implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*;

4. *Welcomes* the contributions of the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol and the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol to the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Protocol;

5. *Requests* the Compliance Committee and the Liaison Group to provide a contribution to the sixth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and the final evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Protocol;

Goal A.1: Parties have in place functional national biosafety frameworks⁶

6. *Expresses concern* that several Parties have not taken any measures or have only draft or temporary measures for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol;

7. *Requests* Parties that have not yet fully done so to put in place, as a matter of priority, legal, administrative and other measures to implement their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol and take action to secure the necessary political will and awareness, while acknowledging that Parties face various challenges that prevent them from fully complying with the obligations under Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Protocol;

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2226, No. 30619.

³ Decision [CP-10/3](#), annex.

⁴ Decision [CP-10/4](#), annex.

⁵ Decision 15/4, annex.

⁶ Paragraphs 6 to 41 are grouped by the relevant goal of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol.

8. *Notes with appreciation* the progress made by Parties in designating competent national authorities, but expresses concern that a small number of Parties have still not designated their competent national authorities, and urges them to do so as soon as possible;

9. *Urges* Parties to ensure sufficient biosafety staffing levels for functional national biosafety frameworks;

10. *Encourages* Parties and other stakeholders to focus capacity development on the elaboration of national measures, in particular legislative measures, for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, and on strengthening the ability of national staff to carry out their functions in the field of biosafety;

Goal A.2: Parties have improved the availability and exchange of relevant information through the Biosafety Clearing-House

11. *Urges* Parties that have not yet fully done so to make all required information available through the Biosafety Clearing-House and keep their records up to date;

12. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue to provide support for maintaining the Biosafety Clearing-House as the principal mechanism for sharing information under the Cartagena Protocol;

Goal A.3: full information on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol is made available by Parties in a timely manner

13. *Recommends* that, when adopting its guidance to the Global Environment Facility on support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, the Conference of the Parties invite the Facility to assist eligible Parties by providing, sufficiently in advance of the reporting deadline, financial support for the preparation of national reports, with a view to giving the Parties enough time to hold adequate national consultations and submit their national reports in a timely manner;

Goal A.4: Parties are in compliance with the requirements of the Cartagena Protocol

14. *Welcomes* progress made by Parties in complying with their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol, notably those concerning the submission of national reports and the publishing of information through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

15. *Also welcomes* the high rate of compliance with the obligation to designate national focal points;

16. *Further welcomes* the supportive role of the Compliance Committee, and acknowledges the importance of its regular and incremental follow-up with Parties on compliance matters, the formal compliance measures and the informal efforts of the Compliance Committee in support of compliance and the achievement of goal A.4 of the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol;

17. *Requests* Parties to cooperate fully when receiving communications from the Compliance Committee;

Goal A.5: Parties carry out scientifically sound risk assessments of living modified organisms and manage and control identified risks to prevent adverse effects of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health

18. *Recognizes* that conducting risk assessment and risk management continues to be a challenge for Parties and that the challenge is made more difficult by rapid developments in modern biotechnology;

19. *Encourages* Parties and other stakeholders to continue to address human resource, financing and infrastructure needs concerning the key areas for capacity-building related to risk assessment and risk management in the capacity-building action plan;

20. *Encourages* Parties and relevant organizations to establish regional networks of risk assessment and risk management experts to facilitate peer review, technical support and knowledge exchange among Parties;

Goal A.6: Parties prevent and address illegal and unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms

21. *Reminds* Parties to report cases of illegal and unintentional transboundary movements through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

22. *Calls for* support for capacity development on preventing and addressing illegal and unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms, with a particular focus on addressing challenges related to limited laboratory detection capacities, insufficient laboratory equipment and trained personnel, porous borders and institutional and regulatory gaps;

Goal A.7: Parties have measures in place to fulfil the handling, transport, packaging and identification requirements of living modified organisms under Article 18 of the Cartagena Protocol

23. *Encourages* Parties to facilitate cross-sectoral cooperation and coordination among competent national biosafety authorities, customs authorities and other relevant government bodies to strengthen capacity for the handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms;

24. *Calls for* support for capacity development on fulfilling the handling, packaging and identification requirements for living modified organisms, with a particular focus on addressing challenges related to: the operationalization of legal frameworks; the training of customs officers; and access to adequate facilities, equipment and resources for the detection and identification of living modified organisms, including by enhancing technical support at the national level for technology transfer;

