



CBD



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/CB-CAR/1/2
11 June 2013

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CARIBBEAN SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY AND ITS SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS

St. George's, Grenada, 4-8 March 2013

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP

INTRODUCTION

1. The Caribbean Subregional Workshop on Capacity-building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was held from 4 to 8 March 2013 in St. George's, Grenada. It was hosted by the Government of Grenada through the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Land and the Environment and was funded by the Government of Japan. A total of 25 participants from 12 governments and 1 organization attended the workshop. The governments represented were: Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Cuba, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago. A representative from University of the West Indies, who is also the Manager of the UNEP-GEF Caribbean sub-regional capacity-building project on the implementation of national biosafety frameworks, also attended. The list of participants is annexed to this report.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

2. The workshop was officially opened by Hon. Roland Bhola, Minister of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Land and the Environment. In his remarks, Hon. Bhola underscored the importance of protecting the environment and conserving biodiversity in Grenada and the Caribbean in general. He noted that as a major producer of quality spices in the world and as a country whose economy depends primarily on tourism, Grenada places great importance on the prudent management of her natural resources and maintenance of a pristine and biodiversity-rich environment. He further noted that the Government of Grenada is consciously aware of the need to prevent or minimise potential adverse effects that living modified organisms might have on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. Hon. Bhola acknowledged that Small Island Developing States face enormous challenges, including lack of financial and human resources, which make it difficult for them to comply with the requirements of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and other international treaties. However, he reminded participants that failure to put in place mechanisms for ensuring the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms could subject the fragile environments of the island states to serious risk.

3. Hon. Bhola expressed his gratitude and appreciation to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Global environment Facility (GEF), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), the Government of Norway, and others for the support they provided, which enabled countries in the

/...

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.

subregion to develop their national biosafety frameworks and build the necessary capacity for implementation of the Protocol. In conclusion, he urged countries in the subregion to ratify Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress as soon as possible. He also challenged participants to champion national efforts to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Cartagena Protocol in the Caribbean subregion, noting that the Caribbean subregion was a rich biodiversity hotspot for which all Caribbean citizens should justifiably be proud.

4. Mr. Charles Gbedemah, Principal Officer for Biosafety, also made opening remarks, on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Mr. Gbedemah noted that the governing body of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety had in many of its decisions called for capacity-building developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States among them, to enable them to meet their obligations under the Protocol. He further noted that according to the second national reports submitted by Parties in 2011 most small island developing States still lacked the capacity to implement the provisions of the Protocol. Thus this workshop was organized to provide a platform for the Caribbean countries to discuss strategies to address their priority capacity-building needs and foster subregional cooperation and coordination, taking into account the current status and lessons learned in the implementation of the Protocol in the subregion. Mr. Gbedemah thanked the Government of Grenada for hosting the workshop and the Government of Japan for funding it. He also thanked the UNEP-GEF Caribbean subregional capacity-building project for co-sponsoring the workshop. He concluded his statement by urging participants to freely share relevant information and to learn from each other's experience.

ITEM 2. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES

5. Under this item, Mr. Erie Tamale from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity presented the objectives and the expected outcomes of the workshop. He noted that the workshop was organized to contribute to enhancing capacity of Parties in the Caribbean subregion for the effective implementation of the Protocol and to facilitating the ratification and early entry into force of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress. The specific objectives were to:

- (a) Promote awareness of the recent developments under the Protocol, including the Strategic Plan of the Protocol for the period 2011-2020, the new capacity-building framework and action plan and other key decisions underpinning capacity-building efforts for the implementation of the Protocol;
- (b) Review the status of implementation of the Protocol in the Caribbean subregion and share experiences and lessons learned in the development and implementation of national biosafety frameworks;
- (c) Identify national and subregional capacity-building needs and priorities and discuss ways to enhance subregional cooperation to address those needs; taking into account the ongoing UNEP-GEF Caribbean subregional capacity-building project on the implementation of national biosafety frameworks;
- (d) Promote awareness of the objective and core requirements of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress and review the challenges and opportunities with regard to its ratification and implementation.

6. After Mr. Tamale's introduction, participants were invited to indicate their expectations from the workshop. Many of them stated that they expected to know more about the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in the subregion and learn from each other's experience. Many participants also expressed interest in learning about the provisions of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress while others expected to learn about existing tools and opportunities for implementation of the Protocol at national and subregional levels.

ITEM 3. THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY AND OTHER RECENT DEVELOPMENTS ON KEY ISSUES UNDER THE PROTOCOL

7. Under this item, staff from the Secretariat made the seven presentations on the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020 and recent developments with regard to key issues and processes underpinning the implementation of the Protocol. The presentations were as follows:

- (a) Introduction to the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and its role in guiding implementation of the Protocol at the national level;
- (b) Overview of the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol based on the analysis of the second national reports;
- (c) The Biosafety Clearing-House;
- (d) Current status and experience gained with the implementation of the identification and documentation requirements for shipments of living modified organisms under Article 18 of the Protocol;
- (e) Capacity-building in risk assessment and risk management;
- (f) The Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and its potential role in facilitating national and regional level efforts; and
- (g) The programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs (2011-2015).

