

**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/INF/3
3 August 2010

ENGLISH ONLY

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION
ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE
MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA
PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Fifth meeting

Nagoya, Japan, 11-15 October 2010

**CAPACITY-BUILDING: REPORTS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE LIAISON
GROUP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR BIOSAFETY**

1. The Executive Secretary is pleased to circulate herewith, for the information of participants in the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, reports of the sixth and seventh meetings of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety, which were held on 12 and 13 March 2009, in San José, Costa Rica, and on 4 and 5 February 2010, in Siem Reap, Cambodia, respectively.
2. The two reports were previously issued by the Secretariat as documents UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/6/1/3 and UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/7/2, respectively.

/...

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.

REPORT OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE LIAISON GROUP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR BIOSAFETY ¹

I. INTRODUCTION

3. The sixth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety was held in San José, Costa Rica on 12 and 13 March 2009. It was attended by 22 participants from 14 countries and 7 organizations. The countries were: Belize, Cambodia, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Germany, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Norway, Serbia, Slovenia and South Africa. The organizations were: Desarrollo Medio Ambiental Sustentable, ECOROPA, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Global Environment Facility (GEF), Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), the Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP/GEF) and Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico (UNAM). The list of participants is contained in annex V to this report.

II. PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

4. The meeting was opened by Mr. Charles Gbedemah on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Mr. Gbedemah welcomed the participants and thanked them for offering their time to provide advice to the Executive Secretary on key issues concerning capacity-building for the implementation of the Protocol. He also thanked the Government of Costa Rica for hosting the meeting and IICA for providing the meeting facilities and organizational support. Mr. Gbedemah noted that the fourth meeting of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to prepare a draft strategic plan for the Protocol on the basis of submissions by Parties and relevant organizations. The draft will be considered at the fifth meeting of the Parties. He hoped that the Liaison Group would provide input into that process, especially with respect to capacity-building.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

5. After the opening session, the participants elected Mr. Desmond Mahon (Canada) to serve as Chair of the meeting and Ms. Darja Stanic Racman (Slovenia) as Rapporteur.

6. The participants adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/6/1) that was proposed by the Executive Secretary.

7. They also adopted the organization of work which was provided as document UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/6/1/Add1. The following substantive agenda items were discussed:

- 3.1 Review of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on capacity-building and consideration of possible capacity-building elements to be incorporated in the strategic plan for the Protocol and the new medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol;
- 3.2 Consideration of a revised country capacity-building needs-assessment framework and process;

¹ This report has also been published as document UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/6/3.

- 3.3 Review of the draft web-based reporting format for activities contributing to the implementation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

ITEM 3. ISSUES FOR IN-DEPTH CONSIDERATION

3.1. *Review of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on capacity-building and consideration of possible elements of the capacity-building component of the strategic plan for the Protocol and the new medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol*

8. Under this agenda item, the participants brainstormed on the possible strategic goals and objectives for the capacity-building component of the strategic plan for the Protocol. Each participant was invited to express his/her views on what should be achieved over the next ten years, with regard to building capacity for the implementation of the Protocol.

9. During the discussions, participants emphasized the need to ensure that by 2020 all Parties would have the requisite capacities to fulfil their obligations under the Protocol. Some of the specific desired goals and achievements over the next years, that were expressed by participants include the following:

- (a) More countries become Parties to the Protocol;
- (b) Strengthened operational capability of competent national authorities in developing countries;
- (c) More Parties have operational national biosafety frameworks (including biosafety policies, laws and systems to handle the requests);
- (d) Parties have sustainably developed national regulatory systems;
- (e) Parties have the ability to make informed decisions within the timeframes specified in the Protocol or their national regulatory frameworks;
- (f) The BCH is fully operational and well populated with validated information;
- (g) Information exchange is enhanced;
- (h) Parties have mechanisms in place to ensure public access to information and broad public involvement in decision-making regarding LMOs;
- (i) The majority or all Parties have public awareness systems on biosafety in place and increased awareness of the Protocol and biosafety issues on both national and global level;
- (j) Parties have the ability to enforce their obligations under the Protocol (including enforcement of decisions, prevention of unintentional and illegal movements and improved general compliance with the Protocol's provisions);
- (k) Parties have the ability to integrate biosafety issues into their national development plans;

(l) Parties have coordination mechanisms in place at the national level to ensure synergistic implementation of different biosafety initiatives; and

(m) Parties have sufficient resources and sustainable systems to ensure the implementation of the Protocol.

10. A number of participants highlighted the need to ensure the sustainability of capacity-building efforts and the establishment of stable and harmonized administration to ensure their success. It was further noted that many countries have had several short-term biosafety capacity-building initiatives that were never expanded or followed up to ensure a successful impact. It was also noted some countries experience a high turnover of personnel, which calls for establishment of strong institutional systems that ensure continuity.

11. Some participants suggested that, in order to develop effective goals and objectives, a stock-taking exercise would be needed. Such an exercise would help to establish a baseline and to better understand the prevailing circumstances. However, the participants observed that it would not be feasible to conduct a stock-taking exercise before the next meeting of the Parties. In this regard, they agreed that the formulation of strategic goals and objectives should be undertaken on the basis of existing information, knowledge and experience.

