



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/5  
30 August 2012

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

Sixth meeting

Hyderabad, India, 1-5 October 2012

### **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 sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the reports of the eighth and ninth meetings of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety, which were held on 7 to 8 April 2011, in Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, and 15 to 16 March 2012, in Prague, Czech Republic, respectively.
2. The two reports were previously issued by the Secretariat as documents UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/8/2 and UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/9/2, respectively.

/...

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

### **INTRODUCTION**

1. The eighth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety was held from 7 to 8 April 2011 in Chisinau, Republic of Moldova. It was attended by 18 participants from 12 countries and 6 organizations.

2. The countries represented were: Austria, Bolivia, Cambodia, Czech Republic, Germany, India, Liberia, Mexico, Moldova, Spain, Ukraine and Zimbabwe.

3. The organizations represented were: ECOROPA, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), GenØk - Centre for Biosafety, Global Industry Coalition, Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

### **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. Mr. Gbedemah welcomed the participants and thanked the Government of the Republic of Moldova for hosting the meeting. Mr. Gbedemah noted that the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP 5), in its decision BS-V/3, requested the Liaison Group to give advice on the organization of the workshop on capacity-building for research and information exchange on socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms (LMOs). Accordingly he noted that the meeting would be providing advice on, among other things, the preparatory activities proposed by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and on the organizational aspects of the workshop. In addition, the meeting would provide advice on the proposed process for the comprehensive review of the Action Plan and exchange on possible improvements to the Action Plan and its Coordination Mechanism. Mr. Gbedemah expressed hope that the Liaison Group would provide concrete advice to help to guide the two processes.

### **ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

5. After the opening session, the participants elected Mr. Andreas Heissenberger (Austria) to serve as Chair and Ms. Georgina Catacora-Vargas (Bolivia) to serve as Rapporteur.

6. The meeting then adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/8/1) 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 Organization of the workshop on capacity-building for research and information exchange on socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms and other related activities;
  - 3.2. Second comprehensive review of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol.
4. Other matters.
5. Conclusions and recommendations.
6. Closure of the meeting.

7. The participants also adopted the organization of work for the meeting, as contained in annex I to the annotated agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/8/1/Add.1).

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

#### ***3.1 Organization of the workshop on capacity-building for research and information exchange on socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms and other related activities***

8. A representative of the Secretariat gave a presentation introducing the agenda item. She outlined past deliberations on the issue of socio-economic considerations and on capacity-building for addressing it. She then described elements of section IV of decision BS-V/3, including the requests to the Executive Secretary to convene regional online conferences on socio-economic considerations and a workshop on capacity-building for research and information exchange on socio-economic impacts of LMOs. The decision also requests the Liaison Group to give advice to the Executive Secretary on the organization of the workshop. The representative of the Secretariat further described the planned activities on this issue, namely online discussion groups, the regional real-time online conferences and the workshop. She also pointed out that a Portal on Socio-Economic Considerations had been created in the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) to serve as a source for more information and as a platform for the online discussion groups and the real-time online conferences.<sup>1</sup> Finally, she presented some points and questions on which the Liaison Group could provide advice regarding the organization of the workshop. These included questions regarding the format and structure of the workshop, the duration of the workshop, the number of participants and the criteria for selecting participants, the themes and topics to be discussed, the presentations to be made and the possible keynote speakers and resource persons, the background materials to be used and preparatory work for the workshop.

##### *(a) Format and structure of the workshop*

9. After the presentation, the Group discussed the various points and questions mentioned by the Secretariat and also raised additional points. With regard to the format and structure of the workshop, the Group suggested that both plenary sessions with presentations by keynote speakers and resource people as well as small group discussions be considered. It was noted, however, that the specific format for the workshop would depend on the issues and material to be discussed and also on the total number of participants. It was also suggested that the small group discussions could include discussions in regional groups. It was further suggested that specific topics and questions for consideration in the small group discussions be identified ahead of time. The Group noted that the preparatory work from the online activities should allow the workshop to move quickly to the small group setting.

##### *(b) Duration of the workshop*

10. Regarding the duration of the workshop, the Group suggested that at least three days would be necessary. However some participants were of the view that three days might be short given the scope of the issues to be discussed.

##### *(c) Participants*

11. The Group considered the question regarding the appropriate number of participants for the workshop and the stakeholders that should be represented. The Secretariat indicated that the funds currently available could enable the participation of approximately 25 developing country participants, including representatives from stakeholder groups. The Group emphasized the need for a broad range of expertise and knowledge (including experts on social impact assessment, social scientists, economists, anthropologists and other disciplines) to be represented at the workshop. It also emphasized the importance of regional balance and balanced representation of stakeholder groups in the selection of participants. Furthermore, the Group underlined the need to ensure a proper balance between Parties and

---

<sup>1</sup>The portal is accessible at: [http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb\\_art26/portal.shtml](http://bch.cbd.int/protocol/cpb_art26/portal.shtml).

observers and also between developing and developed country representation at the workshop. Some members of the Group suggested that the experts (including resource persons and paper presenters) invited to the workshop should not be counted among the workshop participants.

12. Concerning the criteria for selecting participants to attend the workshop, the Secretariat indicated that priority would be given to those who would have taken part in the online discussion groups and the regional real-time online conferences. However, some members of the Group expressed concern about selecting participants for the workshop solely on the basis of their involvement in the online activities given difficulties with internet connectivity in some developing countries.