8. Mr. Charles Gbedemah gave the presentation on the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. He described the vision and mission of the Strategic Plan and outlined its five strategic objectives and 23 operational objectives as well as their corresponding expected outcomes and indicators. The strategic objectives relate to the following core areas presented in the order of priority: further development of systems for the implementation of the Protocol, capacity-building, compliance and review, information sharing, and outreach and cooperation.¹ He noted that the core areas were prioritized according to their strategic importance and contribution to the full implementation of the Protocol. He informed participants that the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan will be conducted in conjunction with the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol at the eighth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

9. Mr. Tamale presented the status of implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in the small island developing states (SIDS) based on the information contained in the second national reports that Parties had submitted to the Secretariat by 31 December 2011.² He noted that, in general, small island developing states lagged behind other Parties in the implementation of various Protocol provisions. He

¹ Details about the Strategic Plan can be accessed at http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/issues/cpb_stplan_txt.shtml.

² The Secretariat received reports from 143 Parties (out of the 161 Parties to the Protocol). This included reports from 22 SIDS (or 76% of all SIDS that are Parties to the Protocol).

presented some statistics showing the percentages of SIDS that had or had not put in place measures/capacities to implement the core provisions of the Protocol.³

10. Mr. Tamale also gave the presentation on the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) focusing on the recent improvements to the central portal of the BCH. He described the mandate of the BCH as stipulated in Article 20 of the Protocol and highlighted the main features of the central portal of the BCH.⁴ He listed the types of information available through the BCH and gave a practical demonstration on how to search for and retrieve information from the BCH and how to register information.⁵ He also highlighted the main recent improvements to the BCH.⁶ Mr. Tamale noted that the number of visits to the BCH had increased six-fold in the last few years and that the number of records registered in the BCH had more than doubled. However, the amount of information from developing countries, especially small island developing states, was still very limited and the potential of the BCH was not yet fully utilized. After the presentation, the participants logged into the BCH and undertook practical exercises to search for and register information in the BCH.

11. Mr. Worku Yifru from the Secretariat presented the current status and experiences gained with the implementation of the identification and documentation requirements for shipments of living modified organisms under Article 18 of the Protocol. He described the identification and documentation requirements for the different types of LMOs (i.e., LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment; for contained use; and LMOs for direct use as food or feed, or for processing) as set out in paragraph 2 of Article 18 of the Protocol and decisions BS-I/6 and BS-III/10. He illustrated how and where to find information on LMOs in existing shipping documentation and provided an overview of the system of unique identifiers for transgenic plants developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and demonstrated how they could be used to search the BCH for further information about specific LMOs. Finally, Mr. Yifru provided examples that constitute unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs and those that constitute illegal transboundary movements.

12. Mr. Gbedemah described the Protocol's provisions on risk assessment and risk management and outlined the initiatives and processes underway to help develop the capacity of Parties in this regard. He highlighted operational objective 1.3 of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol which aims to further develop and support implementation of scientific tools and common approaches to risk assessment and risk management. He further underlined operational objective 2.2 which aims to establish local capacities to

³ For example, 90% of the SIDS had no mechanism for decision-making regarding LMOs; 86% had no mechanism for monitoring LMOs released into the environment; 77% had no measures in place to enforce documentation requirements for LMOs; 64% had no appropriate mechanisms, measures and strategies for risk management; 57% had no regulation on the transit of LMOs; 55% had no regulations on contained use of LMOs; 55% had no capacity to detect and identify LMOs; and 32% had no mechanism for addressing emergency measures in case of unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs. On the other hand, 77% had put in place draft law(s), regulations or administrative measures to operationalise the advance informed agreement (AIA) procedure of the Protocol; 27% had established guidelines on how to conduct risk assessments prior to taking decisions regarding LMOs; 14% had acquired the necessary domestic capacity to conduct risk assessment; 5% had conducted a risk assessment; and 9% had a strategy for detecting illegal transboundary movements of LMOs. The percentages were calculated based on the 22 SIDS that had submitted their reports as of 31 December 2011.

⁴ The BCH central portal is accessible at <http://bch.cbd.int/>.

⁵ The main categories of records in the BCH are: (a) "National Records" submitted only by Governments as mandated by the Protocol and decisions of the Parties to the Protocol (including national contacts, existing laws and regulations, risk assessment reports, final decisions on LMOs, national reports and information relating to the roster of experts); and (b) "Reference Records", i.e., non-mandatory information submitted by Governments and general BCH users (e.g. information regarding capacity-building activities, resource materials and gene and organism registries).