12. After the initial brainstorming session, further details were discussed and developed into a set of draft elements for the capacity-building component of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol, which are contained in annex II to this report. The Secretariat was requested to further develop the elements for consideration at the next meeting of the Liaison Group.

13. Under this agenda item, the participants were also invited to review the previous decisions on capacity-building for the implementation of the Protocol taken by the Parties to the Protocol and to advise on whether there is a need to amend, streamline or drop some of the tools, mechanisms and guidance adopted in those decisions, in light the next phase of the Protocol implementation that will follow the adoption of the Strategic Plan. Some of the tools and mechanisms adopted include the action plan, the coordination mechanism (which comprises coordination meetings, the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building in Biosafety and capacity-building databases), the implementation toolkit, indicators for monitoring the implementation of the Action Plan and the roster of experts. The participants were also invited to identify emerging capacity-building issues that may need to be considered in the context of the developing the strategic plan for the Protocol and the new medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and to advise whether there is a need to develop new tools and mechanisms.

14. The participants noted that in general most of the tools and mechanisms established by the Parties to the Protocol were making a useful contribution to facilitating capacity-building under the Protocol. At the same time, it was recognized that the information available was insufficient to allow for a conclusive assessment. However, participants agreed that there was a need to revise and strengthen some of the tools and mechanisms, in particular the following:

(a) *Indicators for monitoring the implementation of the action plan:* It was noted that current indicators need to be revised to make them “SMART” (i.e. Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound) and to ensure that they follow results-based management or logical framework principles. In this regard, it was suggested that a meeting of experts in monitoring and evaluation be convened to carry out a professional revision of the indicators, as part of the process for developing the strategic plan for the Protocol, and that the GEF Secretariat, in light of its experience in developing, monitoring and evaluating various biosafety capacity-building projects, should be closely involved. It

was noted that such a meeting might also be of interest to donors funding biosafety activities. Furthermore, it was also suggested that the indicators for capacity-building be incorporated into the broader set of indicators for assessing the implementation of the Protocol in order to increase their use by Parties;

(b) *Implementation toolkit (decision BS-I/5, annex III)*: It was noted that current version of the toolkit was designed simply to provide countries with a quick checklist of their main obligations under the Protocol. It was suggested that the toolkit be improved/expanded to include guidance to Parties on how they could implement their obligations;

(c) *Coordination mechanism*: It was noted that in the past there was some overlap between the work of the coordination meetings and that of the Liaison Group. In light of this, some participants suggested that the two elements be merged. However, it was also noted that despite some overlaps, the two elements were established to play distinct roles. The coordination meetings were meant to provide a forum for exchange of information, experiences and lessons learned regarding their capacity-building efforts while the Liaison Group was established to provide expert advice to the Executive Secretary with respect to the overall policy guidance, strategic approaches and conceptual and operational frameworks for capacity-building in biosafety.

15. With regard to emerging capacity-building issues, the participants noted that there is a need to develop a new tool/mechanism to facilitate regional and subregional cooperation on general biosafety issues or specific activities. It was suggested that development of such a tool or mechanism should build on the draft guidance on regional and subregional cooperation developed by the coordination meeting. It should also take into account the experiences, good practices and lessons learned from previous regional biosafety initiatives/projects, such as those funded by GEF, and from examples of collaboration on biosafety under regional and subregional bodies such as the European Union and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). It was emphasized that effective regional and subregional cooperation would require a bottom-up approach involving broad and participatory consultations and joint assessments and planning. It was also noted that countries should build a certain level of confidence/mutual trust and competence in order to cooperate effectively as equal partners.

16. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Liaison Group would further consider this sub-item to systematically review each of the capacity-building tools and mechanisms and make recommendations on whether they should be proposed for revision, expansion due to their increased importance or phased out. In order to facilitate this process, the Secretariat was requested to prepare, prior to the next meeting, a list of all the tools and mechanisms, the decisions that established them and a brief description of their status of operationalization and use by Parties.

Item 3.2. Consideration of a revised biosafety capacity-building needs-assessment framework and process

17. Under this agenda item, the participants reviewed the common format for registering country capacity-building needs and priorities (questionnaire) and the process through which the information is gathered. It was reported that information is currently gathered through country self-assessments using the common format (questionnaire), which is accessible through the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH). The online needs assessment questionnaire can be completed and submitted by Governments at any time.

18. The participants proposed a number of improvements to the needs-assessment questionnaire and the procedure for submitting information, including the timeframe and periodicity of the assessments. It was suggested that the new questionnaire should use the format (structure) of the revised set of indicators for monitoring the updated Action Plan, contained in the annex to decision BS-IV/3. In this regard, a

country completing the questionnaire would, for each need identified, indicate, on a scale of 0 to 4, the extent to which the need has been addressed, (whereby 0 would mean not at all addressed and 4 would mean largely addressed). It was also suggested that the questionnaire should incorporate options for countries to identify their most preferred means for addressing the identified priority needs. The participants emphasized the need to keep the questionnaire relatively simple and concise so as to facilitate its completion by countries, bearing in mind the challenges faced by countries in preparing multiple surveys and responding to reports.