*(d) Speakers and resource persons*

13. The Group discussed whether independent professional moderators should be used to facilitate the discussions during the workshop. It was recommended that the possibility of using moderators from United Nations agencies at a low or no cost should be explored. It was also recommended that possible speakers/resource persons on different topics be identified. The co-chair of the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD) was suggested as a possible keynote speaker.

*(e) Workshop themes/topics*

14. The Group emphasized the importance of linking the workshop to the themes and topics discussed in the online discussion groups and the regional real-time online conferences. It was suggested that the workshop should consider paragraph 1 of article 26 of the Protocol. Some participants however argued that it would be premature to include a discussion on the methodologies for socio-economic assessments in the workshop. The Secretariat reminded participants that paragraph 25 of decision BS-V/3 specified the main objectives of the workshop, i.e., (i) analysis of the capacity-building activities, needs and priorities and identification of options for cooperation in addressing those needs; and (ii) exchange and analysis of information on the use of socio-economic considerations in the context of article 26 of the Protocol. The Group recommended that discussions on the countries' capacity-building needs should be done on a regional basis, noting that the needs vary from region to region.

15. The Group discussed whether the workshop should focus on socio-economic considerations relating to LMOs that have already been commercialized in the agricultural sector or also look at other LMOs. Some members of the Group suggested that the workshop should also consider socio-economic issues relating to other LMOs, such as genetically modified mosquitoes and other LMOs in the medical and health field. The Group also discussed whether the workshop should include a component to consider broader socio-economic issues and social impact assessments. Some members suggested that the workshop should focus on LMOs noting that it would be too difficult linking general socio-economic considerations to LMOs. The Group agreed that information from Parties with experience in this area would be useful. It also suggested that non-governmental organizations could share their knowledge and experience.

*(f) Background materials*

16. The Group suggested that background materials including case studies should be prepared and made available well before the workshop. It was proposed that background materials could include reports on experiences with and lessons learned from socio-economic assessments and on the countries' capacity-building needs and priorities. It was also suggested that an introductory booklet in simple language on what the socio-economic considerations are, why they are important and how they could be taken into account in decision-making on LMOs would be useful.

17. The Group emphasized the need for diversity and regional balance in the selection of the case studies. The following were suggested as possible topics for the case studies:

(a) A comparative study on the integration of socio-economic considerations in decision-making on an LMO versus a non-LMO;

(b) A comparative study on the integration of socio-economic considerations in decision-making on a living modified crop versus another type of LMO;

(c) A study on socio-economic considerations in general environmental decisions, policies or projects;

(d) A study on a country that has included socio-economic considerations in its national biosafety framework;

(e) A study on a country that has not included socio-economic considerations in its national biosafety framework but wishes to do so;

(f) A study on socio-economic considerations in the absence of a legislative framework;

(g) Comparative studies of countries that have released LMOs and those that have not done so.

18. The Group noted that the case studies could help focus the discussions during the workshop and form the basis for discussions on general principles and meta-analysis. In this regard, it was suggested that visual presentations of the general issues from the case studies would be more appropriate and that the details of the case studies (including the detailed scientific data and technical analysis) should be presented in the online fora.

19. The Group agreed that the case studies might help in the analysis of capacity-building activities on socio-economic considerations as well as in the identification of needs and priorities. Some members of the Group emphasized the importance of focusing the discussions on the capacity-building activities, needs and priorities submitted to the BCH. Others suggested that an analysis of needs, priorities and targets should be done by the Secretariat after receiving proposals from Parties.

20. The Group noted the ranking of priorities for capacity-building on socio-economic considerations contained in the report on the outcomes from the survey on experience with and the application of socio-economic considerations in biosafety decision-making. There were also suggestions that the Secretariat send a common format or questionnaire to Parties for them to report their needs and priorities for capacity-building on socio-economic considerations. The Secretariat indicated that a general format for submitting capacity-building needs and priorities is already available.<sup>2</sup>

*(g) Preparatory work for the workshop*

21. The Group discussed how to mobilize participation in the online discussions and regional online conferences. It was agreed that mobilizing participation in the online activities and the submission of information on the capacity-building needs was key to the success of the workshop. It was suggested that the Secretariat could identify which Parties had made submissions in the past and which ones had provisions on socio-economic considerations in their national biosafety framework. The Group also suggested that the participation of countries with experience on socio-economic considerations should be encouraged. Using other institutional networks to distribute information on the activities was suggested as one possible means to mobilize participation. However, it was noted that communication with the national focal points was useful in order to avoid internal coordination difficulties within countries.

22. A number of other points were also raised during the discussions. It was suggested that the focus of socio-economic assessments should be aligned with national protection goals and that Parties need capacity-building on methodologies for conducting socio-economic assessments in order to implement their needs on this issue. The representative of the FAO pointed to an FAO publication on non-LMO biotechnologies and socio-economic considerations that may be relevant. The guidelines on socio-economic assessment that were developed under the Convention were identified as being relevant to the Biosafety Protocol as well.

---

<sup>2</sup> The questionnaire can be accessed at: <http://bch.cbd.int/managementcentre/edit/capacityBuildingNeeds.shtml>.

**3.2 *Second comprehensive review of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol***

23. Under this agenda item, a representative of the Secretariat gave a short presentation in which he described the current capacity-building Action Plan and the proposed process for its comprehensive review. The presentation also described the capacity-building component (focal area 2) of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020, which was adopted by the Parties to the Protocol in decision BS-V/16.