⁶ Improvements to the BCH included: (i) translation of the BCH into the 6 UN languages; (ii) introduction of new features that allow integration and flexible display of search results, (iii) establishment of a BCH YouTube channel, (iv) introduction of platforms for online forums and real-time conferences, (v) establishment of linkages with two new databases on LMO detection methods, i.e. EU Reference Laboratory for GM Food and Feed' (EURL-GMFF) and the CropLife International Detection Methods Database; and (vi) expansion of the 'Help' section which includes various help pages, BCH help manuals, training materials and tutorials; Frequently Asked Questions and a training site.

carry out risk assessments and to manage, monitor and control risks of living modified organisms. He also outlined the ongoing activities to implement the decisions of the meeting of the Parties on risk assessment, including the Open-ended Online Expert Forum and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group which were mandated to revise and test the utility of the "Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms" and develop further guidance on specific topics of risk assessment. He informed the workshop that the Secretariat had organised a series of regional training courses and developed a "Training Manual on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms". He further noted that the COP-MOP requested the Open-ended Online Expert Forum and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group to align the manual to the Guidance. He also informed the workshop that the Secretariat plans convene further training courses in risk assessment and risk management subject to availability of funds, and also develop an interactive learning tool based on the training manual.

13. Mr. Tamale gave a presentation on the "Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety", which was adopted by the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol in October 2012.⁷ He described the seven priority focal areas of the framework and action plan⁸ and the key strategic processes and actions that could be undertaken at the national, regional and international level to facilitate capacity-building for the effective implementation of the Protocol. Mr. Tamale also described the coordination mechanism adopted by the Parties to facilitate exchange of information and foster partnerships, synergies and complimentarity between various capacity-building initiatives. He concluded his presentation by underlining the potential role of the framework and action plan, as well as the coordination mechanism, in facilitating capacity-building efforts at the national and regional levels and urged Parties to develop corresponding national-level action plans and coordination mechanisms, as appropriate. He also urged Parties to adopt results-oriented approaches to capacity-building and use relevant indicators to monitor and measure progress of their capacity-building initiatives.

14. Finally, under this item Mr. Tamale gave a presentation on the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs. He described the operational objectives, activities, expected Outcomes and indicators for the four main elements of the programme of work, namely: capacity-building; public awareness and education; public access to information; and public participation. He noted that the programme of work provided a useful framework to guide national efforts in implementing Article 23 of the Protocol. He urged participants to develop corresponding national programmes of work or action plans in line with their national biosafety frameworks. He also invited Parties to make effective use of tools such as the online forum and portal on public awareness, education and participation and the templates for baseline surveys available in the through the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH). Finally he urged Parties to enhance cooperation at regional and international levels among themselves and with relevant organizations and instruments, such as the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters.

ITEM 4. CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL IN THE CARIBBEAN SUBREGION: ONGOING INITIATIVES AND PRIORITY NEEDS

15. Under this item, participants made short presentations on the status of implementation of the Biosafety Protocol and the biosafety capacity-building efforts in their respective countries. Many of them described the situation with regards to their national biosafety frameworks and highlighted the challenges faced. Biosafety capacity-building activities undertaken over the last few years with support from UNEP-

⁷ A copy of the Framework and Action Plan is available at http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_art22_actionplan.shtml.

⁸ The seven focal areas are: national biosafety frameworks; risk assessment and risk management; handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms; liability and redress; public awareness, education and participation; information sharing; and biosafety education and training.

GEF and other organizations and the priority capacity needs were also highlighted. The main challenges highlighted were lack of human resources, inadequate financial resources due to limited national budgetary allocations for biosafety, general lack of awareness of biosafety issues by policy makers and the public, absence of legislative frameworks for biosafety and lack of or dispersed information on biotechnology and biosafety. A number of participants mentioned the following as their top priorities: enactment/update of legislation and establishment/strengthening of institutional mechanisms to facilitate national implementation, training of staff in various areas, raising public awareness, establishment of laboratories for LMO detection, and development of risk assessment and risk management capacity.

16. Ms. Karen Lynch, Manager of the “UNEP-GEF Regional Project for Implementing National Biosafety Frameworks in the Caribbean Sub-region” made a presentation on the project and the outcomes of the inception workshop for the project that was held 29 October to 2 November 2012 in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. She noted that the project comprised of national components, which would cater for country-specific needs, and regional components would provide coordination and common support services. It was expected that by the end of the project, the participating countries⁹ would have enacted their biosafety laws, established systems for processing LMO applications and developed local capacity for conducting risk assessments, testing LMOs and carrying out routine administrative tasks. It was also expected that countries would have established functional communication and information sharing networks linking various institutions, systems for monitoring and enforcing compliance; as well as systems for public awareness, education and public participation.

17. At the sub-regional level, a Centre of Excellence on Biosafety would be established and hosted by the University of the West Indies (UWI). The Centre would, inter alia, provide training and information to countries on the key components of national biosafety frameworks, provide services for LMO detection and risk assessment, maintain a regional BCH node, and carry out research and other studies in the field of biosafety. UWI would set-up and maintain an accredited laboratory on behalf of participating countries and establish a mechanism for ensuring financial sustainability of the Centre, including through user fees and research grants. Under the project, UWI, in collaboration with the University of Guyana, Anton de Kom University in Suriname and the University College of Belize, would offer an MSc. Biosafety degree programme comprising six modules. The programme would be offered as a one year full-time study or 2 years of part-time study. Individual modules would also be offered as stand-alone non-accredited courses.

