



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/22  
14 August 2012

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

Sixth meeting

Hyderabad, India, 1-5 October 2012

Item 18 of the provisional agenda\*

### PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION USING THE STRATEGIC PLAN INDICATORS

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

#### INTRODUCTION

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) in its decision BS-V/16 adopted the Strategic Plan of the Protocol and its multi-year programme of work for the period 2011-2020.
2. According to paragraph 11 of annex I to decision BS-V/16, a mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan will take place five years after its adoption. The evaluation will be conducted at the eighth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol in conjunction with the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol. The evaluation process will use the indicators as set out in the Strategic Plan to assess the extent to which the strategic objectives are being achieved. Information for the evaluation is to be drawn mainly from the third national reports submitted by Parties, and from other sources that are relevant and available to generate the data necessary for the analysis.
3. Further, in paragraph 13 of annex I to decision BS-V/16, the Parties to the Protocol state the assumption that a baseline of the status of implementation of the Protocol and global indicators will be established after the second assessment and review at the sixth meeting of the Parties to establish a global picture. The decision further notes that the indicators in the Strategic Plan have been drafted in such a way that they would facilitate measurement of progress against this baseline.
4. In view of the ongoing second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, the Secretariat has conducted a preliminary assessment of the status of implementation of the Protocol based on the 81 indicators of the Strategic Plan. The assessment uses the information contained in the second

\* UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/1.

national reports on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and information available in the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH). The results of this exercise are presented in the table below for the information of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG). The results could also be taken into consideration in the establishment of the baseline against which the implementation of the Strategic Plan will have to be measured.

5. Some of the emerging issues from this preliminary assessment include the following:

(a) Of the 81 indicators established in the Strategic Plan, 20 do not currently have a mechanism for collecting data (25% of the total number of indicators in the Strategic Plan);

(b) Some of the existing data (from second national reports) have been used to respond regarding more than one indicator;

(c) The data for some of the indicators may not be considered as dedicated data sets on which evaluations can be based.

**ASSESSMENT OF THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION BASED ON THE INDICATORS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN OF THE PROTOCOL USING DATA IN THE SECOND NATIONAL REPORTS**

*Data extracted from the second national report (2nd NR) from 143 Parties as of 31 December 2011, when there were 161 Parties to the Protocol; data from other sources current as of April 2012 unless otherwise indicated.*

<b>Focal area 1: Facilitating the establishment and further development of effective biosafety systems for the implementation of the Protocol</b>		
<b>1.1 National Biosafety Frameworks</b>		
1. Number of Parties, in particular centres of origin, that have in place national biosafety legislation and implementing guidelines not more than 6 years after accession to / ratification of the Protocol	<p>54/163 = 33% (Parties)</p> <p>52/143 = 36% (A domestic regulatory framework is fully in place)</p> <p>56/143 = 39% (A domestic regulatory framework is partially in place)</p>	<p>Source BCH: number of Parties having submitted information about enacted laws under “Laws and Regulations”.</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q 15: Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol?</p>

<p>2. Percentage of the Parties that have in place administrative rules and procedures for handling notifications and requests for approval of imports of living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (LMOs-FFP); for contained use and for introduction into the environment</p>	<p>81/143 = 57% (Yes)  96/143 = 67% (Yes)  84/143 = 59% (Yes)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 51: Has your country adopted specific law(s) or regulation(s) for decision-making regarding domestic use, including placing on the market, of LMOs-FFP?  Source 2nd NR - Q 26: Does your country regulate the contained use of LMOs?  Source 2nd NR - Q 29: Has your country adopted law(s) / regulations / administrative measures for the operation of the AIA procedure of the Protocol?</p>
<p>3. Percentage of Parties that have designated national focal points and competent national authorities</p>	<p>162/163 = 99% (NFP); 142/163 = 87% (NFP &amp; CNAs); 20/163 = 12% (NFP but not CNAs)  143/143 = 100% (Yes)  141/143 = 99% (Yes)  42/143 = 29% (Yes, more than one)  93/143 = 65% (Yes, one)</p>	<p>Source BCH: number of Parties having submitted information on NFP and CNAs  Source 2nd NR - Q 116: Has your country designated one national focal point for the Cartagena Protocol to be responsible for liaison with the Secretariat?  Source 2nd NR - Q 117: Has your country designated one national focal point for the Biosafety Clearing-House to liaise with the Secretariat regarding issues of relevance to the development and implementation of the BCH?  Source 2nd NR - Q 118: Has your country designated one or more competent national authorities, which are responsible for performing the administrative functions required by the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and are authorized to act on your country's behalf with respect to those functions?</p>

4. Percentage of Parties that have received notifications in accordance with Article 8 of the Protocol or appropriate domestic legislation	40/143 = 28% (Yes)	Source 2nd NR - Q 37: Has your country ever received an application / notification regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment?
5. Percentage of Parties that have taken import decisions in accordance with Article 10 of the Protocol or appropriate domestic legislation	19/163 = 12% (Parties)  36/122 = 30% (Yes)	Source BCH: number of Parties having submitted information on “Decision on LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment (according Article 10 or domestic regulatory framework)” under “Country's Decision or any other Communication”  Source 2nd NR - Q 38: Has your country ever taken a decision on an application / notification regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment?
<b>1.2 Coordination and support</b>		
6. Number of Parties that have assessed their capacity-building needs, including training and institutional needs, and submitted the information to the BCH not more than 3 years after accession to / ratification of the Protocol	68/143=47% (Yes)  61/143=43% (Yes)	Source 2nd NR - Q 145: During the current reporting period, has your country carried out a capacity-building needs assessment?  Source 2nd NR - Q 56: Has your country indicated its needs for financial and technical assistance and capacity-building in respect of LMOs-FFP?