24. The Group agreed that the new capacity-building Action Plan needs be aligned with the Strategic Plan to ensure consistency. In this regard it was suggested that the seven operational objectives under focal area 2 of the Strategic Plan, which focuses on capacity-building, should form the basis for the new capacity-building Action Plan.

25. The Group observed that some of the main weaknesses of the current Action Plan were that: (i) it does not identify clear priorities in terms of actions to be taken in the short term, medium term and long term; (ii) it does not include substantive activities undertaken to address each of the core elements; and (iii) it does not identify specific actors and the means (including financial resources) for its implementation. It was thus suggested that these omissions be addressed in the new the Action Plan.

26. The Group noted that the success of the process for the next comprehensive review of the Action Plan review process will depend on the timely and adequate submission of information by Parties and other Governments. It was emphasized that the review of the Action Plan should take into account the needs and priorities of Parties and other Governments. In this regard, the Group recommended that efforts should be made to encourage and assist Parties and other Governments to submit the required information and to complete their second national reports on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety before the 30 September 2011 deadline.

27. It was further recommended that the independent evaluation should in particular analyse the projects funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on the implementation of the national biosafety frameworks and the regional capacity-building projects implemented since the Action Plan was adopted.

28. After the initial general discussion, the Group embarked on an exercise to try to align the capacity-building Action Plan with the Strategic Plan. The Group identified possible specific activities that could be undertaken towards achieving each of the seven operational objectives under focal area 2 of the Strategic Plan. The outcomes of that exercise are presented in annex I below. It was clarified that the exercise was not intended to prejudice the outcomes of the comprehensive review process but rather to demonstrate how the alignment of the capacity-building Action Plan with the Strategic Plan could be done and to propose activities that could be considered for incorporation in the new Action Plan.

**ITEM 4. OTHER MATTERS**

29. There were no other matters raised.

**ITEM 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

30. The main outcomes of the deliberations by the Group are summarised under Item 3 above.

**ITEM 6. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

31. In the final session of the meeting, the participants reviewed and adopted the draft report of the meeting. The Secretariat was requested to incorporate the proceedings of the last session 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.

32. The meeting was closed on Friday, 8 April 2011 at 3 p.m.

*Annex I*

**ELEMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE REVIEW OF THE CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTION PLAN  
IN LIGHT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY**

**VISION**

*Biological diversity is adequately protected from any adverse effects of living modified organisms*

**MISSION**

*To strengthen global, regional & national action and capacity in ensuring an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health and specifically focusing on transboundary movements*

| <i>Strategic Objective</i>  | <i>Expected Impacts</i>   | <i>Operational Objectives</i>   | <i>Activities</i>   | <i>Outcomes</i>   | <i>Indicators</i>   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Focal area 2:</b><br/><b>Capacity-building</b><br/>2. To further develop and strengthen the capacity of Parties to implement the Protocol</p> | <p>Increased safety in the transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms</p> <p>Effective and efficient regulatory, administrative and monitoring frameworks established by Parties for the implementation of the Protocol</p> <p>Necessary mechanisms put in place to enable</p> | <p>2.1 National Biosafety Frameworks</p> <p>To further support the development and implementation of national regulatory and administrative systems</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating institutional capacity for developing and implementing national biosafety frameworks (NBFs), including:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of legislative and regulatory frameworks for living modified organisms (LMOs)</li> <li>- Development of administrative frameworks and creation of biosafety coordination bodies</li> <li>- Development of mechanisms for follow-up, monitoring and assessment of implementation of NBFs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Establishing electronic systems for handling notifications</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Biosafety Frameworks developed and implemented</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Parties with operational regulatory frameworks</li> <li>• Number of Parties with functional administrative arrangements</li> </ul> |

|  |   |  |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
|  | <p>Parties to make science-based risk assessments</p> <p>More transparent and expeditious decision-making</p> <p>Full use of information exchange systems</p> | <p>2.2 Risk assessment and risk management</p> <p>To enable Parties to evaluate, apply, share and carry out risk assessments and establish local science-based capacities to regulate, manage, monitor and control risks of LMOs</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training on risk assessment and risk management</li> <li>• Capacity-building on risk assessment and risk management</li> <li>• Developing guidance documents (e.g., the roadmap) and other relevant documents</li> <li>• Undertaking scientific biosafety research relating to living modified organisms</li> <li>• Certification of LMO laboratories and training of the technicians</li> <li>• Handling of confidential information</li> <li>• Taking into account risks to human health</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources, including human resources required to assess risks of living modified organisms are available and administrative mechanisms are in place</li> <li>• Training materials and technical guidance on risk assessment and risk management developed and used by Parties</li> <li>• Infrastructure and administrative mechanisms established for the management of risks of living modified organisms at national, subregional or regional level</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ratio of risk assessment summary reports as against number of decisions on LMOs on the BCH</li> <li>• Number of risk assessment summary reports in the BCH that are in compliance with the Protocol</li> <li>• Number of people trained on risk assessment, as well as in monitoring, management and control of LMOs</li> <li>• Number of Parties that have infrastructure, including laboratories for monitoring, management and control</li> <li>• Number of Parties that are using the developed training materials and technical guidance</li> <li>• Number of Parties that are of the opinion that the training materials and technical guidance are sufficient and effective</li> </ul> |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|



