



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/10/2  
30 May 2014

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

### LIAISON GROUP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR BIOSAFETY

Tenth meeting  
Budapest, 7–9 April 2014

## REPORT OF THE TENTH MEETING OF THE LIAISON GROUP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR BIOSAFETY

### INTRODUCTION

1. The tenth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety was held from 7 to 9 April 2014 in Budapest. It was attended by 14 members from 11 Parties (Austria, Burkina Faso, Germany, Grenada, Hungary, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Norway, Slovenia and South Africa) and three organizations (ECOROPA, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Global Industry Coalition (GIC)).

2. Members from four other Parties (Brazil, Republic of Korea, Turkmenistan and Uganda) and two organizations (International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)) were invited but could not attend for various reasons.

### ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

3. The meeting was opened by Ms. Katalin Tóth, Deputy State-Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development of Hungary. In her opening remarks, Ms. Tóth noted that cooperation and collaboration had a key role to play in achieving successful implementation of any international agreement and that sharing experiences and lessons learned could help to overcome potential difficulties and motivate countries to adapt and implement good practices. She underscored the importance of integrating national measures for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (referred to in the report as “the Protocol”) into national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs).

4. Ms. Tóth reported that following the adoption of the global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the Government of Hungary embarked on a process of evaluation of the country’s biodiversity status and consequently a new National Biodiversity Strategy for the period 2014-2020 was developed together with an impact assessment. The new Strategy contained 20 objectives and the 17th objective focused on genetically modified organisms. In February 2014, the Hungarian Government adopted the new Strategy and it was expected that the newly elected Hungarian Parliament would also approve it soon. In conclusion, Ms. Tóth expressed hope that the meeting would identify new ways and means to strengthen the capacity of Parties to integrate biosafety into their NBSAPs and to find additional resources to support the national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

/...

5. Mr. Charles Gbedemah, Principal Officer in charge of the Biosafety Division at the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity also delivered an opening statement on behalf of Mr. Braulio de Souza Dias, the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. He welcomed the participants and thanked the Government of Hungary, through the Ministry of Rural Development, for hosting the meeting. Mr. Gbedemah noted that, in accordance with the renewed mandate of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety (decision BS-VI/3, annex II), the meeting was to provide advice on options for strengthening the capacities of Parties to review and integrate their national measures for the implementation of the Protocol into NBSAPs and national development policies, plans and programmes in line with the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020. The meeting was also expected to provide advice on ways and means of mobilizing new and additional resources to support national implementation of the Protocol in accordance with the Strategic Plan.

6. Mr. Gbedemah noted that the outcomes of the meeting would provide input for the special session on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to be held during the seventh meeting of the Parties to the Protocol in Pyeongchang, Republic of Korea. The special session was intended to provide a platform to share views, experiences and lessons learned and to identify ways to better integrate biosafety into relevant national development plans and programmes, including NBSAPs, and to mobilize additional resources to advance the implementation of the Protocol at the national level in line with the Strategic Plan for the Protocol. Mr. Gbedemah concluded by thanking the Liaison Group members for their time and continued support to the work of the Protocol and wished them very fruitful deliberations.

## **ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

7. After the opening session, the Liaison Group members elected Ms. Ranjini Warriar (India) to serve as Chair and Mr. Daniel Lewis (Grenada) to serve as Rapporteur.

8. The meeting adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/10/1) which was proposed by the Executive Secretary:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
  - 2.1. Election of officers;
  - 2.2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
3. Issues for in-depth consideration:
  - 3.1. Capacity-building for the integration of national measures for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety into national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national development policies and plans in line with the Strategic Plan for the Protocol 2011-2020; and
  - 3.2. Strengthening capacities for mobilization of additional resources to support national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.
4. Other matters.
5. Conclusions and recommendations.
6. Closure of the meeting.

9. The Liaison Group members also adopted the organization of work for the meeting, as contained in annex I to the annotated agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/10/1/Add.1).