18. Ms. Lynch informed participants that the project inception workshop held in October 2012 discussed the project work plans, the proposed project management and oversight mechanisms and the financial guidelines for the project. The Regional Project Steering Committee which met after the workshop approved the revised project work plan timelines, the approach for implementing the regional component of the project and the additional project donors and partners.¹⁰

ITEM 5. SUBREGIONAL COOPERATION AND COORDINATION OF BIOSAFETY CAPACITY-BUILDING EFFORTS IN THE CARIBBEAN SUBREGION

19. Under this item, Mr. Tamale made a presentation on experiences and lessons learned from various regional biosafety capacity-building initiatives. He noted the growing need to adopt regional approaches to capacity-building in order to leverage and maximise available resources, infrastructure and expertise and to foster the sharing of experiences and lessons learned among neighbouring countries. Mr.

⁹ The participating countries are: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago.

¹⁰ The main project donors and partners are: the Global Environment Facility (GEF), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat, and University of the West Indies (UWI), University of Guyana and the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA). UWI is the Lead Executing Agency

Tamale outlined some of the regional biosafety capacity-building initiatives implemented in last decade¹¹ and discussed examples of the formal and informal regional and subregional cooperation mechanisms used. These included joint training activities, staff exchanges and secondments, regional centres of excellence, joint rosters of experts, regional advisory groups/panels, regional databases, web-based networks and online discussion forums. He noted that at the global level, Parties could also collaborate through various tools such as the Coordination Mechanism, the roster of experts and online forums and portals available in the Biosafety Clearing-House.

20. The presentation was followed by a brief question and answer session and general discussions. The participants noted that besides the ongoing UNEP-GEF Regional Project for Implementing National Biosafety Frameworks in the Caribbean Sub-region, there were a number of other opportunities, institutions and mechanisms that could be used to promote subregional cooperation and coordination of biosafety capacity-building efforts in the Caribbean. These included Secretariats of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), the Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute (CARDI), and other subregional bodies and networks.

ITEM 6. PROMOTING THE RATIFICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NAGOYA – KUALA LUMPUR SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS

21. Under this item, Mr. Worku Damena Yifru introduced the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. He gave a brief historical background of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and its Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol and outlined their objectives. He highlighted the core provisions of the Supplementary Protocol and relevant concepts, including the definition of damage and types of damage; measures that may be taken in response to damage (response measures) and the potential types of operators.¹² He also discussed the implementation requirements and the application of civil liability rules in the context of the Supplementary Protocol. After the presentation, participants were divided into three groups to review hypothetical cases that depicted different scenarios of damage and potential cases of liability. The purpose of the group exercise was to enable participants to relate the provisions of the Supplementary Protocol to different specific situations and to improve their understanding of the Supplementary Protocol and its possible application or implementation at the domestic level.

22. In another presentation, Mr. Yifru discussed some of the requirements and the corresponding capacity needs for implementing the Supplementary Protocol at the domestic level. He grouped the requirements and capacity needs into the following three broad categories:

(a) *Legal*: These could include reviewing existing domestic laws and/or developing new rules and procedures on liability and redress applying them to address damage in the context of the Supplementary Protocol;

(b) *Administrative*: These could include maintaining data and information on biological diversity and activities involving LMOs; maintaining data on operators, establishing mechanisms for notifying and consulting with affected or potentially affected states in the event of incidents; and determining and implementing appropriate response measures; and

¹¹ Previous regional initiatives included: the Organization of American States (OAS) Project on Biosafety Regulations in Latin America and the Caribbean (2002-2004), the FAO Regional Project on Capacity Building in Biosafety of GM Crops in Asia (2002-2006); and the African Union-German Cooperation project on Capacity Building for an Africa wide Biosafety System (2005-2010). Details about these and other biosafety capacity-building initiatives can be obtained from the projects database in the BCH: <http://bch.cbd.int/database/activities>.

¹² The Supplementary Protocol defines “Operator” as “Any person in direct or indirect control of the living modified organism”

(c) *Information sharing and awareness-raising:* These could include informing operators of their obligations and available remedies, promoting public awareness concerning damage to biological diversity resulting from LMOs, making available information to the BCH on incidents regarding damage to biological diversity and the response measures taken or to be taken; and disseminating information on the availability of insurance or other mechanisms to cover liability for damage to biological diversity.

23. In his last presentation, Mr. Yifru discussed the significance and potential advantages of ratifying or acceding to the Supplementary Protocol. He noted that by ratifying the Supplementary Protocol, the Parties would demonstrate their commitment to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. He further noted that the Supplementary Protocol would enhance the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol by creating incentives and an enabling environment for operators to implement more reliable and effective safety measures. It would also build further confidence in the safe development and application of modern biotechnology. Mr. Yifru outlined generic procedures and presented model instruments of ratification, approval, acceptance or accession to international treaties. Finally, he updated participants on the status of signature and ratification of the Supplementary Protocol and urged countries that had not yet done so to hasten national processes to ratify or accede to the Supplementary Protocol.

ITEM 7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

24. Under this item, participants discussed the way forward regarding capacity-building for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and advancing the ratification of its Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress in the Caribbean subregion. They were divided into three groups and specifically invited to identify the priority areas for capacity-building in the subregion and suggest measures to address the identified priorities including through cooperation at the subregional level. The three groups presented the outcomes of their discussions to the plenary and these were further discussed and consolidated into a unified way forward for the sub region, i.e. a Strategy to Strengthen the Capacity for Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in the Caribbean, which is contained in Annex 1 hereto.

