CBD

UNEP

CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/ICCP/2/12/Corr.1
9 August 2001

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE
CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY
Nairobi, 1-5 October 2001
Item 4.8.4 of the provisional agenda*

HANDLING, TRANSPORT, PACKAGING AND IDENTIFICATION OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS (ARTICLE 18)

Note by the Executive Secretary

Corrigendum

The attached text (Report of the Meeting of Technical Experts on Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification of Living Modified Organisms) should be included as an annex to document UNEP/CBD/ICCP/2/12.

* UNEP/CBD/ICCP/2/1.

/…

Annex

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF TECHNICAL EXPERTS ON HANDLING, TRANSPORT, PACKAGING AND IDENTIFICATION OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

1. At its first meeting, held in Montpellier, France, from 11 to 15 December 2000, the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP) invited Parties to the Convention, Governments and relevant international organizations to provide to the Executive Secretary information on their existing practices, rules and standards relevant to Article 18 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The ICCP also requested the Executive Secretary to prepare a synthesis report of the information and to convene a meeting of government-nominated technical experts in the handling, packaging, transport and identification to consider, based on the synthesis report, the needs and modalities for developing measures for Parties to the Protocol to meet their obligations under paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c) of Article 18 of the Protocol.

2. Accordingly, and following the generous offer made by the Governments of France, Canada and the United Kingdom to provide financial support for the convening of the meeting of technical experts and the offer of France to host and Canada to co-host it, the meeting was held at the Centre de Conférences Internationales (CCI), Paris, from 13 to 15 June 2001.

B. Attendance

3. Participants in the Meeting were selected among government-nominated experts from each geographic region with a view to achieving a balanced regional distribution. In addition, representatives of competent intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, as well as stakeholders were invited to participate.

4. The Meeting was attended by experts nominated by the following Governments: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Benin, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, China, Congo, Croatia, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, France, Ghana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Lithuania, Malaysia, Namibia, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

5. A representative of the European Community also attended, as an observer.

6. Representatives of the following intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders participated in the Meeting:

(a) *Intergovernmental organizations*: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Office International des Epizooties (OIE), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), World Health Organization.

(b) *Non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders*: Belgian Biosafety Council; Direction de la Protection de l'Environnement, Mairie de Paris; Genecor International Inc.; Global Industry Coalition; Greenpeace International; Institut Pasteur; International Seed Trade Federation (FIS/ASSINSEL); SOLAGRAL; World Conservation Union (IUCN).

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

7. The meeting was opened by Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, at 9.30 a.m. on Wednesday 13 June 2001.

8. In his opening statement, Mr. Zedan welcomed all participants and expressed gratitude to the Governments of Canada, France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for their generous support for the organization of the Meeting, and to the Governments of Canada and France, respectively, for hosting and co-hosting the Meeting. Noting that the broad requirements for handling, transport, packaging and identification were spelled out in the relevant provisions of the Protocol, he stressed that, in order for Parties to take an informed and workable decision on how to meet those requirements, they needed the input of experts who fully understood the complexity of the practical issues involved. The current Meeting was central to the achievement of the objective of the Protocol, namely, to contribute to ensuring an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms (LMOs) that might have an adverse effect on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health, and specifically focusing on transboundary movements. Briefly describing the documentation prepared by the Secretariat for the current Meeting, he stressed that the proposals contained therein for a future process to address the issues were intended only to provide the Meeting with a possible option, especially in case the recommendations or proposals developed at the Meeting required further follow-up before they could be finalized. He thanked all the Governments, organizations and individual experts that had provided information to the Secretariat to assist in the preparation of the pre-session documentation, as well as those that had provided additional material to contribute to the discussion. In conclusion, he thanked all participants for bringing their expertise to the Meeting and wished them success in their deliberations.

9. Opening statements were also made by Mr. Philippe Zeller and Mr Desmond Mahon, respectively, the representatives of France and Canada, host and co-hosts of the meeting.