### ITEM 3. ISSUES FOR IN-DEPTH CONSIDERATION

#### **3.1. *Capacity-building for the integration of national measures for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety into national biodiversity strategies and action plans and national development policies and plans in line with the Strategic Plan for the Protocol 2011-2020***

10. Under this agenda item, the Secretariat made a presentation entitled “Integrating Biosafety into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and Relevant Sectoral and Cross-Sectoral Policies, Plans and Programmes”. The presentation provided a brief background to the origin of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and its relationship with the provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity, including Articles 8(g) and 19 (4) regarding living modified organisms (LMOs) and Article 8(h) on alien invasive species. It described the rationale for integrating measures for implementation of the Protocol into NBSAPs and outlined the relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets. It also described possible entry points as well as tools and approaches for integration of biosafety.

11. After the presentation, the Liaison Group had extensive discussions on the basis of the following questions:

- (a) How could the significance of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, as a tool for sustainable development, be reflected in national development plans and NBSAPs?
- (b) What factors could play a role in strengthening the significance of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as a tool for sustainable development?
- (c) What are the main institutional and human resources capacity barriers to mainstreaming biosafety into NBSAPs and national development policies, plans and programmes?
- (d) What and whose capacity needs to be built? What sectors and stakeholders should be targeted?
- (e) How could biosafety be integrated into NBSAPs and relevant sectoral policies (agriculture, forestry, fisheries, health, trade, science and technology, etc.)?
  - i. What concrete steps could be taken (e.g., awareness-raising for key sectors and cooperation among relevant departments on joint projects/activities)?
  - ii. What are the potential entry points for integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and other policies, plans and programmes?
- (f) What are the critical capacity-building needs for integration?
- (g) How could Parties collaborate bilaterally and regionally in advancing biosafety integration into NBSAPs and national development plans?

12. The Liaison Group members noted that there were number of institutional and human resource capacity barriers to integration of biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans and these related to limitations in the following aspects:

- (a) Communication between and among various ministries and departments and other stakeholders, in particular communication between national focal points for the Protocol and the

Convention and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) operational focal points in cases where these are located in different institutions;

(b) Coordination among relevant ministries and departments to allow for integrated, coherent and coordinated approaches to the implementation of the Protocol and the Convention;

(c) Cooperation (and in some cases competition) between institutions responsible for biosafety and other sectoral and cross-sectoral departments;

(d) Availability of human resources with the necessary skills and competences; in most countries there are few staff dedicated to biosafety and most of them are preoccupied with regulatory activities and have limited time to undertake outreach activities;

(e) The communication, education and negotiation skills of the Protocol national focal points and their ability to engage and convince other sectors about the relevance of biosafety to their work and to raise the profile of biosafety;

(f) Consideration of biosafety among other competing national objectives and priorities; in many countries biosafety is still not given due consideration among the top national priorities; and

(g) Availability of funding and other resources for biosafety activities.

13. Below is a summary of the key points and issues raised during the discussions for consideration and action by Parties and relevant stakeholders at various levels.

14. At the national level, it was noted that there was a need to:

(a) Strengthen the capacity of the Cartagena Protocol national focal points to be able to engage and convince policy and decision makers about the importance of promoting biosafety at the national level and to secure their support, including through training in communication, education, negotiation, conflict resolution and stakeholder engagement skills;

(b) Develop communication strategies to promote awareness and profile of the Cartagena Protocol as a tool for sustainable development, including development of clear and compelling messages articulating the relevance of the Protocol to national development objectives and priorities and people's well-being;

(c) Analyse and communicate biosafety issues under the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, for example targets 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 13 and 15;

(d) Identify and address the sustainable development components under the Convention and the Cartagena Protocol, including those relating to the different Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

(e) Establish and/or strengthen Inter-Ministerial Committees (or similar mechanisms that provide advice on matters related to policy, programmes, budgets, etc.) to play a stronger role in promoting the integration of biosafety into relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes;

(f) Strengthen mechanisms for informal and ad hoc cooperation among officials of relevant institutions (including the national focal points for the Protocol and Convention and the GEF operational focal points); and to

(g) Review and expand, as appropriate, the composition and mandate of national biosafety committees (beyond approving LMO applications) to include promotion of integration of biosafety into relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes.