25. With regard to the next steps, participants requested the Manager of the “UNEP-GEF Regional Project to integrate relevant elements of the strategy into the project, as appropriate, and assist countries in the sub-region to develop other initiatives to implement elements that would not be addressed under the UNEP-GEF regional project.

ITEM 8. EVALUATION AND CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP

26. During the last session, participants were invited to complete an evaluation of the workshop. The results of the evaluation are summarized in annex II below.

27. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the workshop was closed at 1.30 p.m. on Friday, 6 March 2013.

Annex I

**WAY FORWARD: STRATEGY TO STRENGTHEN THE CAPACITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA
PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY AND ITS SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS IN THE
CARIBBEAN SUB-REGION**

Priority Areas	Activities	Expected Outputs/ Outcomes	Indicators	Responsible Institution(s)
Priority Area 1: Strengthening human and institutional capacity	1.1 Training in risk assessment, risk management, risk, communication, biosafety and biotechnology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of nominees for training programmes by the end of April 2014; 1 Module annually; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of persons (at least 2 persons) trained in each of the areas who ability to conduct basic risk assessments Development of SOPs for training programmes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; Regional support – University of the West Indies Directors and Project Officers at the national and regional level
	1.2 Training in chain of custody (for customs officers, quarantine inspectors, laboratory personnel, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of nominees for training programmes by the end of April 2014; 1 Module annually; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of persons (at least 2 persons) trained in each of the areas who ability to conduct the train of custody assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; Regional support – University of the West Indies Directors and Project Officers at the national and regional level
	1.3 Training and education of points of access entry personnel in LMO detection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of nominees for training programmes by the end of April 2014; 1 Module annually; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of persons (at least 2 persons) trained in each of the areas who ability to conduct analysis in LMO detection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; Regional support – University of the West Indies Directors and Project Officers at the national and regional level
	1.4 Establishment of regional and national biosafety laboratories and accreditation of at least one regional laboratory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic assessments at the national level Advanced assessments at the Regional level Enhanced research capacity at the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12 national labs established or strengthened by 2015. One regional laboratory established and accredited by international bodies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; Regional support – University of the West Indies.

/...

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.

.../

Priority Areas	Activities	Expected Outputs/ Outcomes	Indicators	Responsible Institution(s)
		Regional level		
	1.5 Development of effective and sustainable knowledge management systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of 13 national nodes; • The establishment of the regional nodes; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operationalisation and update of information on a regular basis in all 13 countries. • General guidelines/ protocols established to facilitate the effective exchange of information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National responsibility – the National Focal Point; • Regional support – University of the West Indies
	1.6 Scientific exchange programmes/attachments (technical assistance and technical cooperation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attachments and centralized regional training (due to the absence of lab facilities in the individual countries); • Area of destruction and disposal; • How to conduct GM trials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to conduct GM detection and analysis • Ability to manage the destruction and disposal process; • Ability to conduct GM field trials. • Number of persons (at least 2 persons) trained in each of the areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; • Regional support – University of the West Indies
	1.7 Development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for handling LMO applications, approval and other processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A harmonized set of SOPs for all 13 countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of awareness and use of the SOPs in all 13 countries; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; • Regional support – University of the West Indies.
Priority Area 2: Strengthening the legal and regulatory framework	2.1 Development of national biosafety laws including all relevant provisions ¹³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of all relevant provisions in the legislation. • Development of a policy and legislative framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enactment of national biosafety legislation by all parties in the region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; • Competent Ministry/Legal Authority; • Proposed network of legal officers within the region;

¹³ Including provisions on issues such as: (i) certification of small LMO developers; (ii) a requirement for developers to provide primers for the diagnostic analysis and the methodology for detecting the LMO traits; (iii) establishment of appropriate threshold levels for adventitious presence of LMOs; and (iv) rules and procedures for response measures for damage resulting from LMOs.

Priority Areas	Activities	Expected Outputs/ Outcomes	Indicators	Responsible Institution(s)
	2.2 Application of a harmonised approach in developing legal and regulatory frameworks across the region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislation and provisions across the region that is consistent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of biosafety regulatory frameworks enacted. Level of consistency of legislation relating to biosafety and biotechnology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed network of legal officers within the region; CARICOM
Priority Area 3: Public awareness, education and participation	3.1 Placement of biosafety and biotechnology issues on the agenda of subregional bodies e.g. CARICOM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biosafety and biotechnology issues addressed by regional bodies and summits taking into account the programme of work adopted by MOP 5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Parties executing the work programme; Number of subregional events considering biosafety issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National responsibility – policy makers/ National Competent Authorities to do so; Regional support – University of the West Indies.
	3.2 Organisation of side events on biosafety and biotechnology issues for the regional policy makers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy makers sensitized about biosafety issues; Biosafety and biotechnology issues placed higher on national and regional agendas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of side events organized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National responsibility – project co-coordinator and officials in the relevant Ministry; Regional support – University of the West Indies.
	3.3 Design and implementation of national and regional public awareness and education campaigns targeting all audiences. 3.4 Promotion of e-learning tools, school competitions and environmental stewardship a part of the school curricular.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2 regional level school competitions on biosafety organized. Public awareness and education campaigns implemented. Baseline KAP surveys on biosafety/biotechnology issues. Media sensitization events organized in the region. National media briefs developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of participants attending school competitions and campaigns. Level of performance in KAP surveys on biosafety and biotechnology issues. Number of educational programmes focusing on biosafety and biotechnology at the national and regional levels. Number of biosafety video documentaries produced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; Regional support – University of the West Indies.
Priority Area 4: Resource mobilisation	4.1 Assessment of cost recovery and allocation of funds to sustain national level biosafety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of a cost involved and assessment reports conducted. Provision in national budgets for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budgetary allocation. Identification of domestic and international sources of funding. UWI's agreement to host the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; Regional support – University of the West Indies.