19. With regard to the timeframe and periodicity of the assessment, it was suggested that all developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition be invited to complete the questionnaire periodically (for example every two, four or six years) and within a fixed timeframe, for example within 3 or 6 months, and not on a rolling basis as is currently the case, in order to facilitate meaningful analysis of the information. It was also suggested that the assessment be programmed to coincide with the meetings of the Conferences of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties, and preferably be synchronized with the cycle for submission of national reports. Some participants noted that ongoing submission of needs through the BCH might still be useful to capture the changing priorities of countries, but it was ultimately agreed that periodic assessments are most useful.

20. A number of participants highlighted the need to ensure that the aim of the assessment is clearly made to Parties and other Governments when notifications are sent out requesting them to complete the survey. It was further agreed that the main objectives of the assessment should be to capture the general picture of the priority needs of countries and to identify the major gaps in order for the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties and donors to respond appropriately with interventions/response measures. A second objective could be to establish the baseline or threshold levels and to facilitate subsequent assessments of the progress and effectiveness in addressing the capacity-building needs.

Item 3.3. Web-based reporting format for biosafety capacity-building activities

21. Under this agenda item, the participants reviewed and provided comments on the draft web-based reporting format prepared by the Secretariat in response to the request by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol contained in paragraph 5 of decision BS-IV/3. The reporting format will be used by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to submit information regarding their capacity-building activities in order to facilitate comprehensive analysis of the status of implementation of the Action Plan for Building Capacity for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol.

22. The draft reporting format presented to the meeting had been structured into categories corresponding to the elements of the updated Action Plan. However, participants observed that such categorization would make it difficult to report on capacity-building activities (e.g. workshops) that contribute to more than one element of the Action Plan (e.g., contribute to human-resource development and also promote technical and institutional collaboration). In this regard, it was suggested that the format should be restructured to provide options (e.g., in form of a drop-down menu) that would allow respondents to make multiple choices of the Action Plan elements to which an activity contributed. It was also suggested that the options should be divided into the broad cross-cutting capacity-building elements (e.g. institutional building and human resource development/training) and the substantive thematic elements (e.g. risk assessment, risk management, identification of LMOs, etc) to avoid mixing strategies with substantive thematic areas.

23. The participants also recommended that the format should include a field for reporting the resource inputs or cost of different activities. It was noted that such information would be useful for

donors and other countries or organizations wishing to carry out or fund similar activities. Furthermore, the participants agreed that the reporting format should include a drop-down menu to indicate if a given activity is a stand-alone intervention or part of a broader initiative (e.g., project or programme).

24. In order to assist those interested in obtaining further information and/or following-up on different activities as reported, it was suggested that contact details of the institutions or persons responsible for implementing or overseeing the different activities, as well as web links to the detailed activity reports, should be provided in the reporting format.

25. The participants also suggested that it would be useful to provide examples of possible entries under different fields in order to guide respondents on specific information that need to be provided. This, it was noted, would help to limit submission to details and useful information.

26. It was clarified that the purpose of this reporting exercise should be to collect and analyse information from different countries in order to find out the overall status and progress made with regard to capacity-building for the implementation of the Protocol. The exercise would also help to compare and evaluate individual activities. The reporting would further help to identify the number and types of capacity-building activities undertaken under different thematic areas, determine the overall resource investment/costs involved and assist in the mapping out the future trends. It was also noted that the reporting would be applicable to both donor-funded capacity-building activities and those implemented at the national level as part of the regular programmes. Overall, the reporting exercise can capture all available information on biosafety capacity-building activities undertaken in order to capture the global picture so as to assist the meeting of the Parties and donors to assess progress and develop future plans and strategies.

27. The Secretariat informed participants that once the reporting format is finalized, it will be made available online through the Biosafety Clearing-House. A notification will be sent out inviting all Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and donors to report on their different capacity-building activities undertaken since the last meeting of the Parties.

28. The revised format, incorporating the suggestions made the Liaison Group, is contained in annex IV to this report.

ITEM 4. OTHER MATTERS

29. There were no other matters.

ITEM 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

30. The Liaison Group adopted draft elements of the capacity-building component of the strategic plan for the Protocol, as contained in annex II to this report. The Secretariat was requested to further develop the elements for consideration at the next meeting of the Liaison Group.

31. With regard to capacity-building needs assessment, the Liaison Group recommended that:

(a) The new capacity-building needs assessment questionnaire should use the graphic layout of the revised set of indicators for monitoring the updated Action Plan, contained in the annex to decision BS-IV/3, and should incorporate options for countries to identify their most preferred means for addressing the identified priority needs. The revised capacity-building needs assessment common format is contained in annex III to this report;

(b) The needs assessment should be carried out every four years, coinciding with the meetings of the Parties and should preferably follow the cycle for national reports. All developing countries and countries with economies in transition should be requested to complete the assessment within six months prior to the meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties that would consider the needs assessment synthesis report;

(c) The first needs assessment using the new questionnaire should be carried out as soon as possible so that the needs assessment synthesis report could feed into the Strategic Plan process of the Protocol at the fifth meeting of the Parties.