10. In his statement, Mr. Zeller welcomed participants to Paris and thanked the Secretariat for the work it had accomplished to prepare for the Meeting. Noting his satisfaction at the cooperation with the Government of Canada in the organization of the Meeting, which illustrated the joint capacities to address issues of biotechnology, he expressed the wish that such cooperation with a transatlantic partner would not be an isolated case. The adoption of the Protocol had marked a major step forward for the international community. It was now necessary to ensure the safe transboundary movement of LMOs and give concrete form to the provisions of the Protocol. Although the Protocol was technically very complex, in their current deliberations the experts should allow themselves to be guided by the need to ensure its successful future implementation. It was extremely important for the current Meeting to prepare recommendations that would be transmitted to the second meeting of the ICCP, to be held in Nairobi in October 2001. Finally, he wished all participants fruitful and successful deliberations.

11. In his statement, Mr. Mahon congratulated the Government of France on the initiative to host the current Meeting and expressed thanks for the courtesy in offering the Government of Canada an opportunity to share in the Meeting. Canada considered the Protocol to be the best example of an approach to show the complementary nature of economic and environmental objectives in achieving sustainability. That was best illustrated by Article 18, where the issue of documentation to accompany the

transboundary movement of an LMO was addressed. In requesting the Executive Secretary to convene a meeting of experts, Governments had recognized the complexity of the issue and their need for expert advice to enable them to reach informed decisions on the issue. In expanding the number of experts invited, Governments had also recognized the need for a broad range of experience and input into that advice. The participants from intergovernmental organizations and civil society also provided opportunities for a fruitful exchange of ideas. In examining the issues, it was important to identify and build on the strengths of existing systems. The experts had been given a burdensome but very clear mandate and they needed to come up with clear and, if possible, decisive recommendations. In conclusion, he wished them success in their important task.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Election of officers

12. At the opening session of the Meeting, on 13 June 2001, participants elected the following officers for the Meeting:

Chair: Mr. Olivier Letodé (France)

Rapporteur: Mr. George Rhodes (Namibia)

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

13. The Meeting adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda proposed in document UNEP/CBD/BS/TE-HTPI/1/1:

1. Opening of the meeting.

2. Organizational matters:

   2.1. Election of officers;

   2.2. Adoption of the agenda;

   2.3. Organization of work.

3. Overview of the synthesis of existing practices, rules and standards relevant to Article 18 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

4. Consideration of the needs and modalities for developing measures for documentation accompanying living modified organisms:

   4.1. Consideration of the needs and modalities for developing measures for documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are destined for contained use (Article 18, paragraph 2 (b));

   4.2. Consideration of the needs and modalities for developing measures for documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment (Article 18, paragraph 2 (c)).

5. Recommendations.

6. Other matters.

7. Adoption of the report.

8. Closure of the meeting.

2.3. Organization of work

14. Following a discussion, the Meeting agreed to consider the items of the agenda in their customary order, and to hold an initial general debate on item 4, in plenary. As proposed in the annotations to the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/TE-HTPI/1/1/Add.1), at its 2nd plenary session, the Meeting decided to establish two groups: Group I, under the chairmanship of Mr. P.K. Ghosh (India), with a mandate to consider issues under agenda item 4.1 (the needs and modalities for developing measures for documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are destined for contained use (Article 18, paragraph 2 (b)); and Group II, under the chairmanship of Mr. Stephen Yarrow (Canada), to advance discussions under agenda item 4.2 (the needs and modalities for developing measures for documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment (Article 18, paragraph 2 (c)).

