



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/8/4
14 March 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**EIGHTH COORDINATION MEETING FOR
GOVERNMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONS
IMPLEMENTING OR FUNDING BIOSAFETY
CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES**
Prague, 12-14 March 2012

REPORT OF THE MEETING

INTRODUCTION

1. The eighth Coordination Meeting for Governments and Organizations Implementing or Funding Biosafety Capacity-Building Activities was held from 12 to 14 March 2012 at the Ministry of the Environment in Prague, the Czech Republic. A total of 30 participants from 17 Governments and 11 organizations attended the meeting.

2. The governments represented were: Austria, Belize, Bolivia, Czech Republic, Germany, India, Italy, Liberia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain. The organizations represented were: Asociación Desarrollo Medio Ambiental Sustentable, ECOROPA, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), GenØk - Centre for Biosafety, the Global Industry Coalition, the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB), the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Le Groupe-Conseil Baastel Ltée, the Regional Agricultural and Environment Initiatives Network-Africa (RAEIN-Africa), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the University of Westminster. The list of participants is annexed to this report.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

3. The meeting was opened by Ms. Klara Wajdova, Department of International Relations, Ministry of the Environment of the Czech Republic. In her remarks, Ms. Wajdova welcomed the participants to the meeting on behalf of the Government of the Czech Republic and thanked the Secretariat for giving the Czech Republic the opportunity to host the meeting back-to-back with the ninth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety. She informed participants that the Czech Republic became the seventh Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in October 2001 and was the second country to ratify the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, on 13 February 2012. These actions, she noted, clearly demonstrated the commitment of the Czech Government to the Cartagena Protocol. She further stated that the Czech Republic considered the Protocol as a very important global instrument for sustainable development. She reported that the government had adopted a number of policy documents containing biosafety principles, a regulatory regime, a system for handling requests for permits, a system for monitoring of environmental effects and

/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a C-Neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

enforcement; and a system for public information, participation and awareness-raising. Ms. Wajdova noted that effective implementation of the Cartagena was a big challenge requiring systematic and long-term capacity-building efforts. She further noted that during the current economic crisis, when almost all Governments were implementing budgetary cuts, capacity-building activities needed to be focused on the most urgent needs of Parties and implemented in a synergistic and efficient way. She expressed hope that the upcoming meetings would discuss measures for enabling Parties to meet these challenges.

4. Mr. Charles Gbedemah, speaking on behalf of the new Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Braulio Dias, welcomed the participants and thanked the Czech Republic for hosting the meeting. Mr. Gbedemah noted that the implementation of the Protocol continued to be constrained by the lack of human resources and institutional capacities in many developing countries and countries with economies in transition. This situation, he noted, had been exacerbated by the current economic crisis facing most economies. He noted that these challenges required concerted efforts and innovative ways from all stakeholders and that the meeting provided an important forum for discussing possible solutions. Mr. Gbedemah concluded by recognizing the contribution made by Ms. Hana Jirakova and Ms. Milena Roudna in organizing the meeting.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

5. After the opening session of the meeting, participants elected Mr. Hartmut Meyer (Germany) to serve as Chair of the meeting and Ms. Angela Lozan (Republic of Moldova) to serve as Rapporteur.

6. The participants then adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda developed by the Secretariat in consultation with the Steering Committee and available as document UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/8/1.

7. The participants also adopted the organization of work for the meeting, as contained in annex I to the annotations to the agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/8/1/Add.1). It was agreed that all the agenda items would be discussed in plenary.

ITEM 3. STANDING AGENDA ITEMS

3.1. Update on ongoing and planned biosafety capacity-building activities

8. Under this agenda item, the participants made short presentations on their recent and ongoing biosafety capacity-building activities. Participants who had not yet provided written updates to the Secretariat on their activities were invited to do so as soon as possible in order to have them included in the information document (UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/8/INF/1) to be posted on the webpage for the meeting (<http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=BSCMCB-08>). The Secretariat informed participants that the document would be updated and made available to the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

9. At the end of the presentations, the participants had a general discussion on the current status and trends of capacity-building efforts for the effective implementation of the Protocol. The participants noted with concern the general decline in the level of bilateral and multilateral funding available for biosafety capacity-building activities, which they noted was likely to adversely affect the future implementation of the Protocol. It was observed that, besides the current economic difficulties and budgetary constraints facing many donor countries, the decline had been partly due to the low level at which many developing countries and countries with economies in transition were incorporating biosafety among their priorities for development assistance. In this regard, the participants underscored

the need to mainstream biosafety into national development plans and relevant sectoral policies, strategies and programmes, including national biodiversity strategies and action plans. They also noted that it was important to ensure close collaboration and proactive exchange of information at the national level between the national focal points and other government officials in relevant government ministries and departments, including the Ministries of Finance and Economic Planning and the GEF operational focal points, among others.