|  |  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>2.3 Handling, transport, packaging and identification</p> <p>To develop capacity for handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing methodologies and protocols for sampling and identification of LMOs and/or adapting existing validated protocols</li> <li>• Developing strategies for the management of LMOs during transport, handling and storage</li> <li>• Developing tools and systems for traceability and labelling of LMOs</li> <li>• Implementing the documentation requirements under article 18.2 of the Protocol</li> <li>• Establishing infrastructure for and training of human resources in detection of LMOs, including accreditation of laboratories</li> <li>• Establishing and implementing measures for the detection, prevention and management of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs</li> <li>• Enabling relevant agencies to report findings under article 18.2 and article 25 to the BCH</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customs/border officials are able to enforce the implementation of the Protocol's requirements related to handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms</li> <li>• Personnel are trained and equipped for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of customs officers and laboratory personnel trained</li> <li>• Percentage of Parties that have established or have reliable access to detection laboratories</li> <li>• National and regional laboratories certified with the capacity to detect LMOs</li> <li>• Number of certified laboratories in operation</li> </ul> |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>2.4 Liability and Redress</p> <p>To assist Parties to the Protocol in their efforts to establish and apply the rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage resulting from the transboundary movements of living modified organisms</p>   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An institutional mechanism or process identified or established to facilitate the implementation of the international rules and procedures on liability and redress at the national level</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of eligible Parties that received capacity-building support in the area of liability and redress involving living modified organisms</li> <li>• Number of domestic administrative or legal instruments identified, amended or newly enacted that fulfill the objective of the international rules and procedures in the field of liability and redress</li> </ul>  |
|  |  | <p>2.5 Public awareness, education and participation</p> <p>To enhance capacity at the national, regional and international levels that would facilitate efforts to raise public awareness, and promote education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthening national systems for public awareness, education and participation (PAEP)</li> <li>• Developing tools including guidance materials for implementing PAEP for different groups using differentiated methodologies</li> <li>• Strengthening mechanisms on public rights and access to information</li> <li>• Strengthening or establishing mechanisms for dissemination of information and public consultation in the decision-making process (in relation to article.23.2 of the Protocol) and other processes relevant to the implementation of the Protocol</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parties have access to guidance and training materials on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs</li> <li>• Parties are enabled to promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation in biosafety</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of Parties having in place mechanisms for ensuring public participation in decision-making concerning LMOs not later than 6 years after accession to/ratification of the Protocol</li> <li>• Percentage of Parties that inform their public about existing modalities for participation</li> <li>• Number of Parties having in place national websites and searchable archives, national resource centres or sections in existing national libraries dedicated to biosafety</li> </ul> |

|  |   |   |   |   |                       |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|
|  |   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fostering joint debate with other complementary international agreements (e.g., the Aarhus Convention)</li> </ul>  |   | educational materials |
|  | <p>2.6 Information sharing</p> <p>To ensure that the BCH is easily accessed by all established stakeholders, in particular in developing countries and countries with economies in transition</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing/maintaining infrastructure for access to the BCH</li> <li>• Training in the use of the BCH at the national level (including development of toolkits)</li> <li>• Developing national systems for gathering and management of information for submission to the BCH in accordance with the obligations under the Protocol</li> <li>• Establishing mechanisms for translation of information in the BCH into official national languages and vice versa</li> <li>• Enhancing and supporting the BCH coordination mechanism at the national level</li> <li>• Monitoring and encouraging ongoing use of the BCH at the national level and addressing gaps</li> <li>• Developing programs to facilitate the use of the BCH by other stakeholders</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased access to information in the BCH and sharing of information through the BCH by users in developing countries and countries with economies in transition</li> <li>• Tools to facilitate implementation of the Protocol are easily accessible through the BCH</li> <li>• Information on the BCH is easily accessible to stakeholders including the general public</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of submissions to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition</li> <li>• Amount of traffic from users to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition</li> </ul> |                       |

|  |  |   |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
|  |  | <p>2.7 Biosafety education and training</p> <p>To promote education and training of biosafety professionals through greater coordination and collaboration among academic institutions and relevant organizations</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewing and applying lessons learned to existing biosafety education and training initiatives</li> <li>• Developing modules for use by biosafety education and training initiatives</li> <li>• Creating regional and subregional platforms for sharing experiences and best practices in biosafety education and training</li> <li>• Strengthening national biosafety education and training initiatives</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sustainable pool of biosafety professionals with various competencies available at national/international levels</li> <li>• Improved biosafety education and training programmes</li> <li>• Increased exchange of information, training materials and staff and students exchange programmes among academic institutions and relevant organizations</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of academic institutions by region offering biosafety education and training courses and programmes</li> <li>• Number of biosafety training materials and online modules available</li> </ul> |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|

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

### **INTRODUCTION**

1. The ninth meeting of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety was held from 15 to 16 March 2012 in Prague, Czech Republic. It was attended by 21 participants from 13 governments and 7 organizations.
2. The countries represented were: Austria, Belize, Bolivia, Czech Republic, Germany, India, Liberia, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Slovenia.
3. The organizations represented were: ECOROPA, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), GenØk - Centre for Biosafety, Global Industry Coalition, International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB), Le Groupe - Conseil Baastel Ltee and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

### **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. Mr. Gbedemah welcomed the participants and thanked the Government of the Czech Republic for hosting the meeting. Mr. Gbedemah noted that the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (COP-MOP 5) adopted, in its decision BS-V/3, the terms of reference for the comprehensive review of the updated Action Plan and requested the Executive Secretary to commission the independent evaluation of the Action Plan. In this regard, he noted that the Liaison Group would discuss the draft report of the independent evaluation of the Action Plan prepared by the Consultant and provide advice on the new Action Plan. The meeting would also discuss measures for improving the Coordination Mechanism. Mr. Gbedemah expressed hope that the meeting would provide concrete advice to help to guide the capacity-building efforts within the framework of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol for the period 2011-2020.

