



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/4
2 August 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

STATUS OF CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In its decision BS-I/5, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Protocol (COP-MOP) adopted an Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol to guide the capacity-building efforts and established a Coordination Mechanism for the implementation of the Action Plan. In decision BS-III/3, it adopted an updated version of the Action Plan and decided that a comprehensive review of the Action Plan would be conducted every five years, based on an independent evaluation of the initiatives undertaken in support of its implementation. In section 6 of the updated Action Plan (entitled "Monitoring and coordination"), the Executive Secretary is requested to prepare and submit to the regular meetings of the Parties, reports on the steps taken towards the implementation of the Action Plan so as to assess whether the actions listed are being carried out successfully and effectively.

2. In paragraph 4 of decision BS-IV/3, Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations were invited to provide information on their capacity-building activities to the Secretariat and the Biosafety Clearing-House at least six months prior to its regular meetings in order to facilitate comprehensive reporting on the implementation of the Action Plan and promote the sharing of experiences and lessons learned. In paragraph 6 of that decision, the Parties welcomed the offer by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to undertake, in collaboration with the Global Environment Facility (GEF), its agencies and the Executive Secretary, an expert review of capacity-building activities with a view to assessing the effectiveness of various approaches to capacity-building and developing lessons learned.

3. Furthermore, in their decisions BS-I/5 (paragraphs 6 and 7), BS-II/3 (paragraphs 8 and 15) and BS-IV/3 (paragraph 7), the Parties invited Parties and other Governments to submit their

* UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/1.

capacity-building and training needs to the Secretariat and the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH). In paragraph 16 of decision BS-I/5 and paragraph 12 of decision BS-IV/3, the Executive Secretary was requested to compile, on the basis of the information submitted, summary reports on the needs and priorities for the consideration of the Parties at their regular meetings, make them available to donor Governments and through the Biosafety Clearing-House.

4. Pursuant to the above decisions, section II of this note presents a summary report on the status of implementation of the Action Plan. Section III provides a summary report on the training and capacity-building needs of Parties and other Governments based on the submissions made to the Secretariat and the Biosafety Clearing-House. Section IV summarises outcomes of the expert review on the effectiveness of various approaches to capacity-building and the lessons learned, commissioned by UNEP in response to paragraph 6 of decision BS-IV/3. Section V introduces the proposed terms of reference for the comprehensive review of the updated Action Plan, details of which are annexed to the note. Section VI conveys the recommendations of the sixth “Coordination Meeting for Governments and Organizations Implementing or Funding Biosafety Capacity-Building Activities” regarding the possibilities for cooperation in identifying needs for capacity building among Parties for research and information exchange on socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms in response to paragraph 3 of decision BS-IV/16. The last section proposes elements of a possible decision on capacity-building.

5. The meeting of the Parties to the Protocol is invited to consider the information provided in this note and provide further guidance to facilitate the implementation of the Action Plan and to address the needs and priorities of developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition.

II. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTION PLAN

6. This section presents a summary report of the activities undertaken since the last meeting of the Parties in support of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol. The report draws on the information submitted to the Secretariat and to the Biosafety Clearing-House in response to paragraph 4 of decision BS-IV/3, using the reporting format that was developed by the Secretariat. It also draws from the information that was made available during the fifth and sixth coordination meetings for governments and organizations implementing or funding biosafety capacity-building activities, held 9-11 March 2009 in San José, Costa Rica and 1-3 February 2010 in Siem Reap, Cambodia. A compilation of all the submissions are made available in information document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/INF/8.

A. Overview of Capacity-building activities undertaken by Parties and other Governments

7. In response to the request in paragraph 4 of decision BS-IV/3, the following Parties and other Governments made submissions regarding their biosafety capacity-building activities: Cambodia, Croatia, Cuba, European Union and its member States, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Norway, Republic of Korea and South Africa.

8. The Government of Cambodia reported that it continued to implement the UNEP-GEF funded project on Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework. Through the project, it put in place a sub-decree on LMO management, developed application forms for LMO releases, trained administrative and technical staff on legal and technical matters, strengthened the capacity for implementation of its National Law on Biosafety, prepared a draft biosafety curriculum for secondary schools and a training manual, put in place guidelines risk assessment and risk management (in Khmer and English); and refurbished an existing laboratory for monitoring and identification of LMOs. It also strengthened communication and information exchange relating to biosafety, including seminars, biosafety debate on national television and radio.

9. The Government of Croatia reported that it conducted six workshops under the UNEP-GEF BCH project; one regional workshop on risk assessment (9-10 February 2009) and the EU-TAIEX workshop referred to in paragraph 11 below. A national biosafety portal in Croatian and English was also set up to serve as a national node of the BCH. A study tour to the Agricultural Institute of Slovenia was organised from 4 to 14 August 2009 as part of the FAO Project on "Capacity building of regulatory agencies for handling and monitoring GM crops, products and processed food" to enable experts learn "Advanced Methods and Technologies used for Detection and Quantification of GM in Seed, Food and Feed".

10. The Government of Cuba continued to support a training course on biosafety which includes lectures on biosafety regulatory frameworks, methodologies for risk assessment and risk management and field monitoring as well as practical laboratory sessions and visits to field trials. The government also developed a new UNEP/GEF project entitled "Completion and Strengthening of the Cuban National Biosafety framework for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol". The project aims to reinforce the National Coordination Mechanism with emphasis on setting norms and standards and harmonizing biosafety regulations and decision-making processes, develop a framework for the import and export of LMOs, implement a system for human resources training in biosafety and augment the scientific, technological and infrastructural capacities of National Competent Authorities. It also developed another project for designing and implementing a post-release monitoring system of LMOs.

11. The European Union and its member States cooperated in the development and strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety in developing country Parties as well as in Parties with economies in transition. During the reporting period, the European Union supported the following activities: (i) the regional training of trainers' workshop on identification and documentation of LMOs in Africa, which was organized by the Secretariat in collaboration with the Green Customs Initiative from 14-18 September 2009 in Bamako, Mali as part of the wider implementation of documentation requirements agreed under the Protocol; (ii) the TAIEX workshop on "Handling applications for release of GMOs into the environment and placing GMOs on the market" held 12-13 November 2009 in Zagreb, and (iii) the "Co-Extra" (GM and non GM supply chains: their CO-EXistence and TRAceability) project (2005-2009) aimed at developing tools and methodologies for tracing genetically modified materials along the food and feed chains and facilitating the coexistence of genetically modified, non genetically modified (conventional and organic) crops. The project involved 52 partners in 18 countries, including participants from Argentina, Brazil and Russia.

12. The Joint Research Center (JRC) of the European Union continued to undertake a number of activities including: training courses on the analysis of food and feed samples for the presence of genetically modified organisms (e.g. the TAIEX Workshop on "Harmonization on GMO Detection and Analysis" held in Istanbul from 27 to 28 April 2009); development of a manual, in collaboration with the World Health Organization (WHO) to assist laboratory personnel to become accustomed with GMO detection and quantification techniques; organization of the first "Global Conference on GMO Analysis" in Como, Italy, from 24 to 27 June 2008 which was attended by more than 600 participants from over 70 countries; and the development, validation and harmonisation of GMO detection methods and sampling procedures within the European Union. A report on the latest state of art in sampling and detection methods is available online through the BCH (Record 43770).