ITEM 3. OVERVIEW OF THE SYNTHESIS OF EXISTING PRACTICES, RULES AND STANDARDS RELEVANT TO ARTICLE 18 OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

15. The Meeting took up agenda item 3 at its 1st session, on Wednesday, 13 June 2001.

16. Introducing the item, the representative of the Secretariat described the documentation prepared by the Secretariat. She pointed to the note by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/BS/TE-HTPI/1/2), which contained a synthesis report on existing practices, rules and standards relating to handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms; a review of the latest developments in existing rules, practices and standards of packaging, handling, transport and identification; consideration of the needs and modalities for developing measures for documentation accompanying living modified organisms; and also containing proposals by the Secretariat. She also briefly introduced document (UNEP/CBD/BS/TE-HTPI/1/INF/1), giving a compilation of the information on existing practices, rules and standards relevant to Article 18 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, on which the synthesis report was based; and the note by the Executive Secretary on handling, transport, packaging and identification (UNEP/CBD/ICCP/1/6), which had been submitted to the ICCP at its first meeting and which was updated by the synthesis report contained in document UNEP/CBD/BS/TE-HTPI/1/2.

17. A statement was made in plenary under the item by the expert nominated by the Government of Djibouti.

ITEM 4. CONSIDERATION OF THE NEEDS AND MODALITIES FOR DEVELOPING MEASURES FOR DOCUMENTATION ACCOMPANYING LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS

18. Agenda item 4 was initially taken up in plenary at the 1st session of the Meeting, on Wednesday 13 June 2001.

19. At that session, statements were made under the item by experts nominated by the following Governments: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Benin, Brazil, Canada, China, Djibouti,

Dominican Republic, France, Ghana, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Malaysia, Namibia, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America,

20. Statements were also made by the representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), also speaking on behalf of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), and the World Health Organization (WHO).

21. The representatives of Global Industry Coalition and of Greenpeace International also made statements.

22. In the discussion, there was general agreement that the nature and form of documentation to accompany a transboundary shipment of LMOs should be simple, visible, adequate and applicable to most situations.

23. The following main points were raised by experts in the course of the session: the objectives of the documentation, including informing the importer that it was receiving LMOs, informing those involved in the transboundary movement of the LMO on measures to be taken in case of spillage, and guaranteeing that the transboundary movement would take place in conformity with the Protocol; the elements to be taken into account in the basic criteria for documentation; the use of existing practices and international agreements; the need to take into account the specificities of importing countries, including climatic conditions and level of technical capacities; the differentiation between documentation accompanying shipments and the information provided in notifications; the type of information in the documentation, including a possible logo or unique identifier for linkage to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

24. At the 2nd plenary session, statements were made under the item by experts nominated by the following Governments: Australia, Austria, Benin, Canada, Croatia, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Namibia, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America.

25. The observer accompanying the expert nominated by the Government of France briefly presented the documentation system applied by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

26. A statement was also made by the representative of UNECE.

27. The following main issues were raised in the course of the 2nd plenary session: the possibilty of using one system of documentation that would be applicable to all cases, perhaps incorporating a section to include any special requirements; how to ensure that the transboundary movement of an LMO was in fact in accordance with the Protocol; the need to take into account handling instructions, as well as procedures in case of accidents; the possibility of identifying and modifying existing agreements and practices, in line with the requirements of the Protocol; the possibility of using the IPPC phytosanitary certificate system as a basis to meet the provisions of Article 18, paragraphs 2 (b) and (c); the appropriateness of the United Nations Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods as a basis to meet the provisions of Article 18, paragraph 2 (b); the need to establish a new system of documentation, specifically tailored to the requirements of the Protocol; the possible duplication of effort inherent in the application of a new and additional system of accompanying documentation, and its knock-on effects for industry and others; the need for the documentation to focus on the use of the organism to be transported, rather than on the organism itself; the need for the accompanying transportation document to be as simple as possible, and

not contain unnecessary information that could be appended or provided elsewhere; the ease and possibility of using supplier's invoices, appropriately completed, to provide the requisite information; the need for the documentation to provide a linkage to the competent national authorities and the Biosafety Clearing-House.

28. As agreed (see para. 14 above), the Meeting subsequently convened two Groups to consider issues under agenda items 4.1 and 4.2.

4.1. Consideration of the needs and modalities for developing measures for documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are destined for contained use (Article 18, paragraph 2 (b))

29. Agenda item 4.1 was taken up in Group I, under the chairmanship of Mr. P. K. Ghosh (India). The Group held one meeting on Thursday, 14 June 2001.