32. The Liaison Group recommended that the Secretariat should use the web-based reporting format for biosafety capacity-building activities, contained in annex IV to this report. It further recommended that Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and donors be invited to submit their reports using this reporting format prior to the fifth meeting of the Parties in order to provide baseline information to guide the discussions on the Strategic Plan for the Protocol and the medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties.

ITEM 6. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

33. On the last day, participants reviewed and adopted the draft report of the meeting covering the proceedings of the first day and part of the last day. The Secretariat, in collaboration with the Chair and the Rapporteur, was requested to incorporate the proceedings of the last day and any subsequent suggestions from participants and send the draft report to all participants for comments before posting it on the Protocol website. The present report has been finalized on that basis.

34. In his closing remarks, the representative of the Government of Costa Rica, Mr. Alejandro Hernandez from the Ministry of Agriculture, expressed gratitude to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for accepting the offer by the Government of Costa Rica to host the meeting. He also thanked the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) for offering the conference facilities and for its active collaboration and support in organizing the meeting. The representative of the IICA, Mr. Bryan Munoz Castillo, expressed his organization's pleasure for hosting the meeting and invited participants to collaborate with IICA on activities of mutual interest within its member States.

35. The meeting of the Liaison Group was closed on Friday, 13 March 2009, at 1 p.m.

Annex I

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

	<i>Plenary</i>
<p><i>Thursday</i> 12 March 2009 9 a.m. to 9.30 a.m.</p>	<p><i>Agenda item:</i></p> <p>1. Opening of the meeting.</p>
<p>9.30 a.m. to 10 a.m.</p>	<p><i>Agenda items:</i></p> <p>2. Organizational matters:</p> <p>2.1. Election of officers</p> <p>2.2. Adoption of the agenda;</p> <p>2.3. Organization of work.</p>
<p>10 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.</p>	<p><i>Agenda items:</i></p> <p>3. Issues for in-depth consideration:</p> <p>3.1 Review of the decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on capacity-building and consideration of possible elements of the capacity-building component of the strategic plan for the Protocol and the new medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol</p> <p>3.2 Consideration of a revised biosafety capacity-building needs-assessment framework and process</p> <p>3.3 Review of the draft web-based reporting format for activities contributing to the implementation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol prepared by the Executive Secretary.</p>
<p>2.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m.</p>	<p>Agenda item 3 (<i>continued</i>)</p>
<p><i>Friday</i> 13 March 2009 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.</p>	<p>Agenda item 3 (<i>continued</i>)</p>
<p>2 p.m. to 5 p.m.</p>	<p><i>Agenda items:</i></p> <p>4. Other matters</p> <p>5. Conclusions and recommendations</p> <p>6. Closure of the meeting</p>

Annex II

**DRAFT CAPACITY-BUILDING ELEMENTS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE
CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY**

I- LEVEL: Vision elements (vision is not be developed by this group)

II- LEVEL: Strategic goals for capacity-building

- a. All Parties have in place operational national biosafety frameworks (including policy, legal, regulatory and administrative frameworks)
- b. All Parties able to make informed decisions
- c. All Parties are able to enforce their decisions
- d. All Parties have ability to implement their obligations in a sustainable manner
- e. All Parties have the ability to promote public awareness and to ensure effective public participation
- f. All Parties have mechanisms to mainstream biosafety into national policies and processes
- g. All Parties fostering cooperation among themselves at global, regional and sub-regional levels

III-LEVEL: Strategic objectives for capacity-building

- a. All Parties have in place operational national biosafety frameworks (including policy, legal, regulatory and administrative frameworks)
 - Develop national biosafety frameworks (NBFs)
 - Develop institutional systems
 - Put in place liability and redress systems, e.g. set up of the administrative procedure, identification of operator, ability to prove damage
 - Establish LMO identification systems
- b. All Parties able to make informed decisions
 - Training of regulators and risk assessors
 - Ensuring access to existing information and/or identify gaps in existing information
 - Establishing fully operational national BCH nodes, with mechanisms for validation of information
- c. All Parties are able to enforce their decisions
 - Establish monitoring systems
 - Establish enforcement mechanisms
- d. All Parties have ability to implement their obligations in a sustainable manner
 - Ensure/build a stable critical mass of trained biosafety personnel
 - Development of coherent national policy/ies on biosafety
 - Develop adequate institutional systems
 - Promote education and training

- e. All Parties have the ability to promote public awareness and to ensure effective participation
 - Develop systems for public awareness and participation
 - Develop systems for information and knowledge exchange

- f. All Parties have mechanisms to mainstream (integrate/anchor) Biosafety into policies
 - Identify relevant national policies
 - (After the conclusion of the coordination meeting are agreed, the relevant conclusions will be copied here)

IV- LEVEL: Implementing activities to achieve objectives

Annex III

DRAFT REVISED COMMON FORMAT FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1. Country:

2. Broad areas in which capacity is needed:

- Institutional capacity
- Human resources capacity development and training
- Capacity in risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise
- Capacity in risk management
- Public awareness, participation and education in biosafety
- Information exchange and data management including participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House
- Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration at subregional, regional and international levels
- Access to and transfer of technology and know-how
- Identification of LMO shipments as required by the Protocol
- Handling of Socio-economic considerations in decision making regarding LMOs
- Implementation of documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol
- Handling of confidential information
- Taking into account risks to human health

3. Specific needs and priorities:

For each of the broad areas selected identify up to three specific priority needs and to indicate, on a scale of 0 to 4, the extent to which the need has been addressed (whereby 0 means not at all addressed and 4 means largely addressed). For each identified specific priority need, select up to 3 preferred means for assistance to address the need.