13. The Government of Austria funded a two-day workshop on risk assessment of GMOs with regard to field trials and commercial use, which was organized in co-operation with the Croatian Ministry of Culture. At least 40 participants from Croatia, Macedonia and Serbia attended. In November 2009 Austria also co-financed a training workshop for the Malaysian Biosafety Committee in risk assessment which focused on testing the draft roadmap developed by the Ad Hoc Technical and Expert Group on Risk Assessment under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. It also supported a five-day training workshop for Malaysian laboratory staff in quantitative PCR techniques for LMO detection.

14. The Government of the Czech Republic implemented various activities under the UNEP-GEF National Biosafety Framework Implementation project (2006–2010) with focus on building a functional policy and regulatory regime, strengthening the administrative system for handling requests for permits, developing guidelines for risk assessment, setting up systems for monitoring of environmental effects of LMOs, improving systems for enforcement of compliance with biosafety regulations and establishing systems for public access to information, education and participation in decision-making.

15. The German Government continued to support the biosafety projects initiated in 2003 within the programme “Implementing the Biodiversity Convention”. These include: the Biosafety Capacity-Building Project in China: Data Management, Promoting Expertise and Awareness Raising (to run until the end of 2011); support to the Burkinabe NGO Association pour la Recherche et la Formation en Agro-écologie (ARFA), the Swiss Réseau Interdisciplinaire Biosécurité (RIBios) national discussion process towards the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol; and the African Union regional project on biosafety (2005-2010), which has supported the establishment of Biosafety Unit at the AU Commission, development of an African strategy for long-term capacity-building in biosafety, revision of the African model biosafety law and organization of regional workshops.

16. The Government of Italy, through the Ministry of the Environment, has provided funding to Marche Polytechnic University in Ancona to conduct biosafety courses since 2008, as part of the UNIDO e-Biosafety Training Programme and to the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB) to conduct two training workshops held in Cà Tron di Roncade, Italy: (i) “Introduction to Biosafety for the Environmental Release of GM Crops: Evaluation of Scientific data and Risk Assessment Dossier” (May 2008); and (ii) “Theoretical Approach and their Practical Application in the Risk Assessment for the Deliberate Release of genetically modified plants” (October 2009).

17. The Netherlands Government provided support to the Southern Africa Biosafety and Environment Programme implemented by the Regional Agriculture and Environment Initiative Network (RAEIN-Africa). The programme activities include stakeholder awareness-raising, capacity-building for risk assessment and risk management, policy development support and generation of research data. The Netherlands also contributed to activities of RAEIN-Africa in the field of socio-economic considerations in the region. It also supported the Africa Technology Policies Studies Network (ATPS) biotechnology project in sub-Saharan Africa and the programme for smallholder biotechnology development in Andhra Pradesh (India) and the Andean region aimed at developing enabling policies for biotechnology, including intellectual property rights and biosafety.

18. The Government of Spain supported a one-week training of trainers’ course on biotechnological strategies in agroforestry in Santa Cruz de la Sierra (Bolivia) in November 2008, which covered various biosafety topics including: surveillance, control and monitoring plans for genetically modified organisms; and coexistence and risk assessment. It also supported the Latin America and the Caribbean regional training of trainers on the identification and documentation of living modified organisms, which was organised by the Secretariat from 23-27 November 2009 at the National Autonomous University of Mexico in Mexico City, Mexico.

19. The Government of Sweden, through the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), continued to fund the Eastern African Regional Program and Research Network for Biotechnology, Biosafety and Biotechnology Policy Development (BIO-EARN). The third phase of the programme (2006-2009) supported research by scholars that were trained during the first and second phases. During 2010-2014, Sida will support a new programme entitled “Bio-resources Innovations Network for Eastern Africa Development (Bio-Innovate)”, worth approximately US\$ 10.7 million.

20. The Government of the United Kingdom provided funds for a UNEP-GEF Biosafety study on national experiences with the integration of socio-economic considerations in biosafety decision-making

processes. A survey on the application of and experience in the use of socio-economic considerations in decision-making on living modified organisms was conducted using a questionnaire developed by a panel of experts. This survey was commissioned in October 2009 by the GEF Coordination Division of the United Nations Environment Programme, in collaboration with the Secretariat. A summary report of the survey has been made available as information document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/INF/10. Also under this initiative, an annotated bibliography of literature related to socioeconomic considerations in biosafety was assembled and made available through the Biosafety Clearing-House.

21. The Government of Japan sponsored the third International Meeting of Academic Institutions and Organizations Involved in Biosafety Education and Training held 15-17 February 2010 at Tsukuba University. A total of 44 participants from 23 countries and four international organizations attended.

22. The Government of Malaysia adopted its Biosafety Act and established a Core Group on Biosafety to coordinate the implementation of the Act. Regulations to guide the implementation of the Act and the Standard Operating procedures have been drafted. Furthermore, several awareness seminars and training workshops on various topics, including risk assessment and detection of LMOs have been conducted, with support from the UNDP-GEF biosafety project.

23. The Government of Mexico implemented courses for government officials on DNA quantification and identification technologies as well as hands-on training on DNA extraction, amplification and quantification. It also created a network on LMO monitoring which includes detection laboratories at the national level. A significant amount of resources was directed at monitoring activities and inspection. Mexico also offered training and technical assistance to other countries in Latin America.

24. The Government of Norway through the GenØk – Centre for Biosafety organized a 5-day specialist course (17-21 August 2009) and a 3-day open conference on biosafety (23-26 August 2009) in Tromsø, Norway. It also organised two regional courses in Africa at Bloemfontein, South Africa (28 June 2009 to 3 July 2009) and in Latin America at the Federal University of Santa Catarina in Florianópolis, Brazil (26 April to 1 May 2010). GenØk and the University of Tromsø also offered a web-based masters module in biosafety in the spring of 2008. The Government also continued to support the Gateways Institutes Program (GIP) implemented by GenØk and the Centre for Integrated Research in Biosafety based in New Zealand. As part of the GIP, NORAD supported a research program between GenØk, the National Institute for Scientific and Industrial Research (NISIR) of Zambia and the Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences and the State Environmental Protection Administration (NIES/SEPA) of China.

25. The Government of the Republic of Korea organized and sponsored a subregional workshop for enhancing capacity in the use of the Biosafety Clearing-House from 10 to 14 December 2008 at the Korea Research Institute of Bioscience and Biotechnology in Daejeon. Eleven countries in the Asian region (Cambodia, China, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Kiribati, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Tonga and Viet Nam) and four from other regions (Estonia, Jamaica, Nigeria and Peru) participated in the workshop.

26. The Government of South Africa, with support from the Norwegian Government, continued to implement an Environmental Biosafety Cooperation Project to improve local capacity for conducting research, monitoring and assessments on the environmental impacts of GMOs used in agriculture. The project also aims at the improving biosafety management and research, focusing on post-release monitoring research of GM maize in terms of gene flow, impacts on target and non target insects as well as the microbial soil rhizosphere. As part of the project, a workshop was held to establish a frame work for post-release monitoring of LMOs in South Africa from 4-7 November 2008.

B. Capacity-building activities undertaken by relevant international organizations

27. The following organizations made submissions regarding their biosafety capacity-building activities: African Union, ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB), Asia-Pacific Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology (APCoAB), BiosafeTrain project, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB), International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Regional Agricultural and Environment Initiatives Network–Africa (RAEIN-Africa) and United Nations Environment Programme-Global Environment Facility (UNEP-GEF) and the World Bank.