10. Some participants also highlighted the need to link national biosafety activities with the national biotechnology policies and programmes. It was also suggested that effort should be made to highlight the linkages between biosafety and sustainable development efforts. In this regard, it was recommended that the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol should be highlighted in the post Rio+20 processes, noting that the Protocol could be highlighted as one of the tools for promoting sustainable development.

11. The participants also emphasized the need for regional approaches to capacity-building for biosafety. It was further noted that regional initiatives were likely to promote economies of scale and ensure that available financial and technical resources were used more effectively.

12. Finally, it was suggested that in the current era of limited availability of funding, effort should be made to adopt cost-effective approaches to capacity-building, including targeted training focusing on personnel already in service as well as individuals with academic background and expertise in relevant fields, who would require only limited resources for retraining.

3.2. *Progress report on implementation of the recommendations of previous coordination meetings and relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol*

13. Under this agenda item, a representative of the Secretariat presented a brief report on the follow-up to the recommendations of the seventh coordination meeting. It was reported that since the last meeting, progress had been made regarding the issue of capacity-building for research and information exchange on socioeconomic considerations. Regional real-time online conferences on socioeconomic considerations, requested by the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol in paragraph 24 of decision BS-V/3, were conducted in June 2011 and the workshop on capacity-building for research and information exchange on socioeconomic impacts of living modified organisms (LMOs), requested in paragraph 25 of the same decision, was held from 14 to 16 November 2011 in New Delhi with funding from the Government of Norway. The workshop was attended by 34 participants from 27 governments and 7 organizations. The report of the workshop (UNEP/CBD/BS/WS-SEC/1/6) will be considered at the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, to be held in Hyderabad in October 2012.

14. In response to the recommendation to invite relevant international organizations to develop training or guidance materials and organize training workshops on LMO safety inspection and enforcement of biosafety regulatory frameworks, the Secretariat communicated the invitation to UNEP, which responded positively. A representative of UNEP reported that a process was currently underway to develop a medium-sized pilot project to be submitted to the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The project would include the following components: stocktaking to assess the current status of enforcement of biosafety regulatory frameworks; development of toolkits and training materials; organization of training workshops for relevant enforcement officials (including customs, quarantine officials and inspectors) in a few pilot countries; and establishment of a network for biosafety enforcement cooperation. The project was expected to involve a number of partners, including the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Green Customs Initiative, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the International Network for Environmental Compliance and Enforcement (INECE), the Parties, and development partners.

15. The Secretariat also reported that it had written to the IUCN Environmental Law Centre inviting them to consider developing an explanatory guide to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress. The IUCN Environmental Law Centre had expressed its interest in developing such a guide in view of its previous experience with the development of a similar guide for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the ongoing process of developing the guide for the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization. However, it indicated that it had limited financial resources to undertake the project.

ITEM 4. ISSUES FOR IN-DEPTH CONSIDERATION

4.1. Capacity-building for preventing, detecting, and managing illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms

16. Under this item, a representative of the Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/8/2. The document reviewed the current status and examples of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs and the measures taken by Parties to address illegal transboundary movements as reflected in the second national reports on the implementation of the Protocol that were submitted as of 31 December 2011. The document also outlined the capacity-building needs identified by Parties in their second national reports and proposed possible strategies and measures that could be undertaken to develop national capacities for the prevention, detection, and management of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs. The last section presented a short conclusion and recommendation on the need for the development of strategies and measures to enhance the capacities of Parties for prevention, detection and control of confirmed cases of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs.

17. After the introduction of the document, the participants shared experiences regarding cases of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs and response measures that had been taken. Some participants also described their existing regulatory and institutional frameworks. Subsequently, three discussion groups were established to discuss the capacity-building needs and measures for the prevention, detection, and control of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs.

18. Following the small group discussions, the Chair invited the rapporteurs from each of the groups to report to plenary. The following are the summaries of the main points raised by the three groups:

A. Capacity-building for preventing illegal transboundary movements of LMOs

19. The group highlighted the need for:

(a) Promoting information exchange (e.g., through the Biosafety Clearing-House and locally adapted means) and raising awareness on the specific potential for illegal introduction of LMOs into the environment;

(b) Awareness-raising, education and dissemination of information to key stakeholders. Some illegal transboundary movements of LMOs may be occurring due to ignorance and lack of information on the part of the exporters, some regulatory authorities or end users (e.g., farmers, etc.). Parties may need to promote awareness among various stakeholders and the public, including through ensuring easy access to relevant information;

(c) Setting up of alert systems that would include traceability (aimed at undertaking checks), detection and other measures (e.g., quarantine) at entry points (e.g., borders) or other distribution points (e.g., markets);

(d) Establishment of institutional structures for monitoring and response measures with clear procedures and responsibilities, and with competencies differentiated at every stage (e.g., for border control officials, field technicians, emergency measure contact points), including designation and building the capacity of emergency measure contact points;