Goal A.8: Parties are able to detect and identify living modified organisms

25. *Calls for* support for capacity-building in the areas of detection and identification of living modified organisms, with a particular focus on addressing challenges related to limited access to accredited laboratories, certified reference materials, validated detection methods, adequate equipment, sustainable financial resources and sufficient trained personnel;

Goal A.9: Parties that choose to do so take into account socioeconomic considerations when making decisions on the import of living modified organisms and cooperate on research and information exchange, in accordance with Article 26 of the Cartagena Protocol

26. *Encourages* Parties to cooperate on research and share information related to socioeconomic impacts of living modified organisms, including on indigenous peoples and local communities, bearing in mind that the regulatory framework for enabling the consideration of socioeconomic aspects, as well as the assessment of socioeconomic impacts, remain challenges related to goal A.9;

Goal A.10: Parties to the Cartagena Protocol become Parties to the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress and have in place measures to fulfil their obligations under the Supplementary Protocol

27. *Encourages* Parties to the Cartagena Protocol to accede, ratify, accept or approve, as appropriate, the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol;⁷

28. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to disseminate information on, and promote outreach and awareness-raising about, the Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress among Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant stakeholders;

Goal B.1: Parties engage in capacity-building activities

29. *Invites* the regional and subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres to incorporate biosafety into their biennial workplans;

30. *Calls upon* Parties and relevant organizations to facilitate capacity-building in the areas in which capacity needs remain most prevalent, namely:

- (a) Risk assessment, risk management and other scientific and technical expertise;
- (b) Sampling, detection and identification;
- (c) Institutional capacity and human resources;
- (d) Public awareness, education and participation;

31. *Encourages* Parties to cooperate with one another in strengthening capacities for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, including by involving indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth and relevant stakeholders;

32. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue to undertake capacity-building activities to assist Parties in implementing the Cartagena Protocol, subject to the availability of resources, and to draw attention periodically to the extensive capacity-building materials available on the Secretariat website;⁸

Goal B.2: Parties mobilize adequate resources from all sources to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, in accordance with Article 28 of the Protocol

33. *Urges* Parties to allocate adequate resources to biosafety in their national budgets;

34. *Urges* eligible Parties to use their allocated resources for biosafety activities from the Global Environment Facility through its System for Transparent Allocation of Resources and to integrate biosafety into their biodiversity projects;

35. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, international organizations, regional development banks and other programmes and initiatives to provide additional financial resources and in-kind contributions, as appropriate, to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol;

Goal B.3: Parties promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation on the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms, in accordance with Article 23 of the Cartagena Protocol

36. *Encourages* Parties to consult the public in the decision-making process regarding living modified organisms and make the results of such decisions available to the

⁷ Decision [BS-V/11](#).

⁸ <https://bch.cbd.int/protocol>.

public, while respecting confidential information, in accordance with Article 21 and their respective laws and regulations, with a view to increasing transparency;

37. *Calls for* support for capacity development on fulfilling the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol related to public awareness, education and participation on the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms;

Goal B.4: Parties enhance cooperation and coordination on biosafety issues at the national, regional and international levels

38. *Encourages* Parties to facilitate the integration of biosafety into cross-sectoral and sectoral legislation, policies and institutions;

39. *Invites* donor countries and relevant organizations to support Parties with the integration referred to in paragraph 38;

40. *Encourages* Parties to cooperate with relevant organizations in the exchange of scientific, technical and institutional knowledge on biosafety, including at the regional and international levels;

41. *Encourages* Parties that have not yet done so to develop mechanisms for involving indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.

Annex I

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

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

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

Annex II

Contribution of the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the fifth assessment and review of the Protocol and midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Protocol

General observations

1. The large number (128) of fifth national reports that had been submitted provided a robust dataset for the analysis in the documentation. The analysis showed positive trends towards the goals of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan, demonstrating progress towards implementation of the Protocol.
2. Biosafety should be approached in an integrated manner, given the interconnection among biosafety, biodiversity, sustainable agriculture, food security, human health and technological innovation. Effective implementation requires cross-sectoral coordination at the national, regional and international levels. This can be supported by enhanced cooperation among Parties and relevant international organizations. Greater inclusion of perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth in biosafety considerations is important.
3. Capacity-building activities and technology transfer have contributed to the progress made in the implementation of the Protocol, but given the ongoing needs, capacity-building remains a priority.
4. The statistical analysis⁹ provided primarily a quantitative overview of progress towards the goals, while qualitative elements were derived from free-text entries in the national reports. While collecting and analyzing additional qualitative data would be challenging, the collection of such data would be useful and could be further explored.