28. The African Union (AU) continued to implement the project on capacity building for an Africa-wide biosafety system with support from German Technical Cooperation (GTZ).¹ During the reporting period, the AU organized regional biosafety workshops in Tripoli, Libya (27-29 October 2008), Eastern and Southern Africa (Arusha, Tanzania (6-8 May 2009) and Western Africa in Abuja, Nigeria (9-11 June 2009). It also supported AU member States in international negotiations, including the meeting of the Friends of the Co-Chairs on Liability and Redress. Furthermore a website and database of African biosafety experts were established to facilitate continuous exchange of information and expertise. In addition, the AU commissioned research papers on: “Public Participation in African Biosafety Regulations and Policies” and “GMO Detection and Commodity Flow in Africa”.

29. The ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB) organised a Workshop on risk assessment of LMOs and enforcement of biosafety from 22-24 June 2008 in Cambodia. Over 40 participants from the ASEAN member countries attended. It also organised a regional workshop on biosafety capacity-building activities from 19-22 November 2008 in Viet Nam. The workshop, attended by 50 participants, focused on risk assessment, risk management, monitoring and enforcement of GMOs and related products and development of ASEAN Guidelines for managing LMOs. The ACB also initiated a process to revise the ASEAN Regional Guidelines for Risk Assessment of LMOs.

30. During its second phase, the BiosafeTrain project (December 2007 to November 2010), funded by the Danish International Development Agency (Danida), continued to support capacity-building in biosafety and ecological risk assessment in East Africa. During the reporting period, a GMO detection laboratory was set up at the University of Nairobi and an insect-proof biosafety glasshouse was installed at the Kenya Agriculture Research Institute (KARI) and at the University of Dar-es-Salaam. There were also 13 MSc and six PhD fellowships offered to students to carry out biosafety research projects at local universities with joint supervision by professors from Danish and Eastern Africa Universities. The project also supported short-term training courses, including the biosafety course held 18-30 August 2009 at the University of Dar-es-Salaam and the training workshop on “Introduction to GMO Biosafety Risk Assessment” held 19-23 October 2009 at Makerere University in Uganda.

31. The FAO continued to support various biosafety capacity-building activities. During the reporting period, it organised a biosafety training course in Gazipur, Bangladesh (21-30 November 2008) and produced a book entitled “Biosafety of genetically modified organisms: Basic concepts, methods and issues”, comprising the proceedings of the course. In 2009, it also published a training package entitled “GM food safety assessment: Tools for trainers” and a report on “The status of agricultural biotechnology and biosafety in Belarus”. In January 2010, it released a report entitled: “Building Biosafety Capacities: FAO’s Experience and Outlook”, which provides an overview of the biosafety capacity-building projects undertaken since 2002.² The report notes that FAO has supported at least 26

¹ See details at: http://www.africa-union.org/root/au/AUC/Departments/HRST/biosafety/AU_Biosafety.htm

² See the report entitled “Building Biosafety Capacities: FAO’s Experience and Outlook”, accessible at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i1033e/i1033e.pdf>.

biosafety projects with total funding of approximately US\$ 7.5 million to date. These included 18 national projects, four subregional projects and two global projects.³ The activities of the national projects included: development and/or implementation of biosafety policies and regulatory frameworks, training in risk assessment and GMO detection and monitoring, upgrading of infrastructure and improvement of public awareness and participation. The regional projects promoted the sharing of information and experience, facilitated harmonization of tools and procedures for handling GMOs; and delivered issue-specific training. The global projects involved development of training materials and training-of-trainers programmes in GMO detection and monitoring and GM food safety assessment.

32. The Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) continued to implement the Hemispheric Biotechnology and Biosafety Program. In 2009, it developed a Communication Strategy on Biotechnology and Biosafety to guide the dissemination and communication of science-based information. It also developed and published two technical documents on risk assessment of LMOs which will serve as reference materials for training workshops. During the reporting period, IICA also organized preparatory meetings for Latin America and the Caribbean countries prior to the negotiations under the Protocol, including the meeting of the Friends of the Co-Chairs on Liability and Redress.

33. The International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB) initiated, in June 2008, a new US \$3 million Biosafety Capacity-Building Project in Sub Saharan Africa (2008-2011), funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. As part of the project, ICGEB organised two workshops, i.e. the GMO Biosafety Risk Assessment Training Workshop at Makerere University Kampala, Uganda (19-23 October 2009) and the workshop on "Theoretical Approaches and their Practical Applications in the Risk Assessment for the Deliberate Release of Genetically Modified Plants" at Hermanus, South Africa (22-26 March 2010). It also awarded five fellowships for a one-year Master of Science course on Risk Assessment of GM Crops at Aberystwyth University and supported participation of scientists and regulators in regional and international biosafety conferences. ICGEB also organized its regular biosafety training workshops, including those referred to in paragraph 16 above, and maintained its Biosafety Bibliographic Database (Bibliosafety) and other biosafety resources and services.⁴

34. The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) continued to implement the second phase of the Program for Biosafety Systems (2008-2013) funded by the United States Agency for International Development.⁵ During the reporting period, the PBS supported a number of activities including: facilitation of national policy development in Malawi, Ghana and Uganda; review of draft biosafety laws and regulations; organization of regional policy seminars in the East African Community; and support for regional policy research projects on socio-economic assessments and likely trade implications of planting GM crops in East and Southern Africa. It also published various discussion papers and policy briefs; organized training of trainers (ToT) courses; and supported risk assessment research in Asia and Africa through the Biotechnology-Biodiversity Interface (BBI) grants facility. It also co-organised a meeting on 29-30 September 2009 in Nairobi to disseminate the results of the collaborative research projects on risk assessment of crop-wild gene flow in Africa.⁶

³ The country projects were: in Africa (Benin, Kenya, Swaziland, Uganda and Tanzania), Asia (Bangladesh, Malaysia and Sri Lanka), Eastern Europe (Croatia) and in Latin America and the Caribbean (Argentina, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Grenada, Nicaragua, Paraguay). The subregional projects were for: Central Asia (Asia Bionet), Eastern Europe (Armenia, Georgia and Moldova), Near East and North Africa/NENA (Jordan, Lebanon, Sudan, Syria, United Arab Emirates and Yemen); and Latin America/MERCOSUR Ampliado (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay).

⁴ Details about ICGEB biosafety activities available at: <http://www.icgeb.org/~bsafesrv/>

⁵ The programme is implemented in Africa (Nigeria, Kenya, Uganda, Malawi, and Mozambique) and Asia (the Philippines, Indonesia and Viet Nam).

⁶ Further information about PBS is available at: <http://programs.ifpri.org/pbs/pbs.asp>

35. The Regional Agricultural and Environment Initiatives Network–Africa (RAEIN-Africa), through its Southern Africa Biosafety and Environment Programme, organised a workshop on “GMO Detection: Current Capacities, Needs & Gaps in Southern Africa” in Harare (24-26 November 2009); launched the Southern Africa Network for GM Detection laboratories (SANGL); and organised the “Biosafety Socio-economic Risk Assessment training workshop” at the University of Pretoria in South Africa (15-18 February 2010).