Key for the preferred means of assistance:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Education and training</i> 2. <i>Funding support</i> 3. <i>Guidance/training materials</i> 4. <i>Knowledge sharing (e.g. through conferences and other fora)</i> 5. <i>Membership with professional bodies/networks</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. <i>Exchange programmes, internships, study tours or twinning arrangements</i> 7. <i>Scholarships/fellowships</i> 8. <i>Technical assistance and advice</i> 9. <i>Other (specify)</i> |
|---|--|

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	
A. Institutional capacity							
<i>(i) Legislative and policy frameworks</i>	○ Assistance in review of existing laws						
	○ Development of a national biosafety policy						
	○ Development of biosafety standards						
	○ Drafting of the national biosafety laws and regulations						
	○ Guidance on mainstreaming of biosafety into other sectors						
	○ National biosafety guidelines						
	○ National biosafety compliance mechanism						
	○ National liability and redress regime						
	○ Support for implementation of the national biosafety policy						
	○ Streamlining of regulatory systems						
	○ Tools for enforcement of biosafety laws and regulations						
	○ Other (specify)						
	<i>(ii) Administrative frameworks</i>	○ Development of administrative systems for handling applications for import and/or release of LMOs					
○ General operational procedures and guidelines							
○ Inter-institutional communication mechanisms							
○ Mechanisms for handling of confidential information							
○ Mechanisms for review of decisions in light of new information							
○ Mechanism to oversee and report on the implementation of the Protocol							
○ National coordination mechanism among regulatory authorities and processes							

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	
<i>(iii) Technical, scientific, and telecommunications infrastructure</i>	<input type="radio"/> Record management system for applications and decisions						
	<input type="radio"/> Strengthening of the institutional body(ies) handling biosafety issues						
	<input type="radio"/> Systems for decision-making (procedures and guidelines)						
	<input type="radio"/> Other (specify)						
	<input type="radio"/> Access to information communication technologies						
	<input type="radio"/> Biosafety research facilities (greenhouse, confined field trials, etc)						
	<input type="radio"/> Border control/inspection facilities						
	<input type="radio"/> Certified LMO laboratory						
	<input type="radio"/> Infrastructure for LMO sampling and detection						
	<input type="radio"/> Internet connectivity						
	<input type="radio"/> Office facilities, equipment and supplies for biosafety work						
	<input type="radio"/> Telecommunication facilities (e.g. telephone, fax, e-mail)						
	<input type="radio"/> Other (specify)						
	<input type="radio"/> Access to information on available funding sources						
<i>(iv) Funding and resource management</i>	<input type="radio"/> Budgeting and financial management skills						
	<input type="radio"/> Funding support						
	<input type="radio"/> Resource mobilisation skills (including proposal writing)						
	<input type="radio"/> Resource-recovery techniques (e.g. fees for applications)						
	<input type="radio"/> Other						

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	
<i>(v) Mechanisms for follow-up, monitoring and assessment</i>	<input type="radio"/> Measures for detecting unintentional or illegal transboundary movements						
	<input type="radio"/> Mechanisms for inspections and enforcement						
	<input type="radio"/> Mechanisms for monitoring of compliance						
	<input type="radio"/> National surveillance guidelines						
	<input type="radio"/> Post-release monitoring and oversight procedures						
	<input type="radio"/> Training of customs and boarder control officers						
	<input type="radio"/> Other						
<i>B. Human resources capacity development and training</i>	<input type="radio"/> Access to academic training programmes in biosafety						
	<input type="radio"/> Access to biosafety training materials						
	<input type="radio"/> Distance learning modules						
	<input type="radio"/> National roster of biosafety experts						
	<input type="radio"/> Opportunities for staff exchange/on-the-job-training						
	<input type="radio"/> Training in biosafety legislation and practice						
	<input type="radio"/> Training workshops and short courses in scientific and technical fields relevant to biosafety						
	<input type="radio"/> Training workshops and short courses in legal, social and economic fields relevant to biosafety						
	<input type="radio"/> Other (specify)						