### **ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

5. After the opening session, the participants elected Mr. Andreas Heissenberger (Austria) to serve as Chair and Ms. Ranjini Warriar (India) to serve as Rapporteur.
6. The meeting adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/LG-CB/9/1) 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 Comprehensive review of the updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol and its possible revision;
    - 3.2 Measures to improve the Coordination Mechanism.
  4. Other matters.
  5. Conclusions and recommendations.
  6. Closure of the meeting.

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

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

#### ***3.1 Comprehensive review of the updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol and its possible revision***

8. Under this agenda item, the Liaison Group discussed the draft report of the independent evaluation of the capacity-building Action Plan and its recommendations (UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/6/INF/2). The first part of the discussion focussed on the recommendation to develop two separate documents to replace the current Action Plan; i.e. strategic framework for capacity-building, which, as the current Action Plan would serve as a reference tool to guide the capacity-building efforts of Parties, other Governments and relevant organisations; and an action plan with concrete prioritised activities, specific targets (expected results) and a limited number of indicators to be used to monitor progress.

9. After a long discussion, the Liaison Group recommended the development of one new document with two components: (i) a "Framework for Capacity-Building", based on the current Action Plan, which would serve as a reference tool or guide for Parties, other governments and organizations; and (ii) a "results-oriented Action Plan" aligned with focal area 2 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. It was also recommended that the timeframe for the new capacity-building framework and action plan be the same as that of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol, i.e. up to 2020.

10. After reaching consensus on the nature of the new document to replace the current Action Plan, members of the Liaison Group then continued with the exercise initiated at the eighth Liaison Group meeting to identify specific target results/outputs, and the activities to achieve those results, relating to the operational objectives under focal area 2 of the Strategic Plan. Four small discussion groups were established to discuss the expected results and activities under the following operational objectives:

- 2.1 National Biosafety Framework development and implementation
- 2.2 Risk assessment and risk management
- 2.3 Handling, transport, packaging and identification
- 2.4 Liability and Redress
- 2.5 Public awareness, education and participation
- 2.6 Information sharing
- 2.7 Biosafety education and training; and
- 1.2 Coordination and support

11. The results of the four small group discussions were presented to the plenary for further discussion. The consolidated outcomes of the discussions are presented in the table annex hereto.

#### ***3.2 Measures to improve the Coordination Mechanism***

12. Under this agenda item, the Liaison Group reviewed the status of implementation of the Coordination Mechanism and discussed possible measures for its improvement. It was observed that the participation of relevant institutions and organizations, especially donors, in the coordination meeting had diminished over the recent few years.

13. The Liaison Group observed that the overall objective of the Coordination Mechanism is still valid but it needs to be refined to take into account the developments that have taken place since the Coordination Mechanism was adopted in 2004. It was noted that the intended aim of the coordination meetings to bring together donors agencies and organizations providing financial/technical support and the recipient countries has not been fully realized, partly due to the low priority given to biosafety by donor agencies and the limited participation of donor agencies in the meetings. In this regard, it was recommended that COP-MOP and the Secretariat should explore possibilities of enhancing the

engagement of donor agencies and encourage more organizations to take part in the coordination meetings in order to promote synergies and avoid duplication.

14. Furthermore, the Liaison Group observed that the coordination meetings have increasingly played a role of providing recommendations to COP-MOP on capacity-building with respect to specific technical issues/topics which has in part led to an overlap with the role of the Liaison Group. In this regard, it was recommended that the coordination meetings should focus on facilitating the sharing of knowledge, views and operational experience.

15. Based on operational experience, the Liaison Group recommended that the elements of the Coordination Mechanism be streamlined as follows:

(a) Element 5 of the coordination mechanism (Reporting mechanisms) be merged with element 2 (capacity-building databases); and

(b) Elements 3 and 4 be merged into one element: "Information sharing and networking". In this regard, a combination of face-to-face meetings and online discussions would be useful in order to broaden the participation of donors, governments and relevant organizations.

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

16. There were no other matters raised.

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

17. The main outcomes of the deliberations by the Liaison Group are summarised under Item 3 above and in the table annexed hereto.

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

18. In the final session of the meeting, the participants reviewed and adopted the draft report of the meeting. The Secretariat was requested to incorporate the proceedings of the last session. The present report has been finalized on that basis.

19. Following brief closing remarks by Mrs. Zuzana Doubkova, Head of the Biosafety Unit in the Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic, the Chair, Mr Andreas Heissenberger, declared the meeting closed at 4.00 p.m. on Friday, 16 March 2012.