/...

Priority Areas	Activities	Expected Outputs/ Outcomes	Indicators	Responsible Institution(s)
	activities, after the Regional Project	<p>national level biosafety activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budgetary provisions for biosafety activities at the UWI and CARICOM. • Financial sustainability of the labs. • Cost recovery mechanisms established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regional node and continue the center of excellence. • The development and expansion of the commercial research programme of the center of excellence (capacity building). • The number of countries in the regions that have cost recovery mechanisms. 	
Priority Area: 5 Collaboration	5.1 Promotion of south-south co-operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreements with Cuba, Mexico, Brazil, Costa Rica, Chile, Argentina. • Agreements with Pacific Region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Memoranda of Understanding established. • Number of personnel exchanges/scientific and legal attachments (at least 1 person per country) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; • Regional support – University of the West Indies
	5.2 Engagement of existing inter-regional groups/ committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant groups within CARICOM identified and engaged¹⁴ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in number of regional-level partners engaged in biosafety and biotechnology issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; • Regional support – UWI • CARICOM could be the coordinating body
	5.3 Development of different networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A network of labs for GMO detection and analysis • Network for Attorneys with the environmental policy and planning background • Network for risk assessment officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings of the network members held at least annually. • Information being shared • A roster of regional experts and focal points on biosafety in place; • Mentoring, peer review and twinning programmes developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National responsibility – the National Competent Authority; • Regional support – UWI. • CARICOM

¹⁴ These could include: 1) University of the West Indies, University of Guyana; 2) Chief Veterinary Officers; 3) Plant Health Directors; 4) Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute (CARDI); 5) Fisheries Officers Network; 6) Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA); 7) Customs agencies; and 8) Environmental unit of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) Secretariat.

Annex II

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

At the end of the workshop, the participants were requested to complete a workshop evaluation form. They were asked to rate, on a scale of 1 to 6, the extent to which the workshop improved their awareness/understanding of the topics/issues below, the extent to which it met their expectations and how well it was organized and conducted. The results of the evaluation are summarized below.

A. Key issues and developments under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the biosafety capacity-building efforts in the Caribbean subregion

How useful was the workshop in improving your awareness and understanding of the following topics/issues?

Topic/ Issue	Average Rating	Level of Satisfaction
1. Recent developments under the Protocol, including the decisions of the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol?	5.04	84%
2. Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2011-2020)	4.75	79%
3. Status of implementation of the Protocol in Caribbean sub-region	4.96	83%
4. Main features and recent improvements to the Biosafety Clearing-House	4.67	78%
5. Main elements of risk assessment and risk management and the available guidance and capacity-building opportunities	4.46	74%
6. LMO documentation and identification requirements are under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the experience gained in the implementation of those requirements	4.50	75%
7. Framework and Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol	4.54	76%
8. Programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning LMOs	4.67	78%
9. UNEP-GEF Regional Project for Implementing NBFs in the Caribbean Sub-region, including its activities and approach	4.79	80%
10. Experiences and lessons learned in the implementation of the Protocol by other countries in the Caribbean sub-region	5.26	88%
11. National and regional biosafety capacity-building needs and priorities in the Caribbean and possible strategies to address them	5.04	84%
12. Existing opportunities for regional cooperation on biosafety in the Caribbean	4.91	82%
13. Core provisions/requirements of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress	5.27	88%
14. National measures and capacities that would be necessary to implement the Supplementary Protocol at the national level	5.00	83%
15. Implications and potential benefits of ratifying/acceding to the Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress	5.00	83%

B. Overall assessment of the workshop

Please provide your rating of the following items:

Item	Average Rating	Level of Satisfaction
16. Extent to which the workshop met your expectations	4.96	83%
17. Extent to which the workshop improved your understanding of the key Protocol implementation issues and mechanisms	5.29	88%
18. Extent to which the workshop helped you better understand how your country could more effectively implement the Protocol	4.88	81%
19. Extent to which the workshop was useful for you as an individual	5.25	88%
20. How well the workshop was organised	4.09	68%
21. The balance between presentations and discussions/ exercises	4.67	78%
22. How useful the thematic presentations by resource persons were	4.79	80%
23. How useful the country presentations were	4.79	80%
24. How useful the group discussions were	5.29	88%
25. Overall rating of the effectiveness/success of the workshop	4.88	81%

What was the most helpful part of the workshop?