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	
<i>C. Risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise</i>	<input type="radio"/> Access to baseline ecological data to support risk assessments						
	<input type="radio"/> Competence to review/audit risk assessments						
	<input type="radio"/> Guidance documents on specific aspects of risk assessment						
	<input type="radio"/> Hands-on training in risk assessment						
	<input type="radio"/> Handbook on how to perform risk assessment						
	<input type="radio"/> Methodologies and protocols for generating data to support risk assessment						
	<input type="radio"/> National operational guidelines on risk assessment						
	<input type="radio"/> Networks of experts on risk assessment and risk management						
	<input type="radio"/> Reference materials and databases						
	<input type="radio"/> Research facilities for risk assessment studies						
	<input type="radio"/> Other						
<i>D. Risk management</i>	<input type="radio"/> Development of national risk management systems						
	<input type="radio"/> Development of emergency measures for unintentional LMO releases						
	<input type="radio"/> Guidance on different risk management measures						
	<input type="radio"/> Guidance on how to develop risk management plans						
	<input type="radio"/> Mechanisms for cooperation in risk management						
	<input type="radio"/> National framework/system for post-release monitoring of LMOs						
	<input type="radio"/> Tools and methodologies for environmental monitoring of LMOs						
	<input type="radio"/> Training of farmers and other users in risk-management strategies and measures						

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	
<i>E. Public awareness, participation and education in biosafety</i>	<input type="radio"/> Other (specify)						
	<input type="radio"/> Access to biosafety awareness/outreach materials						
	<input type="radio"/> Biosafety awareness and education programmes						
	<input type="radio"/> Case-studies on good practices and lessons learned in public awareness and participation						
	<input type="radio"/> Establishment of biosafety documentation units or sections in existing reference libraries						
	<input type="radio"/> Facilities for public access to information and means of access to the Biosafety Clearing-House						
	<input type="radio"/> Guidance on public awareness raising and participation methods and techniques						
	<input type="radio"/> National biosafety website						
	<input type="radio"/> Network of biosafety educators and communicators						
	<input type="radio"/> Outreach strategy and/or communication plan						
	<input type="radio"/> Risk-communication skills						
	<input type="radio"/> Surveys to assess public awareness and opinions						
	<input type="radio"/> Systems for public participation in biosafety						
	<input type="radio"/> Training in media engagement skills						
	<input type="radio"/> Training in information packaging and communication						

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other (specify) 						
<i>F. Information exchange and data management including full participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Biosafety information management system (including policy, strategies and procedures) ○ Common formats for information exchange ○ Data management standards ○ Equipment to facilitate national participation in the BCH ○ Establishment of national biosafety databases ○ Interoperability with the BCH central portal ○ National Internet-based biosafety information system ○ Non-Internet access to the BCH ○ Systems for data and information security and back-up ○ Systems for data validation and quality control ○ Tools for information gathering and analysis (e.g. software) ○ Trained staff dedicated to handle biosafety information ○ Training in the use and management of the BCH central portal 						

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	
<i>G. Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration at subregional, regional and international levels</i>	<input type="radio"/> Training in data/information management and reporting						
	<input type="radio"/> Other (specify)						
	<input type="radio"/> Access to information on available opportunities for collaboration						
	<input type="radio"/> Establishment of technical working groups						
	<input type="radio"/> Guidance on networking strategies and approaches						
	<input type="radio"/> Institutional and operational framework for collaboration						
	<input type="radio"/> Inter-institutional networks						
	<input type="radio"/> Mechanisms for information-exchange and communication						
	<input type="radio"/> Mechanisms for scientific and technical networking						
	<input type="radio"/> Mechanism for south-south cooperation						
	<input type="radio"/> Mechanisms for regional and technical cooperation						
	<input type="radio"/> Research and development cooperation opportunities						
	<input type="radio"/> Scholarly knowledge-sharing among biosafety experts						
	<input type="radio"/> Training in collaboration techniques and approaches						

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Training in negotiation skills ○ Other (specify) 						
<i>H. Access to and transfer of technology and know-how</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access to information on available technologies ○ Development and implementation of national technology transfer agreements ○ Development of a national technology road map ○ Enabling policy/regulatory framework for technology transfer ○ Establishment of technology information platforms ○ Joint technology research and development opportunities ○ National technology transfer framework and action plan ○ National system for protection of intellectual property ○ Public–private partnerships for technology development ○ Technology needs assessment ○ Other (specify) 						
<i>I. Identification of LMO shipments as required by the Protocol</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Accredited reference laboratory for LMO detection and analysis 						

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidance on validated LMO detection methods and protocols ○ Guidance on unique identification systems ○ Guidelines on appropriate sampling methods ○ National system for LMO sampling and detection ○ Reference materials on LMO sampling and detection ○ Training of personnel in LMO sampling and detection ○ Other (specify) 						
<i>J. Handling of socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding LMOs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Establishment of a system for taking into account socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding LMOs ○ Guidance on existing approaches and mechanisms for taking into account socio-economic considerations in decision-making concerning LMOs ○ Mechanisms for cooperation on research on socio-economic impacts of LMOs ○ Mechanisms for cooperation on information exchange on socio-economic impacts of LMOs ○ Methodologies for assessing socio-economic impacts of LMOs ○ Training in methods for assessing socio-economic impacts of LMOs ○ Other 						