15. At the international level, it was noted there was a need to:

(a) Undertake an assessment of the Parties' capacity needs and skill gaps with regard to integration of biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans in order to tailor the capacity-building interventions;

(b) Organize regional and bilateral workshops for the Cartagena Protocol and Convention national focal points and relevant stakeholders to share experiences and lessons learned in the integration of biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans;

(c) Add a standing item entitled "Report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety" on the agenda of the meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention to promote the awareness of the Conference of the Parties of the outcomes of the preceding meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) and the general state of affairs under the Protocol with a view to fostering synergies and integration. This item could be considered during the first day of the meeting of the Conference of the Parties. In this regard, COP-MOP delegates could stay and attend the first part of the meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

(d) Encourage Parties, wherever possible, to include officials with background on, or dealing with, issues under the Convention and the Protocol in their delegations to the meetings of the Conference of the Parties and to COP-MOP to allow for mutual learning about the activities and initiatives under the two treaties;

(e) Urge the Parties hosting the meetings of the Conference of the Parties and its high-level segments to always include an agenda item on integrated approaches to the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols (i.e., the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization);

(f) Urge the Executive Secretary to include in his statements to the meetings of COP-MOP, the Conference of the Parties and its high-level segment and other relevant events clear and strong messages urging Parties to pursue an integrated approach to the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols;

(g) Use the opportunity of the upcoming fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (WGRI 5), under the agenda item on enhancing efficiencies of the Convention and its Protocols, to discuss ways and means of integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and other relevant processes under the Convention;

(h) Consider the possibility of putting into place a joint reporting system for the Convention and its Protocols; this issue should be raised during WGRI 5;

(i) Add questions to the format for the Convention's fifth national report to find out the extent to which Parties have integrated the two Protocols into their NBSAPs, and the indicators being used to measure progress in this regard; and finally

(j) The Executive Secretary should to send letters to the concerned Ministers or a general notification urging Parties to integrate biosafety into their revised NBSAPs and to pursue integrated approaches in the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols.

16. The above points and issues were further discussed on the last day of the meeting under agenda item 5 and the resulting conclusions and recommendations are presented in annex I below.

17. The Liaison Group members also discussed and made suggestions regarding the online forum to be organized by the Secretariat through the Biosafety Clearing-House to allow for a preliminary exchange of views and experiences on the integration of biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans and the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. The outcomes of the online forum would provide background material for the special session on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to be held during the seventh meeting of the COP-MOP.

18. The following are the main suggestions made by the Liaison Group members:

- (a) The online forum should run for a period of two weeks;
- (b) The online forum should be organized under two main sessions, i.e.,:
  - I. Integration of biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans, focusing on the following subtopics:
    - (i) National experiences and lessons learned in integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans,
    - (ii) Strategies and approaches for integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans, and
    - (iii) Measures to strengthen national capacities to integrate biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans and processes; and
  - II. Mobilization of resources for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol/biosafety activities at the national level, including national budgets, GEF and other sources;
- (c) Both sessions should be opened at the same time and be held concurrently for two weeks;
- (d) A few questions (two or three) should be presented at the beginning of each session to guide the discussions under the different sessions. The moderators may ask additional questions under each of the sessions to further stimulate and focus the discussions;
- (e) Each of the two main sessions should have one moderator. In this regard, Ms. Malta Qwathekana (South Africa) and Mr. Daniel Lewis (Grenada) volunteered to serve as moderators of the two sessions.

19. The Liaison Group members also discussed possible questions that could be used to guide the online discussions, which are contained in annex II.

**3.2. *Strengthening capacities for mobilization of additional resources to support national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety***

20. Under this agenda item, the Liaison Group members shared experiences with regard to current approaches to mobilizing resources for implementation of biosafety activities at the national level. It was noted that in most countries the level of funding for biosafety activities was generally low compared to other sectors. Hitherto, the main sources of funding for biosafety in developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition included the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and bilateral support initiatives which supplemented the limited national budgets allocations.