36. The United Nations Environment Programme-Global Environment Facility (UNEP-GEF) continued to assist a number of countries to execute their GEF-funded National Biosafety Framework implementation projects.⁷ It also assisting an additional 30 countries to prepare their National Biosafety Framework implementation project documents for GEF funding. Furthermore, UNEP-GEF supported development of the Phase II of the Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH.

37. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) continued to coordinate and support the e-biosafety training programme in collaboration with partners in different regions, including the Marche Polytechnic University (Ancona, Italy), the Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais (Belo Horizonte, Brazil) and Ghent University (Ghent, Belgium). The programme includes international academically accredited courses, at Masters and diploma levels, based on a combination of distance-learning and on-campus training sessions.

38. The World Bank-GEF continued to support two regional biosafety capacity-building projects, i.e. the Latin American Multi-country Capacity-building for Compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the West African Regional Biosafety Project which assisted eight countries to develop regionally-harmonized methodologies (guidelines, technical documents, forms, and checklists) for risk assessment and risk management of LMOs; implement national biosafety regulatory frameworks; and strengthen national capacity for decision-making regarding LMOs.

C. Capacity-building activities undertaken by the Secretariat

39. The Secretariat implemented various activities in support of capacity-building for the effective implementation of the Protocol. As mentioned in paragraphs 11 and 18, the Secretariat organised two regional training of trainers on the identification and documentation of living modified organisms for Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean. It also facilitated the Malaysian National Workshop on Identification and Documentation of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety from 25 to 29 January 2010 in Kuala Lumpur.

40. Pursuant to paragraphs 12-15 of decision BS-IV/11, the Secretariat organized the Pacific subregional workshop on capacity-building and exchange of experiences on risk assessment and risk management of living modified organisms in Nadi, Fiji (5-7 July 2010) and the Asian training course on risk assessment of living modified organisms in Siem Reap, Cambodia (12-16 July 2010).

41. Furthermore, the Secretariat organised through the BCH two online conferences on "capacity-building in environmental risk assessment and post-release monitoring of living modified organisms" (3-28 November 2008) and on capacity-building for the integration of biosafety into national development plans, strategies and programmes (19 January to 6 February 2009).

42. The Secretariat also organised the fifth coordination meeting for Governments and organizations implementing or funding biosafety capacity-building activities (12 to 13 March 2009) and the sixth

⁷ These included: Albania, Bhutan, Cambodia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Guatemala, Lao PDR, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mauritius, Moldova, Slovakia, Tanzania, Tunisia, and Viet Nam

meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety in San José, Costa Rica. It also organised the sixth coordination meeting (1-3 February 2010) and the seventh Liaison Group meeting (4-5 February 2010) in Siem Reap, Cambodia. Furthermore, it organised the “Third International Meeting of Academic Institutions and Organizations Involved in Biosafety Education and Training” held 15-17 February 2010 in Tsukuba, Japan. The reports of these meetings have been made available in information documents: UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/5/INF/3, UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/5/INF/4 and UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/5/INF/7. The Secretariat also continued to improve, populate and maintain the capacity-building databases and the Biosafety Information Resource Centre in the Biosafety Clearing-House.

43. Furthermore, the Secretariat continued to collaborate with the Green Customs Initiative to strengthen the capacities of customs officers to detect and control the illegal trade of living modified organisms and to contribute to the enforcement of the requirements for documentation and identification of living modified organisms under Article 18 of the Protocol. During the reporting period, it mobilised resource persons to make presentations on the Protocol at the Green Customs workshops held in: Ulaan Bator, Mongolia (28-29 April 2009); New Delhi, India (25-29 May 2009); Mombasa, Kenya (7-10 July 2009); Lagos, Nigeria (29-31 July 2009); Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic (24-27 November 2009) and Beirut, Lebanon (13-15 April 2010).

44. The above summary report, while not conveying the complete picture of the current status, shows that progress was made towards implementation of most of the elements of the Action Plan. According to the information in the BCH capacity-building database, a large number of activities reported as of 30 June 2010 (including projects, short-term opportunities and training courses) have contributed to: institutional capacity-building (146 activities); human resources development (154); risk assessment (119); public awareness, education and participation (119); scientific, technical and institutional cooperation (113); information exchange and data management (112); and risk management (68).

45. Relatively fewer activities were directed towards: technology transfer (47), identification of LMOs, including their detection (34); socio-economic considerations (34); scientific biosafety research relating to LMOs (21); and taking into account risks of LMOs to human health (15). The least supported elements were: handling of confidential information (6); measures to address unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (5); and implementation of the documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol (4 activities).

46. The meeting of the Parties to the Protocol may wish to take note of the above status report and urge Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to enhance their capacity-building efforts, particularly with respect to the elements of the Action Plan that have experienced limited activity.

III. SUMMARY REPORT ON THE TRAINING AND CAPACITY-BUILDING NEEDS OF PARTIES AND OTHER GOVERNMENTS

47. In decisions BS-I/5 (paragraphs 6 and 7), BS-II/3 (paragraphs 8 and 15) and BS-IV/3 (paragraph 7), Parties and other Governments were invited to submit their training and capacity-building needs to the Secretariat and the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) and in decisions BS-I/5 (paragraph 16) and BS-IV (paragraph 12), the Executive Secretary was requested to compile, on the basis of the information submitted, a summary report on the identified needs and priorities.

48. In order to assist governments to submit the above information, the Secretariat, with advice from the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety, developed a revised integrated “Capacity-Building Needs Assessment” questionnaire/common format which was sent to all Cartagena Protocol and BCH National Focal Points for completion online through the BCH. In completing the questionnaire, countries identified the broad areas (based on the Action Plan elements) where they lacked capacity. Within each broad area, the countries specified priority needs and the extent to which the identified

needs had been addressed (i.e. not addressed, minimally addressed, partially address or largely/adequately addressed). The respondent countries also indicated their preferred means for addressing the needs identified (e.g. funding, training, guidance materials or technical advice). As of 30 June 2010, the following 15 countries had responded: Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Saint Lucia, Togo, and Venezuela.

49. The following report summarises the training and capacity-building needs of Parties and other Governments based on the above submissions and also drawing from the information contained in the first national reports and the national biosafety frameworks. In their first national reports, the following countries identified some of their capacity-building needs and the obstacles/impediments encountered in implementing Article 22 of the Protocol: Barbados, Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, India, Kenya, Panama, Qatar, Syria, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania.

50. It may be noted that the report is based on information that was gathered through a simple questionnaire-based self-assessment and not an elaborate statistical survey involving field interviews. It may further be noted that the results presented below comprise a small sample of self-selected countries and therefore only provide a general indication of the capacity-building needs.

51. According to the responses to the questionnaire in the BCH, there is a need for capacity-building in all the broad elements of the Action Plan although the needs vary from country to country. Most countries (13 out of 15 countries or 87 percent) indicated that capacity is needed in the following broad areas (Action Plan elements): risk assessment; risk management and scientific, technical and institutional collaboration.

52. A large number of countries also identified the following broad areas: socio-economic considerations (12 countries or 80 percent); identification of LMOs, including their detection (11); scientific biosafety research relating to LMOs (11), institutional capacity-building (11), human resources capacity development and training (11), public awareness, participation and education (11); information exchange and data management including participation in the BCH (11); taking into account risks to human health (10); implementation of the documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol (9); technology transfer (9) and measures to address unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (8). Relatively fewer countries (6 or 40 percent) mentioned the need for capacity-building in handling of confidential information.