Goal A.1: Parties have in place functional national biosafety frameworks

5. The adoption of legislation and the designation of national focal points for the Cartagena Protocol are of critical importance for the functioning of national biosafety frameworks. In particular, urgent action and support is needed for the development of biosafety measures by those Parties that have either not adopted any national measures at all, or have only adopted temporary or draft measures to implement the Protocol.

Key observations

- (a) A large and growing number of Parties have adopted the necessary measures for the implementation of the Protocol, but almost half of them only have measures partially in place;
- (b) Almost a tenth of Parties have either not adopted any national measures at all, or have only adopted temporary or draft measures to implement the Protocol;
- (c) Although a large and growing number of Parties have designated one or more competent national authorities, almost a tenth of Parties have not done so;
- (d) Almost all Parties have designated their national focal points for the Protocol and the Biosafety Clearing-House, and a growing number of Parties have made available to the Biosafety Clearing-House information concerning their point of contact for receiving notifications under Article 17 of the Protocol;

⁹ CBD/SBI/7/6/Add.1

(e) While almost all Parties have qualified biosafety staff, less than half of these Parties assessed the number of staff as adequate;

(f) The adoption of full measures for the implementation of the Protocol, sufficient biosafety staffing levels and the designation of competent national authorities remain priorities for implementation as prerequisites for functional national biosafety frameworks;

(g) The focus areas for capacity-development in the context of goal A.1 include: (i) the development of national measures for the implementation of the Protocol, with an emphasis on the development of legislation; and (ii) strengthening capacity for national staff to carry out their biosafety functions.

Goal A.2: Parties have improved the availability and exchange of relevant information through the Biosafety Clearing-House

6. The Biosafety Clearing-House continues to play a pivotal role in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. The significant increase in active users of and visits to the Biosafety Clearing-House is a notable example of progress within goal A.2. Ongoing training and capacity building is critical. Collaboration at the regional level among Clearing-House users is useful. National biosafety websites can facilitate the completeness of data within the Biosafety Clearing-House.

Key observations

(a) Progress towards goal A.2 is observed in sharp increases in active users of and visits to the Biosafety Clearing-House, as well as in the increase of Parties having published mandatory information on the Clearing-House;

(b) The launch of the Biosafety Clearing-House on its new platform has positively contributed to the increased use of the Clearing-House;

(c) The development of extensive help materials and the organization of multiple capacity-building events to support users in getting familiar with the new interface have contributed positively to the increased use of the Biosafety Clearing-House;

(d) The proportion of Parties that reported having published mandatory information in the Biosafety Clearing-House has increased. This increase is attributable mostly to Parties reporting that they published information partially. For several categories of information, however, fewer Parties than at the baseline reported having published information fully;

(e) Continuing support is needed to maintain the functionality of the Biosafety Clearing-House as the principal mechanism for sharing information under the Protocol.

Goal A.3: full information on the implementation of the Protocol is made available by Parties in a timely manner

7. The large number of fifth national reports received by the reporting deadline is a commendable achievement that demonstrates the commitment of Parties to the Protocol. Several factors have contributed to the high rate of reporting, including improvements to the Biosafety Clearing-House, the work of the Compliance Committee on national reporting, and the outreach efforts by the Secretariat. Reporting is a valuable process at the national level for taking stock of progress and challenges in implementation of the Protocol, and for strategic planning. Synchronized reporting among the Convention and its Protocols had some benefits; however, there were also challenges with the three reports being due at the same date.

Key observations

(a) Progress towards goal A.3 is observed in the high rate of submission of fifth national reports by the reporting deadline, with more than two thirds of Parties having submitted their report in time;

(b) The high rate of submission enabled the inclusion of the fifth national reports of almost three quarters of Parties in the analysis that underlies the fifth assessment and review of the Protocol and the midterm evaluation of the implementation plan and the capacity-building action plan for the Protocol, ensuring a solid information base;

(c) Early access to Global Environment Facility funding for the development of the fifth national report is likely to have contributed to the high increase of the submission rate, together with a series of regional workshops organized to support eligible Parties with their reporting process. Some Parties, however, received the funding for the development of their fifth national report close to or after the submission deadline;

(d) Future financial support for the preparation of national reports should be made available sufficiently in advance of the reporting deadline to allow Parties time for adequate national consultations and submission of their national reports.