21. The Chair invited the Liaison Group members to share their views on:

(a) How to encourage Parties to give due consideration to biosafety when apportioning their national GEF allocation for biodiversity;

(b) How to create awareness and political commitment among relevant policy and decision makers in order to increase the national budgetary allocations for biosafety activities and to include biosafety among the priority issues to be considered for bilateral and multilateral funding support; and

(c) How to mobilize new and additional resources for supporting biosafety activities.

22. In this regard, the Liaison Group members made the following suggestions:

(a) Regular briefing sessions should be organized by the Cartagena Protocol national focal points for key policy and decision makers (including cabinet members, parliamentarians and senior officials in relevant ministries, such as Ministries of Finance and Planning), to increase their awareness of the importance of biosafety and secure their support and commitment to providing adequate national budgetary allocations for biosafety activities and the inclusion of biosafety among the priority issues for consideration in bilateral and multilateral development cooperation;

(b) National workshops should be organized for the Protocol and Convention national focal points and the GEF operational focal points with a view to ensuring that biosafety is given due consideration when apportioning the countries' national GEF allocations for biodiversity;

(c) Regional and bilateral workshops should be organized for the Cartagena Protocol and Convention national focal points and the GEF operational focal points and relevant stakeholders to share experiences and lessons learned in the mobilization of resources for supporting biosafety activities;.

(d) The Secretariat should send a questionnaire to Parties to find out their main sources of funding for biosafety activities and their capacity-building needs with regard to mobilization of new and additional resources;

(e) The Secretariat should consider sending a letter to the GEF operational focal points describing the current situation of declining national allocation of GEF funding for the national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and also bringing to their attention paragraph 1 of decision BS-VI/5 urging Parties to give priority to biosafety under the GEF System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR), in view of the fact that the GEF is the financial mechanism for the Protocol.

#### **ITEM 4. OTHER MATTERS**

23. Under this agenda item, the Liaison Group members discussed the need for broadening the discussion on integrated approaches to the implementation of the Convention and its Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit-sharing, especially under relevant processes under the Convention such as the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (WGRI) and the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA). It was agreed that every opportunity should be used to initiate this debate to further promote the integrated approach to implementation of the Convention and its Protocols.

24. For the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, it was noted that the upcoming Convention processes, namely the fifth meeting of WGRI (WGRI 5) and the eighteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body (SBSTTA 18), would provide timely opportunities to initiate such discussions. In particular, the discussions during WGRI 5 under agenda item 13 on improving the efficiency of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols would provide a unique opportunity to initiate the dialogue on the need for and the ways and means for integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and other relevant processes under the Convention.

#### **ITEM 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

25. Having reviewed the summary outcomes of the discussions under agenda items 3.1 and 3.2 prepared by the Secretariat, the Liaison Group members arrived at the following general conclusions:

(a) There is a need for concerted and coordinated efforts to promote integrated, coherent and coordinated approaches to the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols, i.e., the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit-sharing, at all levels;

(b) Biosafety should be integrated into NBSAPs and, as appropriate, into other sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes (including agriculture, forestry, fisheries, health, environment, science and technology, trade and industry and others) and not limited only to national biosafety framework documents, in view of the fact that the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was adopted as a treaty under the Convention and that there are provisions in the Convention regarding living modified organisms, including Articles 8(g) and 19 (4), that all Parties are obliged to implement;

(c) The Cartagena Protocol national focal points have a critical role to play in promoting awareness of the importance of biosafety among key policy and decision makers (including members of cabinet, parliamentarians, senior officials in relevant line ministries and departments, GEF operational focal points, and other stakeholders) and to secure their support and commitment with a view to ensuring that biosafety is given due consideration in NBSAPs, national development plans, budgets, development cooperation programmes and other processes;

(d) Effective communication, coordination and cooperation between and among various ministries and departments and other stakeholders, in particular between national focal points for the Protocol and the Convention and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) operational focal points are very crucial in facilitating the integration of biosafety into NBSAPs, national development plans and other sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes;