*Annex*

**RESULTS-ORIENTED CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTION PLAN  
(ALIGNED WITH THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY)**

**OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE 1**

**National Biosafety Frameworks:** To further support the development and implementation of national regulatory and administrative systems

| <i>Outcomes</i>   | <i>Indicators</i>   | <i>Results/Outputs</i>  | <i>Activities</i>  |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>National Biosafety Frameworks developed and implemented</p> <p>Functional national biosafety systems</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Parties with operational regulatory frameworks</li> <li>• Number of Parties with functional administrative arrangements</li> </ul> | <p>1.1 Biosafety laws and implementing regulations in place</p> <p>1.2 Institutional structures and administrative (decision-making) arrangements in place to handle LMO applications</p> <p>1.3 Standard operating procedures for handling LMO applications in place</p> <p>1.4 Budgets allocated for the operation of the national biosafety system</p> <p>1.5 Trained permanent staff in place to administer the national biosafety system</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a best practice guide on:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementation of national biosafety frameworks</li> <li>- Enforcement of national biosafety regulatory frameworks</li> <li>- Establishment of administrative frameworks for biosafety</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Development and/or use existing training materials to implement elements of the guide</li> <li>• Organization of international, regional and national workshops on the use of the of best practice guide</li> <li>• Development and/or implementation of an electronic system on:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• handling of notifications</li> <li>• registration of applications and approvals</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Development and/or implementation of guidelines on the use of the electronic system for:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• handling notifications</li> <li>• registration of application and approval</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |



**OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE 2**

**Risk assessment and risk management:** To enable Parties to evaluate, apply, share and carry out risk assessments and establish local science-based capacities to regulate, manage, monitor and control risks of LMOs

| <i>Outcomes</i>  | <i>Indicators</i>  | <i>Results/Outputs</i>  | <i>Activities</i>   |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Resources, including human resources required to assess risks of living modified organisms are available and administrative mechanisms are in place</p> <p>Training materials and technical guidance on risk assessment and risk management developed and used by Parties</p> <p>Infrastructure and administrative mechanisms established for the management of risks of living modified organisms at national, subregional or regional level</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ratio of risk assessment summary reports as against number of decisions on LMOs on the BCH</li> <li>• Number of risk assessment summary reports in the BCH that are in compliance with the Protocol</li> <li>• Number of people trained on risk assessment, as well as in monitoring, management and control of LMOs</li> <li>• Number of Parties that have infrastructure, including laboratories for monitoring, management and control</li> <li>• Number of Parties that are using the developed training materials and technical guidance</li> <li>• Number of Parties that are of the opinion that the training materials and technical guidance are sufficient and effective</li> </ul> | <p>2.1 Strengthened human resources in fields of expertise relevant for RA and RM of LMOs</p> <p>2.2 Broad knowledge base and expertise in risk assessment and risk management</p> <p>2.3 Guidance on risk assessment of LMOs in place</p> <p>2.4 Local experts competently conducting risk assessments (or risk assessment audits) as part of decision-making regarding LMOs</p> <p>2.5 Parties submitting risk assessment summaries to the BCH</p> <p>2.6 Baseline data on biodiversity and agrobiodiversity relevant to risk assessment and risk management available</p> <p>2.7 Strengthened human resources and infrastructure for risk management</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training on risk assessment and risk management and enhancing trainees ability to cooperate and exchange data</li> <li>• Developing guidance documents (e.g., the roadmap) and other relevant documents</li> <li>• Undertaking scientific biosafety research relating to living modified organisms</li> <li>• Handling of confidential business information</li> <li>• Review existing data on biodiversity and agrobiodiversity relevant to RA and RM</li> <li>• Conducting scientific research to acquire needed information on biodiversity and agrobiodiversity (e.g. botanical files, consensus documents, national inventories)</li> <li>• Creating accessible user-friendly databases with important data on biodiversity and agrobiodiversity adaptable to new relevant inputs</li> <li>• Cooperative capacity building on subregional, regional and adjacent country levels, and enhancing pooling of relevant data for specific ecological conditions</li> <li>• Certification of LMO laboratories and training of the technicians</li> <li>• Training of customs officers, phytosanitary officers, and relevant inspectors</li> </ul> |

**OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE 3**

**Handling, transport, packaging and identification:** To develop capacity for handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms

| <i>Outcomes</i>  | <i>Indicators</i>  | <i>Results/Outputs</i>   | <i>Activities</i>   |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Customs/border officials are able to enforce the implementation of the Protocol's requirements related to handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms</p> <p>Personnel are trained and equipped for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of customs officers and laboratory personnel trained</li> <li>• Percentage of Parties that have established or have reliable access to detection laboratories</li> <li>• National and regional laboratories certified with the capacity to detect LMOs</li> <li>• Number of certified laboratories in operation</li> </ul> | <p>3.1 Systems identification of LMOs for established</p> <p>3.2 Local experts able to detect and identify LMOs in shipments</p> <p>3.3 Capacity for identification and detection of LMOs in place</p> | <p><i>Related to establishment of the system</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing and implementing measures for the detection, prevention and management of illegal transboundary movements of LMOs</li> <li>• Training staff of relevant agencies to report findings under article 18.2 and article 25 to the BCH</li> <li>• Developing norms and operational criteria to support the implementation of international rules and standards for sampling and detection to foster mutual recognition of information and results concerning LMO identification within and between the countries</li> <li>• Developing response measures to address situations of non-compliance</li> <li>• Conducting awareness raising and education measures addressing all relevant stakeholders</li> <li>• Conducting audits on operationality and efficacy of the established system</li> </ul> <p><i>Related to the checkpoints</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizing national, (sub)regional, international workshops on LMO documentation and identification requirements for customs and other border control officials</li> <li>• Organizing national, (sub)regional, international workshops on LMO handling, transport, packaging and identification bringing together the relevant governmental and private sector institutions, organisations and stakeholders</li> <li>• Implementing the documentation requirements under article 18.2 of the Protocol</li> <li>• Developing forms, manuals and checklists</li> <li>• Developing curricula on documentation requirements for professional education and training</li> </ul> |