30. At the 3rd plenary session , on 14 June 2001, the Chair of Group I reported to the Meeting on the results of the deliberations in the Group, and presented a paper containing the approved Chair's summary of the discussion. Concerning the consideration of modalities for developing measures, he explained that the examination of existing agreements had indicated that there were gaps in meeting the requirements of the Biosafety Protocol and further analysis would be required, since the Group had not discussed other specific modalities in detail.

31. At that session, statements were made under the item by the experts nominated by the following Governments: Australia, Namibia, Norway, and United States of America.

32. A statement was also made by the representative of the Office International des Epizooties.

33. Following the discussion, the Chair proposed, and the Meeting agreed, that the Chairs of Groups I and II, the Chair of the Meeting and the Secretariat, taking into account the comments and proposals made, would prepare draft recommendations on the agenda item for submission to the plenary.

4.2. Consideration of the needs and modalities for developing measures for documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment (Article 18, paragraph 2 (c))

34. Agenda item 4.2 was taken up in Group II, under the chairmanship of Mr. S. Yarrow (Canada). The Group held two meetings on Thursday, 14 June 2001.

35. At its 1st meeting, following the debate, Group II agreed to establish an informal, open-ended contact group, with a core membership of Australia, Namibia, Norway and United States of America, to prepare a draft reflecting the Group's findings. The draft was discussed by Group II at its 2nd meeting.

36. At the 3rd plenary session, on 14 June 2001, the Chair of Group II reported to the Meeting on the results of the deliberations in the Group, and presented a paper containing the draft recommendations prepared and discussed by the Group. He explained that, in examining modalities for developing measures, the Group had examined existing practices for documentation supplied by the originator (e.g., invoices or other documentation), existing intergovernmental mechanisms for documentation, and documentation tailored on the existing systems. The Group had attempted to assess the relative advantages and disadvantages of each of the systems, as well as their availability for use in practice. Although no clear

conclusions had emerged, and the three options remained, the Group had gained a better understanding of the issues involved.

37. At that session, statements were made under the item by experts nominated by the following Governments: Australia, Austria, China, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Namibia, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America.

38. Following the discussion, the Chair proposed, and the Meeting agreed, that the Chairs of Groups I and II, the Chair of the Meeting and the Secretariat, taking into account the comments and proposals made, would prepare draft recommendations on the agenda item for submission to the plenary.

ITEM 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

39. At its 4th plenary session, on Friday, 15 June 2001, the Meeting considered a Chair's text, based on the outcome of the consideration of agenda items 4.1 and 4.2 in the two Groups and the plenary, containing a summary of the issues discussed as well as draft recommendations.

40. Following the discussion, in which many experts participated, the Meeting agreed to convene an informal contact group to review the Chair's text in light of the comments made. The Chair's summary of the issues discussed by the Meeting is contained in annex I to the present report. The summary also contains two tables describing the advantages, disadvantages and availability of each of the options considered in respect of Article 18, paragraphs 2 (b) (table 1) and 2 (c) (table 2). Table 2 was the subject of discussion in the Meeting, while table 1 represents an attempt by some experts to adapt table 2 to the specific circumstances of contained use.

41. At its 5th plenary session, the Meeting considered revised draft recommendations submitted by the Chair.

42. The Meeting adopted the draft recommendations, as amended in the course of the discussion, for transmission to the ICCP at its second meeting. The text of the recommendations is contained in annex II to the present report.

43. Following the adoption of the recommendations, the representative of Croatia, supported by a number of other experts, said that she would have preferred subparagraph (b) to state that Parties should strive to work to develop a new mechanism of identification under Article 18, paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c).

44. The representative of Norway expressed his concern that any further technical work on needs and modalities for developing measures to meet Parties' obligations under Article 18, paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c), of the Protocol should be made in an open-ended group, so as to make it possible for Parties and organizations to bring relevant experts. Such an appraoch would also promote transparency in the work. In addition, he considered that, because of the overlap of measures, any further work should be conducted by just one group, considering both paragraph 2 (b) and paragraph 2 (c) of Article 18.