(e) There is a need for a strong outreach programme targeting key policymakers, the general public and other stakeholders, similar to the one that was undertaken under the climate change convention, in order to raise the awareness and profile of biosafety issues among other national priority



issues and objectives and the linkages between biosafety and national sustainable development goals, including food security, research and development and environmental sustainability;

(f) There are potential useful lessons that can be drawn from other processes such as the ongoing processes for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction strategies/early warning systems and climate change adaptation measures into national policies, plans and programmes for sustainable development and poverty reduction;

(g) Every opportunity should be used to promote an integrated approach to implementation of the Convention and its Protocols, starting with the upcoming WGRI 5 and SBSTTA 18 meetings. The planned special session on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to be held during the seventh meeting of COP-MOP, as well as the special informal session during the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, which will discuss opportunities and challenges towards achieving the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, would also provide unique high-level opportunities to share experiences and discuss the way forward towards integration of biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans, and to leverage political support and commitment for this important process.

26. Based on the discussions over the three days of the meeting, the Liaison Group members proposed a number of concrete recommendations to the Executive Secretary which are presented in annex I. The Liaison Group members suggested that the Executive Secretary transmit those recommendations for consideration and action, as appropriate, by Parties and relevant stakeholders at various levels.

#### **ITEM 6. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

27. During the final session of the meeting, the Liaison Group members adopted a draft report of the meeting and requested the Secretariat to refine the recommendations of the meeting and incorporate the proceedings of the last session. The present report has been finalized on that basis.

28. Following brief closing remarks by Ms. Hajnalka Homokion on behalf of the Ministry of Rural Development of Hungary and by Mr. Charles Gbedemah on behalf of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Chair, Ms. Warriar, declared the meeting closed at 3 p.m. on Wednesday, 9 April 2014.

*Annex I*

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TENTH MEETING OF THE LIAISON  
GROUP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR BIOSAFETY**

1. In accordance with the mandate of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety (decision BS-VI/3, annex II) and the specific objectives of the present meeting, members of the Liaison Group wish to propose the following recommendations to the Executive Secretary regarding possible measures for promoting and building the capacity for the integration of biosafety into national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), national development plans and other relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes in line with the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020 as well as ways and means of mobilizing resources to support implementation of the Protocol at the national level.

*Recommendations to the Executive Secretary*

2. With regard to integration of integration of biosafety into NBSAPs, national development plans and other relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes, the Liaison Group recommends that the Executive Secretary:

(a) Undertake an assessment of the Parties' capacity needs and skill gaps with regard to integration of biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans in order to tailor the capacity-building interventions;

(b) Organize regional workshops for the Cartagena Protocol and Convention national focal points and relevant stakeholders to share experiences and lessons learned in the integration of biosafety into NBSAPs;

(c) Send letters to the Ministers responsible for biosafety and biodiversity as well as a general notification to the national focal points urging them to integrate biosafety into their revised NBSAPs and to pursue an integrate approach to the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols; and

(d) Include in his statements to the meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and its high-level segment and other relevant events clear and strong messages urging Parties to pursue an integrated approach to the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols.

3. With regard to mobilization of resources to support national-level implementation of the Protocol, the Liaison Group recommends that the Executive Secretary:

(a) Send a questionnaire to Parties to collect and compile information regarding the main sources of funding for biosafety activities and the capacity-building needs of Parties with regard to mobilization of additional resources; and

(b) Send a letter to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) operational focal points describing the current situation of declining national allocation of GEF funding for the national implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and also bringing to their attention paragraph 1 of decision BS-VI/5 urging Parties to give priority to biosafety under the GEF System for Transparent

Allocation of Resources (STAR), in view of the fact that GEF is the financial mechanism for the Protocol.

4. The Liaison Group recommends that the Executive Secretary transmit the recommendations below for consideration and action, as appropriate, by Parties, other Governments and relevant stakeholders at various levels.