(e) Appraisal of social and economic dynamics of past and potential illegal transboundary movements to identify factors that may contribute to future illegal transboundary movement (e.g., traditional means of transportation of illegal shipments and informal transboundary trading patterns), which may be LMO-specific;

(f) Development of methods for general surveillance to monitor, on a regular basis, potential illegal introductions; this may require capacity-building to enable citizens, in particular farmers and civil society groups, to play a more effective role in preventing illegal transboundary movements of LMOs; e.g., citizen observations for resistance in the field (for instance using questionnaires to observe specific phenotypic characteristics and also making use of the local indigenous knowledge to detect illegal introductions);

(g) Making use of labelling to help distinguish between legal and illegal introductions and ultimately contribute to the prevention of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs.

20. The group also noted that the need for:

(a) Ongoing exchange of experiences; the group recommended the establishment of a network of biosafety inspectors;

(b) Regional approaches to capacity-building aimed at fostering collaborative efforts at regional level to prevent illegal transboundary movements; and

(c) Prioritization of the above needs at the national level.

B. Capacity-building for detecting illegal transboundary movements of LMOs

21. The second group proposed the following capacity-building priorities linked to the process of technical detection and control of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs:

(a) Identification of critical consignments or critical imports;

(b) Development and implementation of inspection and sampling plans; and

(c) Detection in the laboratories.

Identification of critical consignments or critical imports

22. The group also noted that in order to make the inspection most efficient and cost-effective, it was necessary to identify the critical points which might be linked to an illegal transboundary movement. In this regard, they noted that it was important to:

(a) Determine the critical parameters to consider: country of origin, type of commodity, etc.;

(b) Identify and register already known cases, to establish the history of illegal transboundary movements;

- (c) Identify relevant information sources at the national, regional, international levels; and
- (d) Involve the institutions and staff directly involved in control of illegal transboundary movements (including customs, phytosanitary inspections, food and feed inspectors, etc.).

Development and implementation of inspection and sampling plans

23. The group identified various topics in this area for which capacity-building was required. These included:

- (a) Training for staff of different institutions, but also authorities (ministries) in charge of deciding on inspection plans;
- (b) Technical training for developing and implementing sampling plans;
- (c) Taking into account informal cross-border trade and movement of goods (e.g., seeds, LMOs-FFP [living modified organisms used for food, feed or processing]); and
- (d) Using information obtained through internal market surveillance (e.g., food samples from supermarkets) as a possible information source on illegal transboundary movements.

Detection in the laboratories

24. The group noted that it was important to:

- (a) Establish and maintain the infrastructure necessary for detection of LMOs, including laboratories;
- (b) Train laboratory staff in LMO detection; and
- (c) Develop and/or adapt methodology for LMO detection, including analytical strategies.

25. The group also suggested that basic detection could be done at the national level and advanced identification at regional or subregional level.

Cross-cutting issues

26. Furthermore, the group agreed that:

- (a) Information exchange between institutions/authorities/agencies involved is crucial and should be a real exchange (in all directions);
- (b) Regional cooperation and information exchange especially linked to the critical points assessment should be targeted by capacity-building activities; and
- (c) Tools to identify systematic illegal transboundary movements should be developed, legal systems (control, penalties, etc.) strengthened and information sources protected.

C. *Capacity-building for managing confirmed cases of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs*

27. The third group noted that effective action for managing confirmed cases of illegal transboundary movement of LMOs required:

(a) Capable well-trained technicians who are able to act quickly and have the necessary knowledge regarding how to contain and/or destroy the illegal LMO in question;

(b) Physical capacity in the form of appropriately equipped emergency response teams and facilities with the right technology to safely contain or dispose of the LMOs;

(c) A robust legal framework that defines when a transboundary movement of LMOs is within the law. These rules should be drafted by legal and technical experts, and should be based on clear procedures. Such a strong legal framework helps identify who is technically responsible, but also who is legally liable for an illegal movement. This is essential to build a strong legal case, in the event that government action is contested before the court. The legislation should also include appropriate sanctions proportionate to the offence but also sufficient to act as a deterrent to further illegal behaviour;

(d) The capability to prosecute after an illegal event, which requires capacity at the government legal offices and sufficient legal expertise to defend cases in court;

(e) Clear and incontestable division of competencies among government departments and institutions, and clear and broadly defined mandates, so that everyone knows their role in the management of the illegal LMO;

(f) Good information exchange among the different institutions involved within the country and also across the border where the LMO came from or where they could potentially move to, to facilitate timely and effective response;

(g) Good documentation of responses as they occur, in order not only to build a legal case, but also to learn from similar cases so that as time goes on data can be used to build smart monitoring programmes based on past patterns; and

(h) Standard accredited sampling techniques and detection methods.