Goal A.4: Parties are in compliance with the requirements of the Protocol

8. The Compliance Committee has taken a constructive and facilitative approach to help Parties experiencing challenges in the implementation of the Protocol to overcome these challenges. The work of the Committee to support Parties and engage in dialogue with them has been important.

9. Further contributions for this goal were provided by the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol.¹⁰

Goal A.5: Parties carry out scientifically sound risk assessments of living modified organisms and manage and control identified risks to prevent adverse effects of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health

10. Conducting risk assessment and risk management continues to be a challenge for Parties, which is made more difficult by rapid developments in modern biotechnology. In some countries, the lack of legal frameworks, hinders progress in this regard. Parties that are not taking decisions on living modified organisms may not have conducted risk assessments, which could explain why only just over half of Parties have carried out risk assessment. Continuous capacity-building on risk assessment and risk management is needed and opportunities for regional cooperation should be explored.

Key observations

(a) A growing number of Parties conducted risk assessment of living modified organisms in the reporting period, with just over half of Parties having done so. While almost all of these Parties conducted risk assessment for decisions where such an assessment is required, this number has slightly decreased compared to the baseline. More than three quarters of the Parties that carried out any type of risk assessment have also considered, in all or in some cases, “other available scientific evidence” as referenced in Article 15 of the Protocol;

(b) About two thirds of Parties had access to or used resource materials, including guidance documents, for the purpose of conducting risk assessment, or for evaluating risk assessment reports submitted by notifiers, as well as for risk management;

(c) While more than two thirds of Parties have the capacity to assess the risks of living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking into account risks to human health, the progress on this indicator is limited, which reflects the continuing need for strengthening capacities, including in relation to human and financial resources and infrastructure;

¹⁰ CBD/CP/CC/21/5.

(d) The establishment of regional networks of risk assessment and risk management experts should be considered to facilitate peer review, technical support and knowledge exchange among Parties, especially for countries with limited national capacity.

Goal A.6: Parties prevent and address illegal and unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms

11. The information on illegal transboundary movement and unintentional transboundary movement in the national reports suggests that Parties have not published information on all these cases on the Biosafety Clearing-House. This may be attributable to a variety of factors, including uncertainty regarding the procedure for publishing such records on the Clearing-House. Means to obtain full information about illegal and unintentional transboundary movements may not be available to all Parties. Regional cooperation to support capacity-building, including regional reference laboratories, would be useful for addressing illegal and unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms.

Key observations

(a) Progress towards goal A.6 is observable with almost two thirds of Parties having adopted full measures to prevent unintentional transboundary movements and a similar number of Parties having adopted measures to prevent illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms, with a steep increase in the former group. When also considering the Parties that have adopted such measures to some extent, the proportion increases to about three quarters of Parties;

(b) Only a very limited number of Parties reported having become aware of cases of unintentional transboundary movement, and just over a fifth of Parties reported having become aware of cases of illegal transboundary movement; however, only two cases were submitted to the Biosafety Clearing-House;

(c) Challenges related to goal A.6 include limited laboratory detection capacities, insufficient equipment and trained personnel; porous borders; and institutional and regulatory challenges. These challenges underline the need for continuing support for implementation and capacity development in this regard.

Goal A.7: Parties have measures in place to fulfil the handling, transport, packaging and identification requirements of living modified organisms under Article 18 of the Protocol

12. Effective implementation of Article 18 of the Protocol requires not only the adoption of measures but also operational capacities. Such capacity could be strengthened through cross-sectoral cooperation and coordination among biosafety competent national authorities, customs authorities, and other relevant government bodies. For transboundary transportation of living modified organisms through lands, territories and waters of indigenous peoples and local communities, obtaining free prior informed consent of indigenous peoples and local communities is important.

Key observations

(a) A growing number of Parties have fully taken measures to require that living modified organisms subject to transboundary movement are handled, packaged and transported under conditions of safety, taking into account relevant international rules and standards, bringing the global total to just under two thirds of Parties. Considerable variation is observed among the regions. When also considering the Parties that have done so to some extent, the global percentage increases to about three quarters, and the regional differences become less pronounced;

(b) In relation to the adoption of documentation requirements for shipments of living modified organisms, Parties show progress from the baseline. Just over half of Parties have in place measures to fulfil documentation requirements for most categories of living modified organisms and just over a tenth of Parties have these measures in place to some extent;

(c) Just over half of Parties have the capacity to enforce the requirements for the identification and documentation of living modified organisms and just over a quarter of Parties have this capacity to some extent, underlining the challenges Parties face in this regard, in particular in relation to the operationalization of legal frameworks, training of customs officers, access to adequate facilities, equipment and resources for the detection and identification of living modified organisms, including technical support at the national level regarding the transfer of technology.