| <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i> | <i>Results/Outputs</i> | <i>Activities</i>   |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|---|
|                 |                   |                        | <p><i>Related to identification and detection systems</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing methodologies and protocols for sampling and identification of LMOs and/or adapting existing validated protocols</li> <li>• Establishing infrastructure for, and training of human resources in, detection of LMOs, including accreditation of laboratories</li> </ul> <p><i>Related to other stakeholders</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting the development of strategies for the management of LMOs during transport, handling and storage</li> <li>• Supporting the development of tools and systems for traceability and labelling of LMOs</li> </ul> |

#### OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE 4

**Liability and Redress: To assist Parties to the Protocol in their efforts to establish and apply the rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage resulting from the transboundary movements of living modified organisms**

| <i>Outcomes</i>   | <i>Indicators</i>  | <i>Results/Outputs</i>  | <i>Activities</i>  |
|---|--|---|--|
| An institutional mechanism or process identified or established to facilitate the implementation of the international rules and procedures on liability and redress at the national level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of eligible Parties that received capacity building support in the area of liability and redress involving living modified organisms</li> <li>• Number of domestic administrative or legal instruments identified, amended or newly enacted that fulfill the objective of the international rules and procedures in the field</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ratification and entry into force of the Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress</li> <li>• Analysis of existing national policies, laws and administrative systems</li> <li>• Competent authorities have the institutional and human resource capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Measurement of adverse effect and determination of significance of the damage</li> <li>○ Establishment of causal links</li> <li>○ Identifying the operator</li> <li>○ Determining appropriate</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of existing national policies, laws and administrative systems to determine the extent to which they address liability and redress for damage resulting from LMOs</li> <li>• Development of guidelines to assist competent authorities in discharging their responsibilities with respect to the Supplementary Protocol</li> <li>• Strengthening the scientific and technical capacity of the competent authorities to evaluate damage, establish causal links and determine appropriate response measures</li> <li>• Establishment of databases and knowledge management systems to facilitate the establishment of baselines and monitoring of the status of biodiversity at genetic, species and ecosystem levels</li> <li>• Strengthening capacity to provide for administrative or judicial review of decisions on response measures to be taken</li> </ul> |

| <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Indicators</i>        | <i>Results/Outputs</i>  | <i>Activities</i>   |
|-----------------|--------------------------|---|---|
|                 | of liability and redress | response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial security provided for in domestic law, as appropriate</li> <li>• Civil liability rules and procedures applied or developed, as appropriate, in relation to damage as defined in the Supplementary Protocol</li> </ul> | by the operator in accordance with Article 5.6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of mechanisms for providing financial security</li> <li>• Compilation and exchange of information on experiences and lessons learned in the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol through the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)</li> </ul> |

**OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE 5**

**Public awareness, education and participation:** To enhance capacity at the national, regional and international levels that would facilitate efforts to raise public awareness, and promote education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs

| <i>Outcomes</i>   | <i>Indicators</i>  | <i>Results/Outputs</i>   | <i>Activities</i>   |
|---|--|--|---|
| Parties have access to guidance and training materials on public awareness, education and participation (PAEP) concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs<br><br>Parties are enabled to promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation in biosafety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of Parties that have in place mechanisms for ensuring public participation in decision-making concerning LMOs</li> <li>• Percentage of Parties that inform their public about existing modalities for participation</li> <li>• Number of Parties that have national websites and searchable archives, national resource centres or sections in existing national libraries dedicated to biosafety materials</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance materials/toolkits developed</li> <li>• Improved mechanisms for PAEP</li> <li>• Better understanding and effective implementation of PAEP at national, regional and international level</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collection of information on legal frameworks and mechanisms put in place and actual experiences on PAEP</li> <li>• Development of a guidance / toolkit for fostering PAEP at key stages of national biosafety processes and for different groups using differentiated methodologies adapted to various actors</li> <li>• Building capacities by e.g. regional / national workshops, on the implementation of the guidance/toolkit in different scenarios, aiming at strengthening or establishing national mechanisms for PAEP and interlinking with complementary international agreement</li> </ul> |

**OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE 6**

**Information sharing:** To ensure that the BCH is easily accessed by all established stakeholders, in particular in developing countries and countries with economies in transition

| <i>Outcomes</i>  | <i>Indicators</i>   | <i>Results/Outputs</i>   | <i>Activities</i>  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Increased access to information in the BCH and sharing of information through the BCH by users in developing countries and countries with economies in transition</p> <p>Tools to facilitate implementation of the Protocol are easily accessible through the BCH</p> <p>Information on the BCH is easily accessible to stakeholders including the general public</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of submissions to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition</li> <li>• Amount of traffic from users to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parties able to post mandatory information on the BCH</li> <li>• Parties, non-Parties and other stakeholders are able to post non-mandatory information to the BCH</li> <li>• Improved coordination and sharing of experiences on the BCH at national, subregional, regional and global levels</li> <li>• Increased awareness and capacity of relevant stakeholders and general public to access information through BCH</li> <li>• Systems for management of biosafety information in place</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing/maintaining national and regional infrastructure for accessing the BCH</li> <li>• Developing national systems for gathering and managing information for submission to the BCH in accordance with the Protocol obligations</li> <li>• Exploring and using, as appropriate, AJAX and Hermes tools for creation of national websites</li> <li>• Organizing BCH capacity-building activities for specific target groups</li> <li>• Utilizing the BCH Regional Advisors network in BCH capacity-building activities</li> <li>• Enhancing cooperation with relevant international organizations to maximize the use of existing experience and expertise and to minimize duplication of activities</li> <li>• Establishing mechanisms for translation of information in the BCH into official national languages and vice versa</li> <li>• Sharing of experience in the use of the BCH during other biosafety activities and meetings</li> <li>• Developing programs to facilitate use of the BCH by other stakeholders</li> <li>• Continuing the BCH capacity-building projects at national, subregional and regional levels (including development of toolkits)</li> <li>• Enhancing and supporting the BCH coordination mechanism at the national level including interministerial and interagency collaboration with other relevant stakeholders</li> </ul> |

**OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE 7**

**Biosafety education and training: To promote education and training of biosafety professionals through greater coordination and collaboration among academic institutions and relevant organizations**

| <i>Outcomes</i>   | <i>Indicators</i>  | <i>Results/Outputs</i>  | <i>Activities</i>   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>A sustainable pool of biosafety professionals with various competencies available at national/ international levels</p> <p>Improved biosafety education and training programmes</p> <p>Increased exchange of information, training materials and staff and students exchange programmes among academic institutions and relevant organizations</p> | <p>Number of academic institutions by region offering biosafety education and training courses and programmes</p> <p>Number of biosafety training materials and online modules available</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved identification of training needs and target audiences</li> <li>• Baseline data on the current situation with regards to education and training related to biosafety</li> <li>• Relevant documentation (including real-life dossiers and full risk assessment reports) made available for biosafety education and education purposes</li> <li>• Compilations of existing biosafety experts, institutions and training and education initiatives are made available</li> <li>• E-learning and distance education and training programs are available</li> <li>• Scientific and professional conferences and workshops support exchange of information and experiences</li> <li>• Biosafety regulators continually trained through on-the-job and off-the-job training programmes</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducting country assessments and stocktaking to ascertain existing expertise unmet training needs and priorities, and identify target audiences</li> <li>• Supporting existing and new national, (sub)regional biosafety education and training initiatives, including continuing education programs</li> <li>• Including biosafety into national education and training priorities and visions</li> <li>• Establish national and (sub)regional coordination mechanisms for education and training in biosafety and sharing experiences and best practices</li> <li>• Developing training materials and guidance manuals</li> <li>• Developing curricula</li> <li>• Developing academic and professional exchange programs for sharing information and expertise in North-South and South-South cooperation</li> <li>• Develop and maintain databases to facilitate the identification of potential North-South and South-South partners</li> <li>• Working with regional and subregional organizations, universities and research institutes</li> </ul> |

**OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVE 8**

**Coordination and support: To put in place effective mechanisms for developing biosafety systems with the necessary coordination, financing and monitoring support**

| <i>Outcomes</i>   | <i>Indicators</i>   | <i>Results/Outputs</i>  | <i>Activities</i>   |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Improved understanding of the capacity-building needs of developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition</p> <p>A cohesive approach and effective mechanisms established for biosafety capacity-building</p> <p>Parties have adequate and predictable financial and technical resources them to implement their Protocol obligations in an integrated and sustainable manner</p> <p>National biosafety capacity-building strategies and action plans by each Party in place and implemented</p> <p>Existing resources and opportunities leveraged and more effectively used</p> <p>Improved coordination and collaboration between Parties and entities implementing or funding biosafety capacity-building efforts</p> <p>Improved coordination and collaboration between LMO importing and exporting Parties</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Parties that have assessed and submitted their capacity-building needs to the BCH</li> <li>• Percentage of the Parties that have developed national biosafety capacity-building action plans for implementing the Protocol</li> <li>• Percentage of the Parties that have in place training programmes for personnel dealing with biosafety issues and for long-term training of biosafety professionals</li> <li>• Percentage of Parties that have in place national coordination mechanisms for biosafety capacity-building initiatives</li> <li>• Amount of new and additional financial resources mobilized for the implementation of the Protocol</li> <li>• Number of Parties that have predictable and reliable funding for strengthening their capacity in implementing the Protocol</li> <li>• Number of Parties reporting that their capacity-building needs have been met</li> <li>• Number of cooperative arrangements reported involving LMO exporting and importing Parties</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short term, medium term and long term capacity building plan including financial requirements.</li> <li>• Documentation of regional resources – financial and institutional expertise</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stock taking of institutional and human capacity for strengthening biosafety management systems</li> <li>• Stock taking of donors support for biosafety capacity building efforts</li> <li>• Raising of awareness of the roster of expert on a regional level, and the need to establish national committees of roster of experts.</li> <li>• Institutional capacity building on preparing national reports on project funding.</li> <li>• Establish effective networking between national LMO detection laboratories</li> </ul> |

-----