28. The group also noted that government measures needed to be socially acceptable to citizens, and should, for example, include:

(a) Provisions that would allow governments to address emergency situations such as disaster response food aid;

(b) Safeguards against conflict of interest, such as procedures to controls the controllers.

29. The group also recognized the need to develop capacity to understand how the Protocol compliance mechanism worked in instances involving illegal transboundary movements between Parties and between Parties and non-Parties.

4.2. Capacity-building needs and initiatives for post-release monitoring of living modified organisms

30. Under this item, a representative of the Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/8/3. The document summarized how some countries address monitoring of LMOs introduced into the environment in their biosafety regulatory frameworks. It also provided examples of guidance on monitoring developed under the Protocol and by other international/regional organizations, as well as examples previous and ongoing capacity-building activities on monitoring of LMOs. The last section of the document elaborated possible strategies for strengthening national capacities relevant to monitoring of LMOs.

31. The Chair invited participants to make short presentations on whether and how mechanisms for monitoring were included in their national biosafety frameworks. From the presentations, it was noted that there were wide variations among countries in terms of experience in implementing activities on monitoring of LMOs and the scope of those activities.

32. A general discussion took place with a view to identifying needs and priorities for capacity-building in monitoring of LMOs released into the environment. Participants agreed that post-release monitoring of LMOs was a key issue for the effective implementation of the Protocol. They noted that there was limited experience in both developing and developed countries and underscored the urgent need to develop technical capacity for the development and implementation of monitoring frameworks and to foster collaboration among countries in this regard.

33. Participants were then divided into five smaller groups to discuss measures that could be taken to enhance national capacity for post-release monitoring of LMOs, taking into account examples presented in paragraph 30 of document UNEP/CBD/BS/CM-CB/8/3. The groups were also invited to discuss possible elements for recommendations to Parties in the context of capacity-building on post-release monitoring.

34. The five groups presented outcomes of their discussion to the plenary and this was followed by a general discussion on capacity-building priorities for post-release monitoring of LMOs. There was general agreement that there was a need for capacity-building to assist Parties in the development of national strategies for (i) monitoring of adverse effects that were identified but not addressed in the risk assessment, (ii) monitoring of unanticipated adverse effects that were not identified in the risk assessment, and (iii) detection of LMOs whose release was not authorized, e.g., LMOs that were unintentionally released or that entered the country through illegal transboundary movements. A summary of the main viewpoints and recommendations is presented in section B of item 6 below (conclusions and recommendations).

35. The participants also recommended, for consideration by the Parties, the establishment of a stepwise process, including online discussions and face-to-face meetings (e.g., international and regional workshops), as a possible mechanism to assist in the development of the capacities of Parties to monitor LMOs released into the environment.

36. Furthermore, the participants discussed a number of questions that could be used, prior to and during online discussions, to gather information, facilitate the exchange of experiences and help in identifying gaps, needs and success stories in the context of monitoring of LMOs. The following are some of the questions that were proposed:

(a) Has your country carried any activities on monitoring of LMOs? If yes, did the monitoring relate to LMOs for field trials, commercial releases, or illegal/unauthorized releases?

- (b) Were reports from the monitoring activities produced? Are those reports available to the public and where?
- (c) Were baseline studies carried out?
- (d) What were the LMOs or traits in question? Was the monitoring tailored to those LMOs or traits?
- (e) Has the monitoring process produced data relevant to the risk assessment or to the release at a larger scale?
- (f) In cases where a posterior release is intended, was the monitoring carried out in the same environment where the posterior release would take place?
- (g) How were uncertainties associated with the monitoring addressed?
- (h) How was the methodology to be used for data collection (e.g., observation, data collection, etc.) established?
- (i) Was a system for reporting the findings of the monitoring activities available? If not, how was the reporting carried out?
- (j) Was a database used to track the monitoring parameters? If so, please provide details.
- (k) What are the priority needs of your country in relation to post-release monitoring of LMOs? Please name 3 (*the survey questionnaire should provide a list of choices and cluster answers into broad areas*).

37. The participants recommended that countries should first be invited to respond to general questions, including the following:

- (a) Does your national biosafety framework have provisions for monitoring? If not, do you envision including monitoring activities?
- (b) Are databases and baselines available?
- (c) What national agencies are involved in post-release monitoring activities?
- (d) What are the methods being used?
- (e) Is there any coordination mechanism in place?
- (f) What are the reporting capacities in the country?
- (g) How is transparency ensured?
- (h) In addition to government agencies and organizations conducting the post-release monitoring, (including inspectorates, farmer organizations, etc.), do you have a mechanism in place to involve local communities and other relevant stakeholders in post-release monitoring?
- (i) In which areas of post-release monitoring do you see a need for regional or subregional cooperation for increased efficiency?

(j) What types of LMOs are being developed/used in your country? What are their traits and their intended uses?