53. In terms of the specific needs, a majority of countries (12 out of 15 countries or 80 percent) identified training in risk assessment as their main priority. A large number of countries (7 or about 48 percent) also identified the following specific needs: training in risk management, tools/methodologies for environmental monitoring of LMOs, biosafety research, guidance on unique identification systems, and guidance on taking into account socio-economic considerations in decision-making concerning LMOs.

54. Six countries (or approximately 40 percent) identified the following needs: simple/quick LMO test kits, mechanisms for cooperation on research on socio-economic impacts of LMOs, training in socio-economic considerations relating to LMOs, systems for taking into account socio-economic considerations in decision-making regarding LMOs, systems for managing and protecting confidential information, and development of national liability and redress regimes.

55. Many countries (about 34 percent) also indicated that training is needed in biosafety regulatory systems, documentation and identification requirements for LMO shipments, sampling and detection of LMOs and training in legal, social and economic fields relevant to biosafety. The following needs were

also identified: establishment of systems for post-release monitoring of LMOs, systems for decision-making regarding LMOs (including procedures and guidelines), systems/strategies for risk management and facilities for biosafety research (e.g. greenhouses).

56. Other specific needs identified by more than 30 percent of the countries that responded to the questionnaire, include: systems for inspection/verification of documentation accompanying LMO shipments; systems for management of records related to LMO import applications and decisions; systems for detecting and responding to unintentional LMO releases; systems for tracking and dealing with unintentional or illegal transboundary movements; systems for public participation in biosafety; systems for resource-recovery (e.g. collection of fees on applications), training resource mobilisation skills (including project proposal writing), training in biosafety record keeping and information security, guidance on assessment risks of LMOs to human health and development of LMO traceability systems.

(a) The following needs were also mentioned by relatively fewer countries (less 20 percent): Access to information, including ecological data to support risk assessments, information on existing technologies relevant for biosafety, information on available funding sources and information on available awareness materials; Guidance on specific aspects of risk assessment; Administrative Systems and procedures for decision-making and customs and border control procedures; and Mechanisms for coordination among national regulatory authorities and processes and mainstreaming of biosafety into other sectors. Other needs identified included: systems for post-release monitoring of LMOs; systems detection and prevention of unintentional and illegal releases and movements of LMOs; emergency response mechanisms; and systems for addressing impacts of LMOs on human health. A number countries also identified the need for equipment (hardware and software) for participation in the BCH, internet connectivity, interoperability with the BCH central portal and facilities for public access to the BCH; and establishment of national biosafety websites and databases. Others highlighted the need for enabling policy/regulatory framework and an action plan for technology transfer.

57. In terms of training needs, many countries specifically identified the need for training in: risk assessment (12 countries); risk management (7); socio-economic considerations relating to LMOs (6); sampling and detection of LMOs (5); documentation and identification requirements for LMO shipments (5); and training in legal, social and economic fields relevant to biosafety, including biosafety regulatory issues (5). Others identified the need for training in: scientific and technical fields relevant to biosafety (4); post-release monitoring of LMOs (4), cost/benefit analysis as part of the risk management strategy (4); risk communication (4); liability and redress issues under the Protocol (4); biosafety record keeping and information security (4); negotiation skills (4); and training in handling LMO import and release applications (3). Three countries also identified the need for access to biosafety training materials and two countries expressed the need for access to information on existing academic training programmes in biosafety.

58. In their first national reports, a number of countries identified many of the above needs. Some of the needs identified in the national reports but not mentioned in responses to the recent questionnaire in the BCH include the following:

(a) Training in risk assessment review and audit, economic impact assessment; emergency response measures; legal drafting and analysis, enforcement and inspection, and training of policy-makers and regulators in the linkages between other international agreements and Protocol requirements.

(b) Technical infrastructure, including containment and confinement facilities (e.g. greenhouses), border control and inspection facilities, database infrastructure and reliable access to internet to retrieve information to support risk assessments.

(c) Local experts in risk assessment and risk management, including long term monitoring of the impact of living modified organisms on the environment and human health, trained inspectors, technicians on BCH operations and socio economic experts who can conduct studies on the impact of LMOs and their products on small farmers and indigenous communities.

59. Many countries also noted that the implementation of Article 22 of the Protocol has been constrained by a lack of human and financial resources and high turnover of trained personnel due to low salaries and institutional instability and a lack of access to relevant information.

60. The above synthesis is certainly not exhaustive but provides a general synopsis of the countries' main training and capacity-building needs in biosafety. As mentioned earlier, the report is not based on a statistical survey and no attempt was made to prioritise the needs at the global level.

61. The meeting of the Parties may wish to take note of the report and invite developed country Parties, other governments and relevant organizations to take into account the identified capacity-building and training priority needs when planning their bilateral and multilateral assistance to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition. The meeting of the Parties may also wish to urge Parties that have not yet done so to complete the questionnaire in the BCH within three months to enable the Secretariat to prepare a more representative and comprehensive needs assessment report in order to facilitate the next comprehensive review of the capacity-building Action Plan. The COP-MOP may also wish to urge Parties that have prepared stocktaking assessment reports during the design of biosafety projects for funding by the Global Environment Facility and other agencies or during the National Capacity Self-Assessments carried out with the support from UNDP-GEF to submit copies to the Secretariat.

62. Furthermore, the meeting of the Parties may wish to consider the recommendation made in the report of the sixth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety (UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/5/INF/3) to have comprehensive needs assessment carried out every four years, following the cycle for national reports, and to request Parties to complete the needs assessment within six months prior to the meeting of the Parties that would consider the assessment report. It may also wish to ask the Executive Secretary to supplement the ad-hoc country self-assessments through the BCH with systematic surveys involving field interviews.

IV. OUTCOMES OF THE EXPERT REVIEW ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VARIOUS APPROACHES TO CAPACITY-BUILDING

63. In paragraph 6 of decision BS-IV/3, the Parties to the Protocol welcomed the offer made by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to undertake an expert review of capacity-building activities funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), in collaboration with GEF, its agencies and the Executive Secretary, with a view to assessing the effectiveness of various approaches to capacity-building and developing lessons learned. In the same decision, Parties, other Governments, donors and relevant organization were invited to provide additional support to extend the review to non-GEF activities and submit the review to the BCH.

64. Pursuant to the above decision, UNEP commissioned the review in May 2009 and submitted an advance draft report to the Secretariat in June 2010. The review was essentially a desktop exercise which involved analysis of documents from past meetings of the Parties, project-related information registered in the Biosafety Clearing-House, reports by UNEP and the CBD Secretariat, and reports of previous evaluation and assessment of biosafety capacity-development programs and activities by various organizations, including the evaluation of GEF support for biosafety (2006) and the assessment of biotechnology and biosafety capacity development activities carried out by the United Nations University - Institute of Advanced Studies (UNU-IAS) in 2008. This section summarises the main findings and

recommendations of the review as presented in the advance draft report. The final report will be made available in information document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/INF/9.

65. In brief, the report describes special characteristics of biosafety capacity development which need to be kept in mind when designing and implementing biosafety support programs. It also analyzes how capacity development has been approached under the Protocol and distills a set of critical issues emerging from previous reviews of biosafety capacity development and the main challenges at hand. Finally, the report recommends broad strategic changes to the current capacity development approaches and provides practical suggestions for the future direction based on experiences gained so far.