- Sharing of country experiences and the group discussions.
- Presentations on the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.
- Discussions on the way forward.
- Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol
- The hypothetical case studies on the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress; they allowed a practical review and understanding of the issues and requirements.
- The programme of work on public awareness, education and participation.

What was the least helpful part of the workshop?

- Development of the regional strategy in a plenary setting was rather tedious.

Would you recommend the ratification/accession of the Nagoya – Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to your Government?

- Yes, but after putting domestic laws in place.
- Yes, after undertaking further legal and financial analyses.

What would you suggest to improve future workshops?

- Improve time management especially during the breaks.
- Have the regional work plan/strategy discussed first so that there is less repetition and a clear understanding of what is needed at the national level.
- Have a few more group discussions.
- Include presentations and a documentary on what is happening in other developing countries.
- Provide advance notice to enable participants prepare good country presentations.
- Shorten the workshop to three days.

Annex III

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Governments

Antigua and Barbuda

1. Ms. Delamine Claris Andrew
Environment Officer, Environment Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Housing and Environment
Independence Avenue
St. John's, Antigua and Barbuda
Tel.: +1 268 462 4625; 6265
Fax: +1 268 462 6265
E-Mail: delamine_andrew@yahoo.com

2. Ms. Kishma Primus
Plant Protection Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Housing and Environment
Independence Avenue
St. John's, Antigua and Barbuda
Tel.: +1 268 562 1923
Fax: +1 268 562 1923
E-Mail: kishmaprimus@yahoo.com

Belize

3. Ms. Delilah A. Cabb
Coordinator
Sanitary and Phytosanitary Enquiry Point
Belize Agricultural Health Authority
Central Farm, Cayo District
Belize City, Belize
Tel.: +501 824 4899
Fax: +501 824 3773
E-Mail: delilah_cabb@yahoo.com

4. Mr. Eugene Waight
Chief Agriculture Officer
National Biosafety Council
West Block Building
Belmopan City, Belize
Tel.: +501 822 2241; 822-2332
Fax: +501 822 2409
E-Mail: eugenewaight_bz@yahoo.com, eugene.waight@agriculture.gov.bz

Cuba

5. Ms. Lenia Arce Hernández
Head, Safeguard Department and Legal Adviser
Centro Nacional de Seguridad Biológica
Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente
Calle 28 No. 502 e/5ta y 7ma Miramar
Habana, Cuba
Tel.: +53 7 2031935 - 38 - +537 202 3281
Fax: +53 7 2031664
E-Mail: lenia@orosen.co.cu, leniarce2004@yahoo.es; leniarce2004@gmail.com

6. Ms. Teresa Dolores Cruz Sardiñas
Asesor Legal
Direccion de Medio Ambiente
Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente
18A esq. 41 Playa
Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba
Tel.: +537 203 0166
Fax: +537 204 6476
E-Mail: cruz@citma.cu, dolorescruz@yahoo.com

Dominica

7. Mrs. Kongit Haile-Gabriel
Environmental Officer
Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources, Physical Planning and Fisheries
Roseau Fisheries Complex Building
Dame M.Eugenia Charles Blvd
Roseau, Dominica
Tel.: +1 767 266 5256
Fax: +1 767 448 4577
E-Mail: ecu@dominica.gov.dm, kongith@hotmail.com

Grenada

8. Mr. Christopher Joseph
Environment Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
Ministerial Complex, Botanical Gardens
St. George's, Grenada
Tel.: +1 473 440 2101, 440 2708
Fax: +1 473, 440 0775, 440 4191
E-Mail: krispj@gmail.com

9. Mr. Daniel Lewis
Chief Agricultural Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
Botanical Gardens
St. George's, Grenada
Tel.: +1 473 440 2708
Fax: +1 473 440 4191
E-Mail: dannypoo2009@hotmail.com

10. Ms. Simone Lewis
Senior Environmental Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
Ministerial Complex, Botanical Gardens
St. George's, Grenada
Tel.: +1 473 440 2101, 440 2708
Fax: +1 473 440 0775, 440 4191
E-Mail: simonelewis2011@gmail.com, tradegrenada@gmail.com

Grenada

11. Mr. Thaddeus Peters
Agricultural Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
Botanical Gardens
St. George's, Grenada
Tel.: +1 473 440 0019/2708/3078
Fax: +1 473 440 4191
E-Mail: thadpet@hotmail.com
12. Mrs. Joyce Thomas Peters
National Biosafety Project Coordinator
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
Ministerial Complex, Botanical Gardens
St. George's, Grenada
Tel.: +1 473 440 5452/ 473 440 2708
Fax: +1 473 440 4191
E-Mail: jthomascalliste@yahoo.com

Guyana

13. Ms. Stacy Rashanna Lord
Environmental Officer
Biodiversity Unit, Natural Resources Management Division
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Ganges Street, Sophia
Georgetown, Guyana
Tel.: +592 225 5467/5468/5469, +592 225 6048
Fax.: +592 225 5481
E-Mail: stacyrlord@gmail.com