(k) Does your country consider human health aspects in the monitoring of LMOs, in addition to environmental monitoring?

38. The questions proposed specifically relating to capacity-building included the following:

(a) What are the main gaps in and limitations to your country's capacity to conduct post-release monitoring?

(b) What capacity-building activities are needed to identify the protection goal to be informed by the monitoring process?

(c) What capacity-building activities are needed to identify the risk hypothesis associated with the protection goal?

(d) What capacity-building activities are needed to establish the relevant assessment endpoints?

(e) What have been the characteristics of successful monitoring programs implemented so far in your country and what have been the main limitations? What are the success stories of those monitoring initiatives?

(f) What capacity-building activities would help the competent national authorities to implement effective monitoring programs based on defined protection goals, risk hypotheses and relevant assessment endpoints?

39. It was recommended that the survey questions should have a broad scope to cover different areas and capacity-building needs, including regulatory frameworks, technical issues and facilities, and examples of specific cases of monitoring. It was also recommended that at the end of the process a matrix should be produced placing countries in clusters and identifying their capacity-building needs.

40. The elements proposed by the participants for consideration by the Parties at their sixth meeting during deliberations on the comprehensive review of the capacity-building Action Plan are presented under item 6 (conclusions and recommendations) of this document.

4.3. Update on the process for the next comprehensive review of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol and the Coordination Mechanism

41. Under this agenda item, the consultant who carried out the independent evaluation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol gave a presentation on the process and the main findings and recommendations in the evaluation report. During the discussions, participants sought clarifications with regards to the methodology and sources of information used and the basis for some of the conclusions and recommendations made. They made a number of suggestions for the improvement of the report. It was agreed that the revised version of the report, incorporating the views and suggestions made, would be sent to the participants for their feedback before the consultant submitted the final draft to the Secretariat.

42. Prior to the above presentation, the consultant commissioned by the Secretariat to carry out an analysis of the status of implementation of various elements of the Protocol with a view to facilitating the

/...

second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol also briefed the participants about the process and the preliminary results of her analysis. She gave an overview of the process and scope of the second assessment and review, the sources of information used, and the preliminary findings. The analysis encompasses the coverage of the Protocol, the domestic implementation of core procedures and other requirements of the Protocol including its annexes, the effectiveness of international-level procedures and mechanisms, and the impacts of transboundary movements of LMOs on biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health. The participants provided input and made some suggestions for the improvement of the report.

ITEM 5. OTHER MATTERS

A. Issues for consideration at the next coordination meeting

43. The participants agreed to discuss capacity-building needs relating to the following issues at the next coordination meeting:

- (a) Identification (detection) of LMOs; and
- (b) Risk assessment.

44. The other issues considered but deferred for consideration at a later stage included the following:

- (a) Information sharing and data management;
- (b) Risk management; and
- (c) Implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol.

B. Date and venue of the next coordination meeting

45. The participant from the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia expressed her organization's interest in hosting the next coordination meeting. She promised to confirm the offer with the Secretariat after consulting with the senior management of her organization.

ITEM 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

46. The following is a summary of the main suggestions that were made regarding actions that might be taken to foster capacity-building for preventing, detecting and managing illegal transboundary movements and for post-release monitoring of living modified organisms.

A. Capacity-building for preventing, detecting and managing illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms

47. With regards to capacity-building for preventing, detecting and managing illegal transboundary movements of LMOs, the participants highlighted the need to:

- (a) Develop capacities to determine possible pathways of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs, including likely entry points;
- (b) Promote public awareness, education and access to information by key stakeholders regarding illegal transboundary movements of LMOs, including potential pathways and national legal

requirements, as illegal transboundary movements sometimes occur because of ignorance and lack of information on the part of the different actors, including exporters, importers, some regulatory authorities or end users (farmers, etc.);

(c) Build awareness of the possibilities for public participation in the prevention, detection and management of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs;

(d) Apply multidisciplinary and multistakeholder approaches to capacity-building measures for addressing illegal transboundary movements of LMOs;

(e) Develop the capacity of Parties to understand how the Protocol's compliance mechanism would be used in instances involving illegal transboundary movements between Parties and between Parties and non-Parties;

(f) Nominate Emergency Measures Contact Points and make their contact details available to the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH).

B. Capacity- building in post-release monitoring of living modified organisms

48. The participants agreed that post-release monitoring of LMOs was a key issue for the effective implementation of the Protocol and must be conducted as an integral component of the broader system for the implementation of the national biosafety frameworks.

49. The participants noted that monitoring of LMOs released into the environment:

(a) Is an activity that is still evolving and in which there is still limited experience, such that many countries, both developed and in development, need to develop capacity for its full implementation;

(b) Involves various stakeholders (e.g., LMO developers, applicants, competent national authorities, technical personnel conducting the monitoring activities, operators of the LMO, etc.);

(c) Could benefit from existing experience and methodologies in monitoring systems (e.g., for plant protection or biodiversity); and

(d) Could use existing systems (e.g., for plant protection or biodiversity), provided that these systems are properly adapted to the biosafety context and requirements.