*Recommendations for consideration and action, as appropriate, by Parties and other Governments*

5. With regard to integration of biosafety into NBSAPs, national development plans and other relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes, Parties and other Governments may wish to:

(a) Strengthen the capacity of the Cartagena Protocol national focal points to effectively engage and encourage policy and decision makers and officials from other about the importance of promoting biosafety at the national level and to secure their support, including through training in communication, education, negotiation, conflict resolution and stakeholder engagement skills;

(b) Develop communication strategies with clear and compelling messages to promote awareness and the profile of the Cartagena Protocol as a tool for sustainable development, including its relevance and contribution to national development objectives and people's well-being;

(c) Analyse and communicate biosafety issues under the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, for example targets 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 13 and 15;

(d) Identify and address the sustainable development components under the Convention and the Cartagena Protocol, including those relating to the different Aichi Biodiversity Targets;

(e) Establish and/or strengthen Inter-Ministerial Committees (or similar mechanisms that provide advice on matters related to policy, programmes, budgets, etc.) to play a stronger role in promoting the integration of biosafety into relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes;

(f) Strengthen mechanisms for informal and ad hoc cooperation among officials of relevant institutions (including the national focal points for Protocol and Convention and the GEF operational focal points);

(g) Review and expand, as appropriate, the composition and mandate of national biosafety committees (beyond approving LMO applications) to include promotion of integration of biosafety into relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes; and

(h) Wherever possible, include officials dealing with issues under the Convention and the Protocol in the delegations to meetings of the Conference of the Parties and COP-MOP to allow for mutual learning about the activities and initiatives under the two treaties.

6. With regard to mobilization of resources to support national-level implementation of the Protocol, Parties and other Governments may wish to:

(a) Organize regular briefing sessions for key policy and decision makers (including cabinet members, parliamentarians and senior officials in relevant ministries), to increase their awareness of the importance of biosafety and secure their support and commitment to providing adequate national

budgetary allocations for biosafety activities and the inclusion of biosafety among the priority issues for consideration in bilateral and multilateral development cooperation;

(b) Organize national workshops for the Protocol and Convention national focal points and the GEF operational focal points with a view to ensuring that biosafety is given due consideration when apportioning the countries' national GEF allocations for biodiversity; and

(c) Organize bilateral and regional workshops for the Cartagena Protocol and Convention national focal points and the GEF operational focal points and relevant stakeholders to share experiences and lessons learned in the mobilization of resources for supporting biosafety activities.

*Recommendations for consideration and action, as appropriate, by other entities*

7. With regard to integration of integration of biosafety into NBSAPs, national development plans and other relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes:

(a) The fifth meeting of the Working Group on Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (WGRI 5) should, under its agenda item 13 on enhancing efficiencies of the Convention and its Protocols, discuss ways and means of integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and other relevant processes under the Convention;

(b) The Conference of the Parties to the Convention (COP) should consider adding a standing item entitled "Report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety" to the agenda of its regular meetings to consider the main outcomes of the preceding meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) and the general state of affairs under the Protocol with a view to fostering synergies and integration. This item could be considered during the first day of the meeting of the Conference of the Parties so that COP-MOP delegates could attend;

(c) Parties hosting the meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention should consider including on the agenda of its high-level segment an agenda item on integrated approaches to the implementation of the Convention and its Protocols (i.e., the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit-sharing);

(d) The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and other organizations supporting Parties in the development of their revised NBSAPs should consider organizing side events during the seventh meeting of COP-MOP and the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to facilitate exchange of experiences and lessons learned in the integration of biosafety and access and benefit-sharing considerations in the revised NBSAPs;

(e) The report of the special session on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to be held during the seventh meeting of COP-MOP should be transmitted to the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties for its consideration and action, as appropriate.

*Annex II*

**GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR THE ONLINE DISCUSSIONS**

**Session 1: National experiences and lessons learned in integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans**

1. What experience has been gained in integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans and what have been some of the success factors and challenges?
2. To what extent have existing NBSAPs and national development plans taken biosafety issues into account and to what extent are biosafety issues being taken account in the revision of the NBSAPs?
3. What are the main obstacles and challenges to integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans and how have they affected the process and how could they be addressed?
4. What do you see as potential benefits for integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans?