ITEM 6. OTHER MATTERS

45. No other matters were raised for discussion at the Meeting.

ITEM 7. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

46. The present report was adopted on 15 June 2001,on the basis of the draft report.

ITEM 8. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

47. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Meeting was closed at 6.30 p.m. on Friday, 15 June 2001.

Annex I

CHAIR'S SUMMARY OF ISSUES DISCUSSED BY THE TECHNICAL EXPERTS' MEETING ON HANDLING, TRANSPORT, PACKAGING AND IDENTIFICATION OF LMOS

1. General considerations:

(a) Nature and form of the documentation has to be simple, visible, legible and adequate;

(b) The documentation should easily be managed in most situations;

(c) The objectives of the documentation are:

(i) To inform the importer that it is receiving LMOs

(ii) To inform those involved in the transboundary movement of the LMO on measures to take in case of spillage

(iii) To guarantee that the transboundary movement takes place in conformity with the requirements of the Protocol with regard to paragraph 2 (c) of Article 18;

(d) Basic considerations that need to be taken into account in establishing the modalities for documentation:

(i) Nature of the organism;

(ii) Associated risk;

(iii) Purpose or use of the living modified organism;

(iv) Regulatory status;

(v) Transport means;

(e) Modalities of the documentation should not differ from one Party to another;

(f) Information contained in the documentation should take into account some specificities of the importing country;

(g) Accompanying documentation is different from the information submitted under notifications.

2. Technical findings:

(a) *Coverage*. Technical findings were reached with regard to the actual coverage of specific LMOs under existing international agreements, for example:

(i) Under Article 18, paragraph 2 (b), living modified micro-organisms that are pathogens for humans and animals fall clearly under the rules and practices of the United Nations Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods (TDG division 6.2), as far as they meet the definition of infectious substances;

(ii) United Nations Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods address non-infectious "genetically modified micro-organisms" (class 9);

(iii) Under Article 18, paragraph 2 (c) some seeds are covered by the OECD seed scheme, and organisms that are quarantine pests of plants are covered by the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC);

(b) *Gaps*. Gaps have been identified in the coverage of the provisions of the Protocol in the existing practices and rules:

(i) Not all the plants or the organisms are covered by the IPPC rules;

(ii) Existing international agreements (IPPC, OECD, OIE, Codex Alimentarius, United Nations Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods) or rules do not address some of the provisions of the Protocol, *inter alia*, the clear identification as an LMO as defined by the Protocol;

(iii) Some categories/groups of organisms are not covered at all by any instrument (e.g., LMO-fish, LMO-insects that are not plant pests).

3. Issues for further consideration on common points between paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c) of Article 18:

(a) Unique identification – notably with respect to the linkage of the documentation to the Biosafety Clearing-House;

(b) Electronic information-sharing capacity;

(c) Linkage with Article 18, paragraph 3;

(d) Consideration for simplified, user-friendly mechanism for exchange of research material.

4. Needs for clarification have been identified at a specific technical level with regard to Article 18., paragraphs 2 (b) and (c):

(a) Modalities of information, e.g., logo;

(b) Modalities of specifying the requirements of the Protocol with regard to safe handling, storage, transport and use, e.g., documentation on board or reference to external documentation.

Table 1

ADVANTAGES, DISADVANTAGES AND AVAILABILITY OF THE THREE OPTIONS AS THEY APPLY TO ARTICLE 18, PARAGRAGH 2 (b)

	Advantages	**Disadvantages**	**Availability**
Option 1: **Existing documentation practices (specifically invoice, pro forma invoice or other documentation) supplied by originator of shipment**	Simple/easily amended to contain shipping documentation requirements Already in place Most shipments have some form of documentation supplied by the originator No lack of coverage	Potential for insufficient Government oversight Implementation could require domestic legislative backing Could lead to duplication of paperwork	Available now
Option 2: **Existing international documentation systems**	Already in place Parties, importers and exporters are familiar with and currently use them Some degree of Government oversight	Need to use a range of different systems Question whether all of the international organizations would accept Biosafety Protocol statements in their documentation Not a total coverage of all LMOs Time and costs associated with modification	Available now, in some instances