66. The report observed that unlike other fields, building capacity in biosafety is more difficult and more complex because of the special characteristics and challenges surrounding the issue. For example, being an issue of global public good, biosafety requires countries to collaborate and develop capacities for collective action, which is not easy. Secondly, the regulation of living modified organisms involves a number of complex political, trade, health, ethical, and other socio-economic considerations. And sometimes debates about biosafety can rapidly become politicized and polarized. The report also noted that biosafety deals with a technical issue requiring highly skilled people which many countries do not as yet have in large numbers. Interventions must be based on advanced science, public and political support concurrently from the outset. Biosafety is also one of the most difficult issues to enforce. For example, an import and/or distribution of a few bags of unauthorized seeds can undermine the whole biosafety system in a country and sometimes there can be a large gap between biosafety capacity and the subsequent performance of the overall system.

67. Furthermore, the report observed that biosafety is a scientific, technical, socio-economic and political issue which requires broad awareness, support and commitment of not only technical staff and experts but a wide range of other actors, including political leaders, budget officials, law enforcement officials, the media and others. Biosafety issues also need to be communicated carefully to various interest groups, civil society and to the general public. This mix of technology management and public outreach is difficult balance to achieve and requires developing a wide range of skills and other capacities, including in the area of management, facilitation, mediation, community mobilization, political persuasion and others. It also requires dedicated resources for communication, social marketing and other forms of participatory outreach.

68. All the above factors affect biosafety capacity development efforts in one way or the other. The report argues that the Parties to the Protocol, GEF, other funding agencies and implementing organizations need to be much more cognizant of those characteristics and challenges. It also observes that injection of massive funding and technical support, for example, is not likely to make much impact in countries that lack the political commitment, infrastructure and basic capacity to set up and sustain complex technical and organizational systems.

69. Based on the review of information available in the BCH, the documents and decision of previous meetings of the Parties and relevant project-related documents, the report identifies the following as some of the general approaches and circumstances that have characterised biosafety capacity development efforts to date:

(a) *A globalized comprehensive and inclusive approach:* The general approach to biosafety capacity development to date has been to reach as many countries as possible, to involve as many actors and stakeholders as possible, and to cover all capacity-building aspects, needs and requirements simultaneously. In other words, emphasis has been on inclusion and comprehensive coverage. However, the report notes that while this approach was necessary in the beginning to promote broader international awareness, ratification and support for the Protocol, it resulted in scattered funding and dispersed efforts. In the long run, it is neither effective nor sustainable, given the limited available resources.

(b) *A standardized approach:* The capacity development approach to date has tended to put forward standardized packages of interventions (for example the key elements/list of required capacities included in the Action Plan and the associated set of indicators, the UNEP toolkit on NBF development, and other toolkits) although country- and needs-driven approaches have been underlined in principle.

(c) *A top-down approach:* Many biosafety capacity development efforts appear to be driven by the “supply side” in terms of donor support and technical assistance. Often there is very limited assessment and prioritization of the capacity needs by the recipient countries themselves.

(d) *Techno-functional approach:* To date the approach of many biosafety capacity-building programs has been to focus almost exclusively on developing technical and functional capabilities, sometimes well past the point of utility. Little analysis appears to have been made with respect to the human behavioural issues involved in capacity development for biosafety. One capacity lesson that has been learned in the last 50 years it is the need to combine the technical and the human aspects in any effort to develop capacity.

(e) *Optimal approach:* An analysis of existing reports revealed that most of the biosafety capacity development initiatives have been based on “optimal thinking”, which sets out all the pieces of the capacity puzzle needed to put in place a fully-functioning biosafety system, assuming every country would be in a position to choose the optimal way forward. However, the report observes that there are always constraints and limitations to this approach and that the possibility of optimal outcomes for most countries is not feasible. It is this important to determine the most relevant outcomes that are likely be “good enough” or “satisfactory” rather than optimal.

(f) *Catalytic approach:* Because of the minimal available financial resources, biosafety capacity development initiatives have, in the short term, tended to put emphasis on what are thought to be catalytic interventions such as training workshops with the assumption that countries, using their own resources, would later begin a spontaneous process of capacity development to produce an acceptable biosafety system. For example, trainings have tended to be short-term one-off workshops and relatively introductory in nature. The report observes that while this approach — which it refers to as “capacity development lite” — has worked in countries that already have some capacity, it has not made a significant impact in low-capacity countries in terms of developing the required capacities and may not be suitable in the future.

(g) *Short-term approaches:* Most biosafety support projects have been implemented over short periods of 2-3 years, with the assumption this would make a significant difference to capacity development. However capacity development is a generational task lasting several decades and needs continuous maintenance thereafter. Thus, what has been invested to date represents a valuable but only an initial step. Longer term and programmatic approaches are needed.

(h) *Availability of minimal program resources:* Most biosafety capacity development initiatives have experienced pervasive and continual under-investment. This gap, combined with the need to invest in as many countries as possible has led to the inevitable outcomes including: limited technical backstopping; little support for purchase of essential equipment; and under-remuneration of country staff and consultants and other limitations. The report notes that one possible explanation for the current situation seems to be that some participants lost track of the minimal level of resources while expecting medium or maximum level results.

(i) *Limited attention to the issue of sustainability:* The report points out two aspects relating to the issue of sustainability which have not been adequately addressed, i.e. the resilience of the organizational structures and capabilities developed to support biosafety decision-making in low-capacity countries and the issue regarding the cost of biosafety regulation (including the cost of

creating/maintaining the necessary institutions and enforcing the regulations; and the costs to the applicants for compliance) and the need for continuing access to financial support.

70. The report concludes that many of the current approaches to biosafety capacity development have outlived their usefulness. There is a need for a fundamental re-think and adoption of more strategic, adaptable and focused approaches. In this regard, the report makes the following recommendations and practical suggestions on the possible way forward:

(a) *Organize a workshop to reformulate a common strategy:* A workshop involving Parties to the Protocol, donors and relevant organizations should be organized to look comprehensively at a broad range of issues relating to the future strategy for biosafety capacity development and develop a shared understanding of the issues and options. Possible outcomes of that workshop could be an Updated Action Plan, a toolkit for capacity assessment, and guidelines on monitoring and evaluation.

(b) *Foster country ownership and political commitment:* In order to achieve effective and sustained capacity-building there a need for increased national budgetary support for biosafety, improved political commitment by key decision makers and sustained support by senior public sector managers in ministries such as finance and economic development.

(c) *Develop capacity development toolkits:* New biosafety capacity development toolkits should be developed to assist Parties and relevant organizations. This could capacity assessment frameworks and guidelines on monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building initiatives.

(d) *Promote regional approaches to capacity development:* Regional and subregional approaches to biosafety capacity development should be explored and promoted, where feasible, to foster networking, exchange of information and experience, technology transfer, training, exchange of expertise, and cooperation on technical issues, such as conduct of risk assessments and development of technical guidelines.

(e) *Promote customized in-depth and strategic training in biosafety:* There is a need to move away from the heavy reliance on workshops as the prime mechanism for delivery of training. More emphasis should be placed on longer term academic education and research and in-depth technical skills development tailored to particular country needs and strategic objectives and much less emphasis on the one-off, general introductory workshops.