50. Participants further noted that capacity-building activities were needed to assist Parties in the development of a national strategy for:

(a) Monitoring of adverse effects that were identified but not addressed in the risk assessment;

(b) Monitoring of unanticipated adverse effects that were not identified in the risk assessment; and

(c) Detection of LMOs whose release was not authorized, e.g., LMOs that were unintentionally released or that entered the country through illegal transboundary movements.

Recommendations to Parties

51. Parties may wish to consider, at their sixth meeting, during their deliberations on the comprehensive review of the capacity-building Action Plan, the establishment of a stepwise process, including online discussions and face-to-face meetings (e.g., international and regional workshops), towards:

- (a) Establishing the scope of post-release monitoring within their national contexts (e.g., based on national protection goals);
- (b) Integrating monitoring strategies into their national biosafety framework by developing or further elaborating monitoring policies linked to risk assessment and risk management systems;
- (c) Identifying information to be submitted with an application for the release of an LMO into the environment, including, for example, detection methods and methodological conditions for detection, including sensitivity and specificity of the methods, and a proposed monitoring plan;
- (d) Establishing mechanisms for the effective implementation of post-release monitoring, including those for:
 - (i) Adapting existing monitoring systems (e.g., for plant protection, biodiversity) to LMOs;
 - (ii) Training of scientists and inspectors from the regulatory agencies to detect LMOs and monitor the environmental impacts of LMOs;
 - (iii) Developing guidelines and common formats for reporting the results of monitoring (e.g., to a national database), indicating the conditions, methodology and duration of the monitoring process; and
 - (iv) Developing systems and guidelines for subsequent verification/validation of monitoring results.

Recommendations to the Executive Secretary

52. The participants recommended the following activities be implemented, in collaboration with relevant organizations, as appropriate and subject to availability of resources, to facilitate the development of national capacities for post-release monitoring of LMOs:

- (a) Explore the possibility of organizing a side-event at the sixth meeting of the Parties to facilitate the sharing of experiences among Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations regarding post-release monitoring;
- (b) Take stock of existing monitoring initiatives at the national level;
- (c) Organize online discussions to facilitate the sharing of information, experiences, challenges and lessons learned, including:
 - (i) Inviting those who have experience regarding capacity-building activities on monitoring as well as various stakeholders to take part in the online debates;

- (ii) Using questions and/or discussion points to guide the online debate, in particular those that may help promote exchange of experience and cooperation among countries, such as those listed in paragraphs 36 to 38 above;
- (d) Convene regional and international workshops, building on the online discussions, to assist Parties in sharing experiences and identifying obstacles as well as ways of revising and strengthening their national biosafety frameworks with respect to systems for monitoring of LMOs; and
- (e) Create the possibility for Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to submit reports and results of monitoring to the Biosafety Clearing-House as reference records.

ITEM 7. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

53. During the final session, the participants adopted the draft report of the meeting. The Secretariat was requested, in consultation with the Chair and Rapporteur, to incorporate proceedings of the last day and then send the final draft to all participants for comments. The present report has been finalized on that basis.

54. Following brief closing remarks by Ms. Zuzana Doubkova, Head of the Biosafety Unit of the Ministry of the Environment of the Czech Republic, and by Mr. Gbedemah from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 4.30 p.m. on Wednesday, 14 March 2012.

Annex

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Austria

1. Mr. Andreas Heissenberger
Deputy Unit Head
Environment Agency Austria
Spittelauer Lände 5
Vienna A-1090
Austria
Tel.: +43 13 1304 3032
Fax: +43 13 1304 3700
E-Mail: andreas.heissenberger@umweltbundesamt.at
Web: <http://www.umweltbundesamt.at>

Belize

2. Ms. Natalie Gibson
Central Investigation Laboratory
Investigation Laboratory
Belize Agricultural Health Authority
P.O. Box 181
St. Joseph Street
Belize City
Belize
Tel.: +501 224 4794
Fax: +501 224 5230
E-Mail: gibsonnm@hotmail.com,
foodsafety@baha.bz

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

3. Ms. Georgina Catacora Vargas
Asesora
Viceministerio de Medio Ambiente
Avenida Camacho No 1471; 2 Piso
La Paz
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
Tel.: +47 94 153 751
Fax: +59 12 297 1415
E-Mail: g.catacora@gmail.com

Czech Republic

4. Mrs. Zuzana Doubkova
Head, Biosafety Unit
Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic
Vrsovicke 65
Prague 10 100 10
Czech Republic
Tel.: +420 267 122 922
Fax: +420 267 310 013
E-Mail: zuzana.doubkova@mzp.cz
Web: <http://www.mzp.cz>