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	
<i>K. Implementation of documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol</i>	○ Development and implementation of traceability systems						
	○ Establishment of national documentation systems for LMO shipments						
	○ Establishment of identity preservation systems						
	○ Establishment of systems (operating procedures) for inspection, verification and certification of documentation accompanying LMO shipments						
	○ Guidance on the documentation and identification requirements under the Protocol						
	○ Training of customs and boarder control officials						
	○ Training of exporters, shippers, etc on LMO identification and documentation requirements						
	○ Other (specify)						
<i>L. Handling of confidential information</i>	○ Elaboration of rules for protecting confidential information						
	○ Establishment of systems (facilities and operating procedures) for managing confidential information						
	○ Training of regulatory personnel in record keeping and information security						
	○ Other (specify)						
<i>K. Taking into account risks to human health</i>	○ Establishment of a system for taking into account risks to human health in decision-making regarding LMOs						

<i>Broad areas in which capacity is needed</i>	<i>Specific capacity priority need</i>	<i>Extent to which the need has been addressed</i>					<i>Preferred means to address the need (Select options 1-9)</i>
		<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	

- Guidance on methods for assessing risks of LMOs to human health
- Regulatory framework for addressing human health impacts of LMOs
- Other (specify)

4. Contact details:

(Name, job title/designation, organization, address, phone, fax, email, website)

5. Any other relevant information: <Text entry >

6. Attach document: <Upload copies of relevant documents, e.g. needs assessment reports prepared>

7. Notes <Text entry >

Return the completed form to:

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
 413 rue Saint-Jacques, suite 800
 Montreal, Quebec, Canada
 H2Y 1N9
 Tel.: 1 514 288-2220
 Fax: 1 514 288-6588
 Email: secretariat@cbd.int
 Website: www.cbd.int

BCH: <http://bch.cbd.int>

Annex IV

WEB-BASED REPORTING FORMAT FOR INITIATIVES CONTRIBUTING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACTION PLAN FOR BUILDING CAPACITIES FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTOCOL

A. General information	
1. Title of the activity undertaken	
2. Contact person:*	
3. Organization:	

B. General elements of the initiative	
4. Cross-cutting element of the Action Plan to which the activity is contributing	<input type="checkbox"/> Institutional capacity-building <input type="checkbox"/> Human-resources development and training <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness, participation and education at all levels <input type="checkbox"/> Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration <input type="checkbox"/> Information exchange and data management, including participation in the BCH <input type="checkbox"/> Technology transfer
5. Thematic element of the Action Plan to which the activity is contributing	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise <input type="checkbox"/> Risk management <input type="checkbox"/> Identification of LMOs, including their detection <input type="checkbox"/> Socio-economic considerations <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation of the documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol <input type="checkbox"/> Handling of confidential information <input type="checkbox"/> Measures to address unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs <input type="checkbox"/> Scientific biosafety research relating to LMOs <input type="checkbox"/> Taking into account risks to human health

6. Scope of the activity	<input type="checkbox"/> Standalone <input type="checkbox"/> Part of a larger initiative
--------------------------	---

C. Details of the initiative	
7. Location:	
8. Dates/duration:	
9. Objectives:	
10. Brief description of the activity undertaken:	
11. Specific outputs/ outcomes:	
12. Resource inputs/ Cost (US\$):	
13. Remarks (e.g. bottlenecks, lessons learned, etc):	
14. Link to the full activity report:	<URL and website name> <Attachment>*

D. Additional information	
15. Any other relevant information:	<i>and/or</i> <URL and website name> <i>and/or</i> <Attachment>
16. Notes:	

REPORT OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE LIAISON GROUP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR BIOSAFETY^{2/}

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The seventh meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety was held in Siem Reap, Cambodia, on 4-5 February 2010. It was attended by 21 participants from 15 countries and four organizations.
2. The countries represented were: Austria, Cambodia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Egypt, Germany, India, Liberia, Mexico, Moldova, Namibia, Norway, Serbia, and Viet Nam.
3. The organizations represented were: ECOROPA, Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), United Nations Environment Programme-Global Environment Facility (UNEP/GEF) and Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina.
4. The full list of participants is contained in annex II to this report.

II. PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

5. The meeting was opened by Mr. Charles Gbedemah on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Mr. Gbedemah welcomed the participants and thanked the Government of Cambodia for hosting the meeting. Mr. Gbedemah noted that the fourth meeting of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to develop a sound methodological approach to contribute to the second assessment and review of the Protocol and also prepare a draft strategic plan for the Protocol and a draft programme of work on public awareness, education and participation on the basis of submissions by Parties and relevant organizations. The drafts would be considered at the fifth meeting of the Parties. He expressed hope that the Liaison Group would critically review and provide concrete comments on the drafts prepared by the Secretariat.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

6. After the opening session, the participants elected Mr. Jan Husby (Norway) to serve as Chair and Ms. Martha Kandawa-Schulz (Namibia) as Rapporteur.

7. The meeting then adopted following the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/7/1) 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;
 - 2.3. Organization of work.
3. Issues for in-depth consideration:
 - 3.1. Review of:

^{2/} This report has also been published as document UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/7/2.