**Session 2: Strategies and approaches for integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans**

1. In what way and with what specific tools, processes and mechanisms have your governments integrated biosafety considerations into NBSAPs and national development plans?
2. What are some of the potential entry points for integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans?
3. What additional tools could be developed to assist in designing interventions for integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans which are likely to be highly effective and have the desired impact?
4. What indicators could be used to monitor progress and evaluate the success of mainstreaming biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans?

**Session 3: Measures to strengthen national capacities to integrate biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans and processes**

1. What specific capacities (human resources, institutional and other capacities) are required as a priority to integrate biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans?
2. What specific roles should Cartagena Protocol national focal points and other government officials responsible for biosafety play in raising the relevance of biosafety to other sectors (environment, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, land-use planning, finance and planning, and others) and its integration into NBSAPs and national development plans?
3. How could external partners (including bilateral and multilateral institutions, non-governmental organizations and the private sector) support Cartagena Protocol national focal points in their efforts to integrate biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans?

4. What specific activities could be taken to strengthen the capacities of Parties to integrate biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans?
5. Is a generic guidance document on integration of biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans necessary? If yes, what key elements should be contained in such guidance to assist Parties to integrate biosafety into NBSAPs and national development plans?

**Session 4: Strategies for mobilization of resources for implementation of the Protocol/biosafety activities at the national level**

1. What experience has been gained with regard to mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Protocol, including the main sources of funding, success stories, opportunities and challenges/obstacles encountered, and examples of good practices and lessons learned?
2. How could awareness of the GEF operational focal points regarding the significance of biosafety and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety be increased?
3. To what extent and how has biosafety been incorporated into the national resource mobilization plans for meeting the three objectives of the Convention?
4. How could national-level coordination and collaboration among key stakeholders with regard to resource mobilization be improved?

*Annex III*

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
**Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety**

**Austria**

1. Dr. Helmut Gaugitsch  
Head of Unit  
Department of Landuse & Biosafety  
Environment Agency Austria  
Spittelauer Lände 5  
Vienna A-1090  
Austria  
Tel.: +43 1 31 304 3133  
Fax: +43 1 31 304 3700  
Email: [helmut.gaugitsch@umweltbundesamt.at](mailto:helmut.gaugitsch@umweltbundesamt.at)  
Web: <http://www.umweltbundesamt.at>

**Burkina Faso**

2. Pr Chantal Yvette Zougrana / Kaboré  
Directrice de l'Agence Nationale de Biosécurité  
Directrice du laboratoire d'Etude et de Recherche des Ressources  
Naturelles et des Sciences de l'Environnement (LERNSE)  
Ministère de la Recherche Scientifique et de l'Innovation  
03 BP 7047  
Ouagadougou  
Burkina Faso  
Tel.: + 226 70723271  
Email: [cykabore@yahoo.fr](mailto:cykabore@yahoo.fr)

**Germany**

3. Mr. Volker Matzeit  
Department of New Technologies  
Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture  
Rochusstrasse 1  
Bonn 53123  
Germany  
Tel.: +49 228 529 4489  
Fax: +49 228 529 3741  
Email: [volker.matzeit@bmel.bund.de](mailto:volker.matzeit@bmel.bund.de)

**Grenada**

4. Mr. Daniel Lewis  
Chief Agricultural Officer  
Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries and Environment  
Botanical Gardens  
St. George's  
Grenada  
Tel.: +473 440 2708  
Fax: +473 440 4191  
Email: [dannypoo2009@hotmail.com](mailto:dannypoo2009@hotmail.com)

**Hungary**

5. Ms. Rita Andorko  
GMO and Biodiversity Expert  
Biodiversity and Gene Conservation Unit,  
Department of Rural Development Strategy  
Ministry of Rural Development  
Kossuth Lajos ter 11  
Budapest 1055  
Hungary  
Tel.: +36 1 457 3555  
Fax: +36 1 2754505  
Email: [rita.andorko@vm.gov.hu](mailto:rita.andorko@vm.gov.hu)