Czech Republic, cont'd

5. Ms. Hana Jirakova
CPB National Focal Point
Department of Environmental Risks
Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic
Vrsovicke 65
Prague 10 100 10
Czech Republic
Tel.: +420 267 122 066
Fax: +420 267 310 013
E-Mail: Hana.Jirakova@mzp.cz,
hana_jirakova@env.cz
Web: <http://www.mzp.cz>
6. Ms. Milena Roudná
UNEP/GEF Project Coordinator, Advisor
Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic
Vrsovicke 65
100 10 Prague
Czech Republic
Tel.: +420 2 6712 2769
Fax: +420 2 6731 0013
E-Mail: milena.roudna@mzp.cz

Germany

7. Mr. Hartmut Meyer
German International Cooperation/Deutsche
Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
(GIZ) GmbH
Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5
Eschborn D-65760
Germany
Tel.: +495315168746
Fax: +495315168747
E-Mail: hmeyer@ngi.de
Web: www.giz.de

India

8. Ms. Ranjini Warriar
Director
Conservation and Survey Division
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Paryavaran Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road,
New Delhi 110003
India
Tel.: +91 11 2436 3964
Fax: +91 11 2436 0894
E-Mail: warrier@nic.in, ranjiniw@yahoo.com

Italy

9. Ms. Anna Russo
Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea
Via C. Bavastro 174
Roma 00154
Italy
Tel.: +39 339 260 4866
Fax: +39 065 722 8277
E-Mail: Anna.Russo@icgeb.org

Liberia

10. Mr. Johansen T. Voker
Coordinator
Multilateral Environmental Agreements Division
Environmental Protection Agency
4th Street Sinkor, Tubman Blvd
PO Box 4024
Monrovia Montserrado County
Liberia
Tel.: + 231 6 520042
Fax: +231 312 054 07127
E-Mail: vokerj@yahoo.com

Lithuania

11. Ms. Odeta Pivoriene
Chief Officer
GMO Division
Ministry of Environment of Lithuania
A. Jaksto Str. 4/9
Vilnius LT-01105
Lithuania
Tel.: +370 5 2663 564
Fax: +370 5 2663 663
E-Mail: o.pivoriene@am.lt

Malaysia

12. Mr. Letchumanan Ramatha
Director General
Department of Biosafety
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Level 1, Podium 2, Wisma Samber Asli, No. 25,
Persiaran Perdana, Precinct 4
Putrajaya 62574
Malaysia
Tel.: +603 8886 1580
Fax: +603 8890 4935
E-Mail: letchu@nre.gov.my, biosafety@nre.gov.my

Netherlands

13. Ms. Renske van Tol
Directorate for International Affairs
Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment
P.O. Box 20901
The Hague 2500 EX
Netherlands
Tel.: +31 70 456 6435

E-Mail: renske.van.tol@minienm.nl
Web: www.ienm.nl

Norway

14. Mr. Bjarte Heide
Senior Advisor
Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management
Tungasletta 2, 5672 Sluppen
N-7485 Trondheim, Norway
Tel.: +47 7358 0500
E-Mail: bjarte.heide@dirnat.no
Web: <http://www.dirnat.no/>

Republic of Moldova

15. Ms. Angela Lozan
Head of the Biosafety Office
Ministry of Environment
Str. Cosmonautilor 9, Bir 526
Chisinau MD 2005, Republic of Moldova
Tel.: +373 22 22 68 74
Fax: +373 22 22 68 74
E-Mail: angelalozan@yahoo.com

Serbia

16. Mr. Aleksej Tarasjev
Department of Evolutionary Biology, Institute for
Biological Research, University of Belgrade
Desota Stefana 142
Belgrade 11000, Serbia
Tel.: +381 11 207 83 76; +381 11 241 64 37
Fax: +381 112761 433
E-Mail: tarasjev@yandex.ru, tarasjev@ibiss.bg.ac.rs

Slovakia

17. Ms. Tatiana Horecka
Slovak Inspectorate of Environment
Karloveska 2
Bratislava 84222, Slovakia
Tel.: +421 903 806 937
Fax: +421 265 427 969
E-Mail: horecka@sizp.sk

Slovenia

18. Mr. Martin Batic
Secretary, Head of Biotechnology Unit
Environment and Climate Change Department
Ministry of Agriculture and the Environment
Dunajska 22
Ljubljana SI-1000
Slovenia
Tel.: +386 1 478 7402
Fax: +386 1 478 7420
E-Mail: martin.batic@gov.si
Web: <http://www.mop.gov.si>

Spain

19. Mr. Rodrigo Díaz Méndez
Technical Advisor
Support and Coordination
Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio
Ambiente

Subdirección General de Apoyo y Coordinación
Paseo de Infanta Isabel, 1
Madrid 28071
Spain