(f) *Develop expert-support networks:* Effort should be made to create systems to facilitate ongoing institutional learning-by-doing, adaptiveness and experimentation. As well, a broad critical mass of independent experts should be mobilised to ensure ready access to expertise that can tapped on a continuous basis to provide specific biosafety capacity technical support.

(g) *Develop M&E systems:* Investment should be made in developing monitoring and evaluation systems as an integral part of implementing the Action Plan, supported by clear operational guidelines. This should go beyond the current set of indicators.

(h) *Improve coordination and collaboration:* Greater coordination and collaboration among donors and implementing organizations should be promoted at various levels, from priority setting, through the planning and implementation stages and to monitoring and reporting. This is particularly important in countries and regions with multiple biosafety programs in order to minimize duplication of effort and resources and to achieve greater impact.

71. The meeting of the Parties may wish to take note of the review report and consider incorporating the above recommendations, as appropriate, in its decision on capacity-building and in the upcoming comprehensive review of the capacity-building Action Plan.

V. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE UPDATED CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTION PLAN

72. In decision BS-III/3, the Parties to the Protocol agreed that a comprehensive review of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol would be conducted every five years, based on an independent evaluation of the effectiveness and outcomes of capacity-building initiatives implemented in support of the Action Plan.

73. In order to facilitate the next comprehensive review of the Action Plan, which is due in 2011, the Executive Secretary has developed, for consideration by the present meeting; draft terms of reference for the review contained in the annex below. The terms of reference outline the objectives of the review; the scope and schedules activities to be undertaken and the indicative responsibilities of various stakeholders; the information sources to support the review; and the expected outputs.

74. It is envisaged that the report of the independent evaluation of the effectiveness and outcomes of capacity-building initiatives implemented in support of the Action Plan and the other products from the comprehensive review will feed into the second assessment and review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at the sixth meeting of the Parties if the process and inputs for the second assessment and review proposed in document in UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/15 are adopted at the present meeting.

75. The meeting of the Parties may wish to endorse the proposed draft terms of reference and request the Executive Secretary and other relevant stakeholders to embark on the review process in accordance with those terms of reference with a view to completing the process by the sixth meeting of the Parties.

VI. POSSIBILITIES FOR COOPERATION ON IDENTIFICATION OF CAPACITY-BUILDING NEEDS FOR RESEARCH AND INFORMATION EXCHANGE ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS

76. In its decision BS-IV/16, paragraph 3, the meeting of the Parties invited the Coordination Meeting for Governments and Organizations Implementing or Funding Biosafety Capacity-Building Activities to further consider possibilities for cooperation in identifying needs for capacity building among Parties for research and information exchange on socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms.

77. In this regard, the sixth coordination meeting considered the above request and in its report (made available as information document UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/5/INF/4), it recommended that for the purposes of enhancing cooperation on the identification of capacity-building needs among Parties for research and information exchange on socio-economic considerations and to facilitate further consideration of Article 26 of the Protocol, the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, at their fifth meeting, consider adopting the draft decisions reproduced in section VII below.

78. The sixth coordination meeting also considered the draft report of the survey on the application of and experience in the use of socio-economic considerations in decision-making on living modified organisms which was commissioned in October 2009 by the GEF Coordination Division of the United Nations Environment Programme, in collaboration with the Secretariat. The meeting recommended that:

- (a) The final report of the survey be made available to the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol as an information document;⁸

⁸ As recommended, a summary report of the survey has been made available as information document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/INF/10.

(b) Further analysis of the survey data be undertaken to examine, inter alia, the difference in responses between the various regions and also between developed and developing countries, and to identify any region-specific experiences, issues and needs;

(c) Case studies be developed to document experiences and lessons learned from different regions with regard to the integration of socio-economic considerations in decision-making concerning living modified organisms; and

(d) A methodological toolkit or guide on socio-economic considerations be developed to assist decision-making authorities and those responsible for conducting and evaluating socio-economic assessments concerning living modified organisms.

79. The meeting of the Parties is invited to consider the above recommendations and incorporate them, as appropriate, in its decisions.

VII. ELEMENTS OF A DRAFT DECISION

80. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Protocol may wish to:

Status of implementation of the Action Plan and the country needs

(a) Take note of the status report on the implementation of the capacity-building Action Plan contained in the present note by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/4);

(b) Urge Parties and other Governments that not yet done so to submit reports on their capacity-building activities undertaken in support of Action Plan within the next six months using the online format available in the Biosafety Clearing-House to facilitate the comprehensive review of the Action Plan;

(c) Take note also of the summary report on the priority training and capacity-building needs of Parties and other Governments prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/4);

(d) Invite developed country Parties, other governments and relevant organizations to take into account the identified needs in their bilateral and multilateral assistance to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition;

(e) Urge Parties and other Governments that have not yet done so to assess and submit to the BCH their priority needs within the next six months to enable the Secretariat to prepare a more representative and comprehensive needs assessment report to facilitate the next comprehensive review of the capacity-building Action Plan;

(f) Request the Executive Secretary to undertake a comprehensive needs assessment every four years and invite Parties to complete the needs assessment at least 12 months before the meeting of the Parties that would consider the needs assessment report;

Coordination Mechanism

(g) Take note of the report of the fifth and sixth coordination meetings for Governments and organizations implementing or funding biosafety capacity-building activities made available in document UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/5/INF/4;

(h) Request the Executive Secretary to publish and make available to Parties a toolkit on regional and subregional approaches to capacity-building in biosafety based on the guidance developed by the fifth coordination meeting;

(i) Take note also of the report of the “Third International Meeting of Academic Institutions and Organizations Involved in Biosafety Education and Training” made available in document UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/5/INF/7;

(j) Commend the Government of Japan for organizing and hosting the meeting referred to in subparagraph (i) above;

(k) Invite Parties and other Governments to:

- (i) Support existing and new national, subregional and regional biosafety education and training initiatives, including mobility support;
- (ii) Establish national and regional or subregional coordination mechanisms for education and training in biosafety;
- (iii) Commission country surveys/studies to establish baseline data on the current situation with regards to education and training related to biosafety;
- (iv) Make available to academic institutions relevant documents (including real-life dossiers and full risk assessment reports), where available, for education and education purposes;

Review of the effectiveness of various approaches to biosafety capacity-building

(l) Welcome the expert review report on the effectiveness of various approaches to biosafety capacity-building and the lessons learned produced by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/INF/9);

(m) Invite Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to take into account, as appropriate, the findings and recommendations of the expert review in the design and implementation of the biosafety capacity-building initiatives and support programmes;

(n) Decide to organize an expert workshop to discuss and make recommendations on new strategic approaches to capacity-building for the effective implementation of the Protocol and propose capacity assessment and monitoring and evaluation frameworks, taking into account the experiences with the use of the revised set of indicators adopted in decision BS-IV/3;

(o) Request the Executive Secretary to develop, with advice from liaison group on capacity-building for biosafety, toolkits to assist Parties and relevant organizations to improve the effectiveness of various biosafety capacity-building approaches and initiatives;

Comprehensive Review of the Action Plan

(p) Endorse the terms of reference for the comprehensive review of the updated Action Plan contained in annex II hereto;