Jamaica

14. Mr. Robert C. St. C. Collie
Director of Legal Services and Enforcement
National Environment and Planning Agency
10 & 11 Caledonia Ave
Kingston 5, Jamaica
Tel.: +1 876 908 1324
Fax: +1 876 754 7594
E-Mail: robert.collie@nepa.gov.jm
15. Mr. Fitzroy White
Senior Plant Quarantine Officer
Plant Quarantine Branch
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Kingston, Jamaica
Tel.: +1 876 977 0637
Fax: +1 876 977 6992
E-Mail: hodijah@hotmail.com

Saint Kitts and Nevis

16. Mr. Sylvester Belle
Senior Conservation Officer
Department of Physical Planning and Environment
(Sustainable Development)
Bladen Commercial Development

Wellington Road
Basseterre, Saint Kitts and Nevis
Tel.: +869 465 2277
Fax: +869 465 5842
E-Mail: phyplskb@sisterisles.kn,
sylbelle44@gmail.com

17. Ms. Claudia Amelia Walwyn
Environmental Officer
Upstairs Water Department
Department of Physical Planning and Environment
Charlestown Nevis, Saint Kitts and Nevis
Tel.: +1 869 469 5521 ext 2040
Fax.: +1 869 469 0096
E-Mail: walwynca@hotmail.com

Saint Lucia

18. Ms. Sallyane Cotter
Legal Officer
Ministry of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science and Technology
Hewanorra House
Trou Garnier
Castries, Saint Lucia
Tel.: +1 758 468 5851
Fax: +1 758 456 0490
E-Mail: sallyane.cotter@govt.lc
19. Ms. Jannel Gabriel
Biosafety Implementation Project Coordinator
Ministry of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science and Technology
1st FL, Caribbean Cinemas Complex, Choc
Castries, Saint Lucia
Tel.: +1 758 468 4127
Fax: +1 758 453 2035
E-Mail: jannelgabriel@gmail.com; jannel.gabriel@govt.lc

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

20. Ms. Michelle Fife
Legal Advisor
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Consumer Affairs
3rd Floor Administrative Centre, Bay Street
Kingstown, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Tel.: +1 784 457 2618; +1 784 457 03456
Tel.: +1 784 456 2610
E-Mail: michellefife777@hotmail.com
21. Mr. Marcus L. Richards
Agriculture Officer,
Plant Protection and Quarantine Unit
Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Transformation, Forestry, Fisheries and Industry
Richmond Hill
Kingstown VC0100, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Tel.: +1 784 457 1283
Fax: +1 784 457 1688
E-Mail: mlrids@yahoo.com; ppq@gov.vc

Suriname

22. Mrs. Estrella M. Kromodihardjo-Madngisa
Environmental Policy Officer
Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment
Prins Hendrikstr 17
Paramaribo, Suriname
Tel.: +597 420960; 475368
Fax: +597 475574
E-Mail: estrellakromodihardjo@yahoo.com,
milieu_atm@yahoo.com,
estrella.kromodihardjo@atm.gov.sr
23. Ms. Nancy Wijngaarde
Environmental Policy Officer
Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment
Prins Hendrikstr 17
Paramaribo, Suriname
Tel.: +597 420960; 475368
Fax: +597 475574
E-Mail: milieu_atm@yahoo.com,
nwijingaarde@yahoo.com
nancy.wijngaarde@atm.gov.sr

Trinidad and Tobago

24. Ms. Candace Amoroso
Biodiversity Specialist, Multilateral Environmental Agreements Unit
Environmental Policy and Planning Division
Ministry of Environment and Water Resources
Level 26 Tower D
International Waterfront Complex, #1 Wrightson Road
Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago
Tel.: +1 868 623 3158 Ext. 222
Fax: +1 868 624 2455
E-Mail: candace.amoroso@gov.tt
25. Ms. Avanti Supersad
Legal Officer
Ministry of Environment and Water Resources
Level 26, Tower D
International Waterfront Complex, #1 Wrightson Road
Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago
Tel.: +1 868 623 3158 ext. 230
Fax: +1 868 624 2455
E-Mail: avanti.supersad@gov.tt
avanti.supersadenvw@gmail.com

Education/University

University of the West Indies

26. Ms. Karen Lynch
Regional Project Manager (Biosafety)
University of the West Indies
Sir Frank Stockdale Building
St. Augustine Campus
St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago
Tel.: +1 868 645 0573
Fax: +1 868 663 7741
E-Mail: regionalbiosafetyproject@gmail.com

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

27. Mr. Charles Gbedemah
Principal Officer
Biosafety Division
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W., Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 7032
Fax: +1 514 288 6588
E-Mail: charles.gbedemah@cbd.int
28. Mr. Erie Tamale
Programme Officer
Biosafety Division
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W., Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
29. Tel.: +1 514 287 7050
E-Mail: erie.tamale@cbd.int
- Mr. Worku Damena Yifru
Programme Officer, Biosafety policy and law
Biosafety Unit
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W. Suite 800
Montreal Quebec
Canada
Tel.: 1 514 287 7006
Fax: 1 514 288 6588
E-Mail: worku.yifru@cbd.int