	Advantages	Disadvantages	Availability
Option 3: **New documentation tailored on existing systems**	Clear Specific and unique to the Biosafety Protocol	New system – lack of experience Some countries would need new legislation/regulatory arrangements to put new system in place Potential for duplication of information provided through other documentation systems Time and costs associated with modification	Would require development and regulatory adjustments in all countries

Table 2

ADVANTAGES, DISADVANTAGES AND AVAILABILITY OF THE THREE OPTIONS AS THEY APPLY TO ARTICLE 18, PARAGRAGH 2 (c)

	Advantages	Disadvantages	Availability
Option 1: **Existing documentation practices (specifically invoice, pro forma invoice or other documentation) supplied by originator of shipment**	Simple/easily amended to contain shipping documentation requirements Already in place Most shipments have some form of documentation supplied by the originator No lack of coverage Linked to notification approval Linked to the Biosafety Clearing-House	Potential for insufficient Government oversight Implementation could require domestic legislative backing Could lead to duplication of paperwork	Available now but with little Government oversight

	Advantages	Disadvantages	Availability
Option 2: **Existing international documentation systems**	Already in place Parties, importers and exporters are familiar with and currently use them Minimal impact in terms of implementation of Article 18, paragraph 2(c) Some degree of Government oversight	Need to use a range of different systems Question whether all of the international organisations would accept Biosafety Protocol statements in their documentation Not a total coverage of all LMOs Time and costs associated with modification	Available now, in some instances (e.g. IPPC)
Option 3: **New documentation tailored on existing systems**	Clear Use existing documentation systems as models Specific and unique to the Biosafety Protocol Linked to notification approval Linked to the Biosafety Clearing-House	New system – lack of experience Some countries would need new legislation/regulatory arrangements to put new system in place Potential for duplication of information provided through other documentation systems Time and costs associated with modification	Would require development and regulatory adjustments in all countries

Annex II

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY AT ITS SECOND MEETING

The Meeting of Technical Experts on Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification of Living Modified Organisms,

Having met to consider the needs and modalities for developing measures for Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to meet their obligations under paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c) of Article 18 of the Protocol,

Recognizing that the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety applies to the transboundary movement, transit, handling and use of all living modified organisms that may have adverse effect on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health,

Acknowledging that there are a range of international systems and documentation practices that may be relevant to Article 18, paragraph 2 (b) and Article 18, paragraph 2 (c),

Having identified during its deliberations three major options that may address the documentation requirements under Article 18, paragraph 2 (b) and Article 18, paragraph 2 (c), namely: (i) existing documentation practices supplied by the originator; (ii) existing international documentation systems; and (iii) a new documentation mechanism tailored on existing systems,

Having concluded that measures are required to assist Parties to meet their obligations under Article 18, paragraph 2 (b) and Article 18, paragraph 2 (c),

Noting the need for a simple, visible, legible and adequate documentation to meet the requirements of Article 18, paragraph 2 (b) and Article 18, paragraph 2 (c),

Recommends that:

(a) ICCP considers the following options:

(i) Parties use an accompanying document provided by the originator and/or existing international documentation systems that incorporates the information required under Article 18, paragraph 2 (b) and Article 18, paragraph 2 (c), as relevant, to enable Parties to fulfil their obligations as required in the Protocol (options (i) and (ii));

(ii) Parties keep under review and discuss the need to develop a new system of documentation under Article 18, paragraph 2 (b) and Article 18, paragraph 2 (c), (option (iii)).

(b) International organizations responsible for the following instruments, and other relevant international organizations, be invited to provide advice on their ability to assist Parties to meet the requirements of Article 18, paragraph 2 (b) and Article 18, paragraph 2 (c) of the Protocol and their capacity to adjust their systems, should adjustment be necessary: the International Plant Protection Convention, the Seed Certification Schemes of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and

Development, and division 6.2 and class 9 of the United Nations Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods.