Goal A.8: Parties are able to detect and identify living modified organisms

13. The need for continuous updating of capacities for detection and identification of living modified organisms in the light of the rapid developments in biotechnology is a challenge that affects Parties across all regions and levels of development. Regional cooperation and networks play a role in strengthening capacities for detection and identification of living modified organisms. The Network of Laboratories, managed by the Secretariat, facilitates the exchange of experiences and information in this context.

14. A variety of challenges exist for accessing certified reference materials, which include financial, regulatory and administrative constraints.

Key observations

(a) Progress towards goal A.8 is notable with almost 90 per cent of Parties having reliable access to technical infrastructures, such as laboratories, for the detection of living modified organisms, a number that has increased considerably from the baseline. About three quarters of Parties has access to such infrastructures for the purpose of identification of living modified organisms. Similarly, about 80 per cent of Parties have access to resource materials and detection methods necessary to detect and identify living modified organisms, although there are notable regional differences in this regard. Only about two thirds of Parties have access to certified reference materials, with strong regional variation;

(b) For just over half of the living modified organism records on the Biosafety Clearing-House, associated information in the “Detection method(s)” field of the common format is provided;

(c) Despite the progress achieved, Parties continue to face challenges in relation to goal A.8, including limited access to accredited laboratories, certified reference materials, validated detection methods, adequate equipment, sustainable financial resources and sufficient trained personnel. The continuous development of new living modified organisms highlights the importance of maintaining and further strengthening capacities in this field.

Goal A.9: Parties that choose to do so take into account socioeconomic considerations when making decisions on the import of living modified organisms and cooperate on research and information exchange, in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol

15. The nexus between socioeconomic considerations and sectoral applications of living modified organisms, including in the food and agriculture sectors, was evident in several examples provided in the national reports. Including cultural aspects as part of socioeconomic considerations is important for indigenous peoples and local communities.

Key observations

(a) Progress towards goal A.9 can be observed in the growing percentage of Parties taking socioeconomic considerations into account in decision-making, with a total of two thirds of the Parties taking decisions on the import of living modified organisms doing so. About half of these Parties have taken socioeconomic considerations into account in some cases only, and the other half have taken them into account in all decisions taken in the reporting period;

(b) Less than a third of Parties cooperated with other Parties on research and information exchange on any socioeconomic impacts of living modified organisms, which represents a minimal increase from the baseline, with considerable regional differences (10 per cent in Latin America and

the Caribbean; 26 per cent in Africa; 26 per cent in Eastern Europe; 35 per cent in Asia and the Pacific; and 53 per cent in Western Europe and other States). A slightly lower proportion of Parties used resource materials for taking socioeconomic considerations into account;

(c) Challenges related to goal A.9 include those related to the regulatory framework enabling the consideration of socioeconomic aspects, as well as those related to the actual assessment of socioeconomic impacts.

Goal A.10: Parties to the Cartagena Protocol become Parties to the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress and have in place measures to fulfil their obligations under the Supplementary Protocol

16. Further outreach and awareness raising about the Supplementary Protocol is necessary among Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities, stakeholders and decision makers. It is concerning that limited progress has been made by Parties to the Supplementary Protocol in the adoption of measures for its implementation.

Key observations

(a) Progress towards goal A.10 is observable. The number of Parties to the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress has increased by eight. Although only a third of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol have become party to the supplementary instrument, a considerable number of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol have a process in place towards becoming party to the Supplementary Protocol;

(b) Just under two thirds of Parties have in place all measures for the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol, which represents a slight increase from the baseline. When also considering the Parties having in place such measures to some extent, the percentage increases to just over two thirds;

(c) The adoption of legislation to implement the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress is one of the main challenges Parties face in achieving goal A.10.

Goal B.1: Parties engage in capacity-building activities

17. The slight decrease in the number of Parties engaging in capacity-building activities, alongside persistently high capacity-building needs, highlights the importance of ensuring continued and adequate support in this area.

18. The capacity-building action plan is complementary to the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development.¹¹ The long-term strategic framework includes key strategies to improve capacity-building and development, such as institutionalizing such capacity-building and development, which, if applied, would contribute to more effective and sustainable capacities. The centres for technical and scientific cooperation can play a role in furthering capacities for biosafety.