(q) Request the Executive Secretary to commission an independent evaluation of the effectiveness and outcomes of capacity-building initiatives implemented in support of the Action Plan to facilitate the comprehensive review of the Action Plan;

(r) Invite Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to submit to the Executive Secretary, by 30 June 2011, relevant information that might facilitate the comprehensive review of the updated Action Plan as well as views and suggestions on possible revisions to the Action Plan;

(s) Reiterate its invitation to Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, made in paragraph 17 of decision BS-IV/3, to submit to the Executive Secretary information on their experiences

with, and lessons learned from, the use of the revised set of indicators in monitoring and evaluating capacity-building activities implemented in support of the Action Plan;

(t) Request the Executive Secretary to prepare a working document to facilitate the comprehensive review, based on the submissions to the Biosafety Clearing-House of reports on capacity-building activities and information provided in the second national reports, also taking into account the findings of the independent evaluation referred to in subparagraph (q) above and previous relevant reviews and assessments;

Cooperation on identification of capacity-building needs for research and information exchange on socio-economic considerations

(u) Invite Parties to submit to the Executive Secretary and the Biosafety Clearing-House their capacity building needs and priorities regarding socio-economic considerations at least six months before the sixth meeting of the Parties.

(v) Request the Executive Secretary to establish an online forum, preferably in different United Nations languages, to facilitate exchange views, information and experiences on socio-economic considerations.

(w) Decide to establish an ad hoc expert group on socio-economic considerations in accordance with the terms of reference contained in annex I hereto;

(x) Invite Parties, other Governments and relevant international organizations to submit to the Executive Secretary relevant information on socio-economic considerations, including guidance material and case studies on, *inter alia*, institutional arrangements and best practices;

(y) Invite Parties, in collaboration with regional bodies and relevant organizations, to organize regional workshops to facilitate sharing of information and experiences regarding socio-economic considerations.

(z) Welcome the report of the survey on the application of and experience in the use of socio-economic considerations in decision-making on living modified organisms conducted by the United Nations Environment Programme and the Secretariat (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/INF/10).

(aa) Invite the United Nations Environment Programme and other organizations to conduct additional case studies to document experiences and lessons learned in different regions.

(bb) Invite also the United Nations Environment Programme to develop a toolkit to assist Parties in conducting or evaluating socio-economic assessments and taking into account socio-economic considerations in decision-making concerning living modified organisms.

Annex I

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE AD HOC EXPERT GROUP ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

1. The ad hoc expert group on socio-economic considerations shall:

(a) Elaborate possible elements of socioeconomic considerations in the context of Article 26 of the Protocol;

(b) Develop criteria that could assist Parties in determining which socio-economic considerations they wish to include in their decision-making frameworks;

(c) Develop a guidance document on ways in which socio-economic issues could be considered in the decision making process on living modified organisms with a view to enable the development of training for socio-economic considerations;

(d) Meet twice, pending availability of funds, prior to the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and perform necessary tasks between the two meetings to achieve the proposed outcomes outlined herein;

(e) Include experts selected on the basis of their expertise on the issues relevant for the mandate of the Group, based on a standardized common format for submission of CVs from experts nominated by Parties, respecting geographical representation, in accordance with the consolidated modus operandi of the SBSTTA of the Convention on Biological Diversity (decision VIII/10 of the Conference of the Parties, annex III); and

(f) Include observers in accordance with the rules of procedure for meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

2. The deliberations of the ad hoc expert group shall take into account:

(a) Submissions from Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations; and

(b) Any other relevant materials made available by the Secretariat.

Annex II

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE UPDATED ACTION PLAN

A. *Introduction*

1. In its decision BS-III/3, the meeting of the Parties adopted an updated Action Plan and decided that a comprehensive review of the Action Plan would be conducted every five years, based on an independent evaluation of the initiatives undertaken in support of its implementation. The first review of the Action Plan was undertaken in 2005 and the results were presented in documents UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/3/4 and UNEP/CBD/BS/COP MOP/3/INF/4.

2. The next comprehensive review is due in 2011 and its report will be considered by the sixth meeting of the Parties, expected to take place in 2012. The following terms of reference have been developed to facilitate the review process. They outline the objectives of the review; the scope and schedules activities to be undertaken and the indicative responsibilities of various stakeholders; the information sources to support the review; and the expected outputs.

B. *Objectives of the review*

3. The objectives of the comprehensive review are to:

(a) Assess the overall progress and achievements made in implementing the Action Plan (including key results and impacts) and examine the effectiveness of the Action Plan in facilitating the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety.

(b) Identify the gaps in the implementation of the Action Plan and the obstacles and constraints limiting its full implementation and propose possible measures for overcoming them.

(c) Identify best practices and lessons learned in the implementation of the Action Plan.

(d) Propose, as appropriate, revisions to the Action Plan, taking into account the additional emerging needs and priorities of Parties and other governments and the new Strategic Plan for the Protocol (2011-2020).

(e) Propose options for enhancing the implementation of the Action Plan and for improving the monitoring and evaluation of its progress and effectiveness.

4. The overall objective of the review will be to ensure that the Action Plan is relevant and effective in providing a coherent framework for capacity-building efforts in response to the needs and priorities of Parties and other Governments.

C. Scope and schedule of activities to be undertaken

5. The review process will include the following activities/tasks:

| <i>Activity/Task</i> | <i>Timeframe</i> | <i>Responsibility</i> |
|---|------------------|--|
| 1. Independent evaluation of the initiatives undertaken in support of the Action Plan | Jan-June 2011 | Consultant |
| 2. Submission of reports on capacity-building activities undertaken in support of Action Plan | 15 Apr 2011 | Parties, other governments and organizations |
| 3. Submission of capacity-building and training needs using the questionnaire in the BCH. | 15 Apr 2011 | Parties, other governments |
| 4. Submission of experiences with, and lessons learned from, the use of the revised set of indicators | 30 June 2011 | Parties, other governments and organizations |
| 5. Submission of views and suggestions on possible revisions to the Action Plan | 30 June 2011 | Parties, other governments and organizations |
| 6. A review of the above submissions and preparation of discussion documents to facilitate the review | Sept. 2011 | Secretariat; Liaison Group on Capacity-Building |
| 7. Expert workshop to discuss new strategic approaches to capacity-building and develop a new monitoring and evaluation framework for the Action Plan | Nov 2011 | 25 experts nominated by governments and relevant organizations |
| 8. Preparation of a working document to facilitate the comprehensive review | June 2012 | Secretariat |

D. Information sources for the comprehensive review

6. The review will draw from various information sources, including: status reports on implementation of the Action Plan prepared by the Secretariat the meetings of the Parties; reports on the training and capacity-building needs of Parties and other Governments; the second national reports on the implementation of the Protocol; information, views and suggestions submitted by Parties, other governments and relevant organizations; previous evaluations and assessments of biosafety capacity-building initiatives; and other relevant documents; report on the independent evaluation of the initiatives undertaken in support of its implementation; as well as previous evaluations and assessments of biosafety capacity-building initiatives.

E. Expected outcomes of the review

7. The expected outcomes of the comprehensive review process are:

- (a) A draft revised Action Plan.
- (b) A new monitoring and evaluation framework for the Action Plan, incorporating a revised set of indicators.
- (c) A revised capacity-building needs assessment framework.
- (d) A guidance document on strategic approaches to biosafety capacity-building at national and regional levels.