- (a) The draft Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; and
 - (b) The draft proposed framework for the second assessment and review of the Protocol;
- 3.2 Consideration of the need to improve or retire some of the capacity-building guidance, tools and mechanisms adopted in previous decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol;
- 3.3 Review of the draft programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms.
4. Other matters.
5. Conclusions and recommendations.
6. Closure of the meeting.

8. The participants also adopted organization of work for the meeting, as contained in annex I to this report, based on the suggestions made by the Executive Secretary in the annotations (UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/7/1/Add.1). Due to time constraints, the participants agreed to focus on items 3.1 and 3.3 and defer agenda item 3.2 to the next meeting.

ITEM 3. ISSUES FOR IN-DEPTH CONSIDERATION

3.1. Review of: (a) the draft Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; and (b) the draft proposed framework for the second assessment and review of the Protocol

9. Under agenda item 3.1 (a), participants reviewed the draft Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety which was prepared by the Executive Secretary on the basis of the submissions from Parties and elements derived from the report of the evaluation of the Protocol, the first national reports and decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

10. After a brief general discussion in the plenary on the first day, three discussion groups were established to consider and propose specific changes to the operational objectives, outcomes and indicators under the five strategic objectives. The proposals from the three groups were then presented and discussed in the plenary session on the second day. The proposed changes were incorporated into the revised draft Strategic Plan for the Protocol contained in the advance pre-session document for the fifth meeting of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/5/16).

11. Under sub-item 3.1 (b), participants reviewed the draft proposed framework for the second assessment and review of the Protocol. They noted that the proposed framework would impose tight timelines on Parties and on the Secretariat or another entity that might be charged with compiling and analysing relevant evaluation data from the second national reports for the second assessment and review of the Protocol by the Parties at their sixth meeting, in 2012. The participants also reviewed the indicators that might be utilized as the basis for the evaluation of the assessment and made recommendations for their improvement. The proposed changes were incorporated in the advance pre-session document for the fifth meeting of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/5/15).

3.3. *Review of the draft programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms*

12. Under agenda item 3.3, the participants reviewed draft programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms that was prepared by the Secretariat. Three discussion groups were established to consider and propose changes to the operational objectives, expected outcomes, suggested activities, timelines and the responsible actors under the three programme elements on public awareness and education, public access to information and public participation, respectively. The cross-cutting programme element on "capacity-building for the promotion of public awareness, education and participation" was taken up in the plenary.

13. It was recommended that the programme of work should include indicators which would be used to monitor progress with its implementation. The proposals from the three groups were then presented and discussed in the plenary session on the second day. The proposed changes were directly incorporated into the advance pre-session document for the fifth meeting of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/5/13).

ITEM 4. OTHER MATTERS

14. There were no other matters raised.

ITEM 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

15. The Liaison Group agreed on following conclusions and recommendations:

Draft Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

(a) The Executive Secretary was invited to consider the specific proposed changes to the draft operational objectives, outcomes and indicators when preparing the final draft strategic plan for consideration by the fifth meeting of the Parties.

Proposed framework for the second assessment and review of the Protocol

(b) In view of the tight timelines that the proposed framework will impose on Parties in terms of submission of their second national reports and on the Secretariat or another entity that might be charged with compiling and analysing relevant evaluation data from those reports for the second assessment and review of the Protocol by the Parties at their sixth meeting, in 2012, it was recommended that the Bureau takes into account the proposed timing when scheduling the dates for the sixth meeting of the Parties.

Review of the draft programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms

(c) The Executive Secretary was invited to consider incorporating the specific changes proposed by the Liaison Group into the final draft programme of work on public awareness, education and participation to be submitted for consideration by the fifth meeting of the Parties.

(d) It was recommended that the Executive Secretary ensures coherence and consistency between the aspects on public awareness, education and participation in the draft Strategic Plan of the Protocol and the content in the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms.

ITEM 6. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

16. At the last session of the meeting, the participants reviewed and adopted the draft report of the meeting covering the proceedings of the first day and part of the last day. The Secretariat was requested to incorporate the proceedings of the last day and send the draft report to all participants for comments before posting it on the Protocol website.

17. The meeting was closed on Friday, 5 February 2010 at 5.15 p.m.

*Annex I***ORGANIZATION OF WORK**

	<i>Plenary</i>
<i>Thursday</i> <i>4 February 2010</i> 9 a.m. to 9.30 a.m.	<i>Agenda item:</i> 1. Opening of the meeting.
9.30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i> 2. Organizational matters: 2.4. Election of officers 2.5. Adoption of the agenda; 2.6. Organization of work.
10 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i> 3. Issues for in-depth consideration: 3.4 Review of the: (a) Draft Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; (b) Draft framework for the second assessment and review of the Protocol.
2.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m.	Agenda item 3.1 (<i>continued</i>)
<i>Friday</i> <i>5 February 2010</i> 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i> 3.5 Consideration of the need to improve or retire some of the capacity-building guidance, tools and mechanisms adopted in previous decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. 3.6 Review of the draft programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms.
2 p.m. to 5 p.m.	<i>Agenda items:</i> 4. Other matters 5. Conclusions and recommendations 6. Closure of the meeting