Tel.: +34 91 347 53 34/+34 91 322 6029
E-Mail: rdiaz9@tragsa.es,
protocolo.cartagena@marm.es

UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

**FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central
Asia (FAO/REU)**

20. Ms. Nevena Alexandrova
Agricultural Research and Biotechnology Officer
FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central
Asia (FAO/REU)
Benczur utca 34
Budapest, Hungary
E-Mail: nevena.alexandrova@fao.org
Web:
[http://www.fao.org/world/Regional/REU/index_e
n.htm](http://www.fao.org/world/Regional/REU/index_en.htm)

**United Nations Environment Programme,
Division of Environmental Policy
Implementation (UNEP/DEPI)**

21. Mr. Alex Owusu-Biney
Portfolio Manager (Biosafety),
GEF Coordination
Division of Environmental Policy
Implementation
United Nations Environment Programme,
Division of Environmental Policy
Implementation
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 762 4066
Fax: +254 20 762 4041, +254 20 762 4042
E-Mail: alex.owusu-biney@unep.org
Web: <http://www.unep.org/DEPI/>

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

**International Centre for Genetic Engineering
and Biotechnology (ICGEB)**

22. Mr. Decio Ripandelli
Head, Biosafety Unit
Secretary of the Board
International Centre for Genetic Engineering and
Biotechnology
AREA Science Park, Padriciano 99
I-34012
Trieste I-34149, Italy
Tel.: +39 040 375 7345
Fax: +39 040 375 7363
E-Mail: decio@icgeb.org
Web: <http://www.icgeb.org>

International Food Policy Research Institute

23. Mr. John Komen
Assistant Director
Program for Biosafety Systems (PBS)
International Food Policy Research Institute
c/o Duinoordstraat 69
2023 WC Haarlem
Netherlands
Tel.: +31 23 5263125
Fax: +31 84 724 7818
E-Mail: jce.komen@planet.nl

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Asociación Desarrollo Medio Ambiental Sustentable

24. Ms. Antonietta Gutiérrez-Rosati
Presidente
Asociación Desarrollo Medio Ambiental
Sustentable
Avenida La Molina 2135, Sol de la Molina
Lima 12, Peru
Tel.: +51 1 479 2866
E-Mail: antoniettaornella@gmail.com,
asdmass@asdmass.com

ECOROPA

25. Ms. Christine von Weizsäcker
President
ECOROPA
Postfach 1547
Emmendingen 79305
Germany
Tel.: +49 7641 9542214
Fax: +49 7641 9542215
E-Mail: cvw@ecoropa.de

RAEIN-Africa

26. Ms. Phumzile Zanele Dlamini
Technical Advisor
RAEIN-Africa
University of Namibia - P.O. Box 23544
340 Mandume Ndemufayo Avenue -
Pioneerspark
Windhoek, Namibia
Tel.: +264 61 206 3350
E-Mail: pdlamini@unam.na
Web: <http://www.raein-africa.org>

BUSINESS

Global Industry Coalition (GIC)

27. Mr. Eric Sachs
Lead, Global Scientific Affairs
Monsanto Company
Global Industry Coalition
800 N Lindbergh Blvd.
St Louis, MO 63167
United States of America
Tel.: +1 314 694 1709
E-Mail: eric.s.sachs@monsanto.com

EDUCATION/UNIVERSITY

GenØk - Centre for Biosafety

28. Mr. Jan Husby
Senior Advisor
GenØk - Centre for Biosafety
Science Park, PO 6418
Tromsø, Norway
Tel.: +47 48 04 57 33
Fax: +47 77 64 61 00
E-Mail: jan.husby@genok.org,
jan.husby@uit.no
Web: <http://www.genok.org>

University of Westminster

29. Ms. Ruth Mackenzie
School of Law
University of Westminster
4-12 Little Titchfield Street
London W1W 7UW
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland
Tel.: +44 1273 507251
E-Mail: ruthmackenzie.art35@gmail.com

OBSERVERS

Le Groupe-Conseil Baastel Ltée

30. Ms. Elsa Da Costa
Environmental Consultant
Le Groupe-Conseil Baastel Ltée
P.O.Box 1874, Station B
85 Victoria
Gatineau J8X 3Z1
Canada
Tel.: +1 819 595 1421 x227
E-Mail: elsa.dacosta@baastel.com

SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

31. Mr. Charles Gbedemah
Senior Programme Officer
Biosafety Division
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W. Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 7032
Fax: +1 514 288 6588
E-Mail: charles.gbedemah@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int

33. Mr. Erie Tamale
Programme Officer
Biosafety Division
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W. Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 7050
E-Mail: erie.tamale@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int

32. Ms. Manoela Miranda
Environmental Affairs Officer
Biosafety Division
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W. Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 8703
Fax: +1 514 288 6588
E-Mail: manoela.miranda@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int