19. Involving indigenous peoples and local communities, women, youth and relevant stakeholders in capacity-building and development is important.

20. Drawing attention to the available capacity-building and resource materials on the Secretariat website would be useful.

Key observations

(a) A slightly lower percentage of Parties undertook activities for the development or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety, compared to the baseline, with over three quarters of Parties having done so. A similar sized group of Parties still has capacity-building needs, which also constitutes a slight decrease from the baseline;

¹¹ Decision [15/8](#), annex I.

(b) Just under two thirds of Parties have prioritized their capacity-building needs and just under half of Parties developed a capacity-building needs assessment. Just over half of Parties cooperated with other Parties in strengthening capacities for the implementation of the Protocol;

(c) Common challenges faced by Parties include limited number of trained staff, staff turnover, insufficient institutional coordination and insufficient financial resources. Several developing country Parties described that they depend on donor funding for biosafety activities and that implementation of the Protocol is fragmented as a result;

(d) The most common areas for ongoing capacity needs are: risk assessment, risk management and other scientific and technical expertise; sampling, detection and identification; institutional capacity and human resources; public awareness, education and participation.

Goal B.2: Parties mobilize adequate resources from all sources to support the implementation of the Protocol, in accordance with Article 28 of the Protocol

Key observations

(a) Progress towards goal B.2 is limited. Although almost three quarters of Parties have access to resources for biosafety from national budgets, for almost two thirds of these Parties these resources are inadequate. As a result, almost three quarters of Parties do not have any or only inadequate national resources for biosafety. There are substantial regional differences among Parties for which biosafety resources from national budgets are adequate (0 per cent in Africa, 8 per cent in Latin America and the Caribbean, 33 per cent in Asia and the Pacific, 73 per cent in Eastern Europe and 94 per cent in Western Europe and other States);

(b) More than half of Parties have accessed resources that were additional to funds from national budgets, which represented a slight decrease compared to the baseline, and around one in seven eligible Parties accessed their allocation for biosafety activities under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources of the Global Environment Facility;

(c) In the absence of adequate national funding for biosafety in the majority of countries, donor funding continues to play a critical role in financing the implementation of the Protocol, and the Global Environment Facility also continues to play a pivotal role in this regard.

Goal B.3: Parties promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation on the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms, in accordance with Article 23 of the Protocol

21. Making results of decisions on living modified organisms available to the public would contribute to increased transparency. Including indigenous peoples and local communities and stakeholders through participatory and transparent consultations, making use of culturally appropriate ways of communication, is important and should be enhanced, taking into consideration that indigenous peoples and local communities live across borders.

Key observations

(a) Progress towards goal B.3 can be observed. A growing number of Parties established a mechanism to facilitate and promote public participation, including consultation, in the decision-making process regarding living modified organisms, with just over half of Parties having done so, and just over a fifth of Parties having done so to some extent;

(b) Similarly, the percentage of Parties having informed the public about existing modalities for public participation in the decision-making process regarding living modified organisms has increased, with half of Parties having done so and about a fifth of Parties having done so to some extent;

(c) A growing number of Parties have consulted the public in the decision-making process, with over three quarters of Parties having done so. Yet only half of these Parties made the results of the decision-making process available to the public;

(d) Over three quarters of Parties informed the public about the means to access the Biosafety Clearing-House, which represented an increase from the baseline;

(e) A large group of Parties still have capacity needs in relation to goal B.3.

Goal B.4: Parties enhance cooperation and coordination on biosafety issues at the national, regional and international levels

22. Integration of biosafety across sectors is needed in the light of its interconnection with biodiversity, sustainable agriculture, human and animal health and technological innovation. Enhanced international and regional cooperation and coordination among Parties is required, involving also relevant international organizations. More Parties should develop mechanisms for involving indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of the Protocol.

Key observations

(a) Many Parties cooperate on biosafety, with nearly two thirds of Parties having cooperated with other Parties in the exchange of scientific, technical and institutional knowledge in the reporting period;

(b) Nearly all Parties have integrated biosafety in national sectoral and cross-sectoral strategies, action plans, programmes, policies or legislation or have done so to some extent;

(c) One third of Parties have mechanisms for involving indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of the Protocol;

(d) More than three quarters of Parties have capacity needs to be able to integrate biosafety into cross-sectoral and sectoral legislation, policies and institutions, which represents no change from the baseline.