**India**

6. Ms. Ranjini Warriar  
Director  
Biodiversity Conservation 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 3964  
Email: [warrier@nic.in](mailto:warrier@nic.in), [ranjiniw@yahoo.com](mailto:ranjiniw@yahoo.com)

**Malaysia**

7. 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 1579  
Fax: +603 8890 4935  
Email: [letchu@nre.gov.my](mailto:letchu@nre.gov.my), [biosafety@nre.gov.my](mailto:biosafety@nre.gov.my)

### **Mexico**

8. Dra. Sol Ortiz García  
Executive Secretary  
Comisión Intersecretarial de Bioseguridad de los  
Organismos Genéticamente Modificados  
San Borja 938, esquina Heriberto Frias, Colonia del Valle  
Delegación Benito Juárez  
México D.F. Distrito Federal - 03100  
Mexico  
Tel.: +52 55 55 75 76 18 etx/20  
Fax: +52 55 55 75 76 18 etx/30  
Email: [sortiz@conacyt.mx](mailto:sortiz@conacyt.mx), [solortiz@conacyt.mx](mailto:solortiz@conacyt.mx)

### **Norway**

9. Mr. Bjarte Rambjør Heide  
Senior Adviser  
Norwegian Environment Agency  
Box 5672 Sluppen  
Trondheim N-7485  
Norway  
Email: [Bjarte.Rambjor.heide@miljodir.no](mailto:Bjarte.Rambjor.heide@miljodir.no)

### **Slovenia**

10. 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  
Email: [martin.batic@gov.si](mailto:martin.batic@gov.si)  
Web: <http://www.mop.gov.si>

### **South Africa**

11. Ms. Malta Qwathekana  
Senior Policy Advisor  
International Advisory Services  
Department of Environmental Affairs  
Private Bag X447  
Pretoria 0001  
South Africa  
Tel.: +27 12 310 3067  
Fax: +27 12 320 1343  
Email: [mqwathekana@environment.gov.za](mailto:mqwathekana@environment.gov.za)

## **United Nations and Specialized Agencies**

### **Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)**

12. Dr. Nevena Alexandrova  
Agricultural Research and Biotechnology Officer  
FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia  
(FAO/REU)  
Benzur utca 34  
Budapest  
Hungary  
E-Mail: [nevena.alexandrova@fao.org](mailto:nevena.alexandrova@fao.org)  
Web: [http://www.fao.org/world/Regional/REU/index\\_en.htm](http://www.fao.org/world/Regional/REU/index_en.htm)

## **Non-Governmental Organizations**

### **ECOROPA**

13. Mrs. Christine von Weizsäcker  
President  
ECOROPA  
Postfach 1547  
Emmendingen 79305, Germany  
Tel.: +49 7641 9542214  
Fax: +49 7641 9542215  
E-Mail: [cwv@ecoropa.de](mailto:cwv@ecoropa.de)



## Business

### **Global Industry Coalition (GIC)**

14. Dr. 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](mailto:eric.s.sachs@monsanto.com)

### **Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>15. Mr. Charles Gbedemah<br/>Senior Programme Officer<br/>Biosafety Division<br/>Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity<br/>413, Saint-Jacques Street W.<br/>Suite 800<br/>Montreal Quebec H2Y 1N9<br/>Canada<br/>Tel.: +1 514 287 7032<br/>Fax: +1 514 288 6588<br/>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:charles.gbedemah@cbd.int">charles.gbedemah@cbd.int</a><br/>Web: <a href="http://www.cbd.int">www.cbd.int</a></p> | <p>16. Mr. Erie Tamale<br/>Programme Officer<br/>Biosafety Division<br/>Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity<br/>413, Saint-Jacques Street W.<br/>Suite 800<br/>Montreal Quebec H2Y 1N9<br/>Canada<br/>Tel.: +1 514 287 7050<br/>E-Mail: <a href="mailto:erie.tamale@cbd.int">erie.tamale@cbd.int</a><br/>Web: <a href="http://www.cbd.int">www.cbd.int</a></p> |
|---|--|

-----