7. Percentage of the Parties that have developed national biosafety capacity-building action plans for implementing the Protocol	39/142 = 27% (Yes)	Source 2nd NR - Q 148: Has your country developed a capacity-building strategy or action plan?
8. Percentage of the Parties that have in place training programmes for personnel dealing with biosafety issues and for long-term training of biosafety professionals	N/A	Data not available
9. Percentage of Parties that have in place national coordination mechanisms for biosafety capacity-building initiatives	35/41 = 85% (Yes)	Source 2nd NR - Q 121: In case your country has designated more than one competent national authority, has your country established a mechanism for the coordination of their actions prior to taking decisions regarding LMOs?
10. Amount of new and additional financial resources mobilized for the implementation of the Protocol	N/A	Data not available
11. Number of Parties that have predictable and reliable funding for strengthening their capacity in implementing the Protocol	78/141 = 55% (Yes)	Source 2nd NR - Q 17: Has your country established a mechanism for the budgetary allocations of funds for the operation of its national biosafety framework?

<p>12. Number of Parties reporting that their capacity-building needs have been met</p>	<p>18/143 = 13% (No)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 146: Does your country still have capacity-building needs?</p> <p>Of those answering “No”, 14 are from WEOG, 3 from Asia and 1 from Africa. 114 Parties (80% of the respondents to question 146) reported that they still have many capacity-building needs and 11 (8%) have a few.</p>
<p>13. Number of cooperative arrangements reported involving LMO exporting and importing Parties</p>	<p>23/142 = 16% (Yes)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 77: Has your country entered into any bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements?</p>
<p><b>1.3 Risk assessment and risk management</b></p>		
<p>14. Percentage of Parties adopting and using guidance documents on risk assessment and risk management for the purpose of:</p> <p>1. Performing their own risk assessment and risk management;</p> <p>2. Evaluating risk assessment reports submitted by notifiers.</p>	<p>70/140 = 50% (Yes)</p> <p>32/78 = 41% (Always) 4/78 = 5% (In some cases only)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 83: Has your country established guidelines for how to conduct risk assessments prior to taking decisions regarding LMOs?</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q 91: Has your country ever required the exporter to conduct the risk assessment(s)?</p>

<p>15. Percentage of Parties adopting common approaches to risk assessment and risk management</p>	<p>27/118 = 23% (Parties)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 93 and Q 99: further details on the implementation of Articles 15 and 16 (free text). The European Union and its countries were the only to mention a common approach to RA &amp; RM (e.g., <a href="http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/scdocs/doc/1879.pdf">http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/scdocs/doc/1879.pdf</a>)</p>
<p>16. Percentage of Parties that undertake actual risk assessment pursuant to the Protocol</p>	<p>46/142 = 32% (Yes)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 86: Has your country ever conducted a risk assessment of an LMO for intentional introduction into the environment?</p>
<p><b>1.4 LMOs or traits that may have adverse effects</b></p>		
<p>17. Guidance on living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health, developed by Parties and available</p>	<p>0 (No guidance has been developed yet)</p> <p>41/143 = 28% (Yes)</p>	<p>There is an ongoing discussion aiming at identifying LMOs or traits that may have adverse effects.</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q 97: “Has your country cooperated with other Parties with a view to identifying LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity?”</p>

<p>18. Number of Parties that have the capacity to identify, assess and monitor living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking into account risks to human health</p>	<p>35/141 = 25% (Yes) 73/141 = 52% (Yes, to some extent)</p> <p>63/141 = 45% (Yes)</p> <p>71/142 = 50% (Yes)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 34: Does your country have the capacity to detect and identify LMOs?</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q 84: Has your country acquired the necessary domestic capacity to conduct risk assessment?</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q 33: Has your country established a mechanism for monitoring potential effects of LMOs that are released into the environment?</p> <p>No data available about the number of Parties capable of monitoring specific traits that may have adverse effects.</p>
<p><b>1.5 Liability and Redress</b></p>		
<p>19. Entry into force of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety prior to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol</p>	<p>51 Signatures 2 Ratifications</p>	<p>Source BCH;</p> <p>84 Parties have indicated in their report that they have initiated steps towards ratification, acceptance or approval of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol</p>



<p>20. Percentage of Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety having in place national administrative and legal frameworks incorporating rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage caused by living modified organisms</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Data not available</p> <p>The national reports don't cover this specifically, because it is not a requirement at this time. They refer to frameworks in place for the Cartagena Protocol as a whole.</p> <p>The European Union has indicated that its legislation on liability for environmental damage is already fully consistent with the adopted Supplementary Protocol.</p> <p>There are no available statistics of the extent to which this is the case in other countries, even less so when referring to L&amp;R for damage caused by LMOs specifically.</p>
--	------------	---



<p>22. Percentage of Parties that put in place documentation requirements for living modified organisms for contained use and for intentional introduction into the environment</p>	<p>61/143 = 43% (Yes) 32/143 = 22% (Yes, to some extent)</p> <p>60/143 = 42% (Yes) 25/143 = 17% (Yes, to some extent)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 111: Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying LMOs that are destined for contained use clearly identifies them as living modified organisms and specifies any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information, including the name and address of the individual and institution to whom the LMO are consigned?</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q 112: Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying LMOs that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment of the Party of import clearly identifies them as living modified organisms; specifies the identity and relevant traits and/or characteristics, any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information and, as appropriate, the name and address of the importer and exporter; and contains a declaration that the movement is in conformity with the requirements of this Protocol applicable to the exporter?</p>
<p>23. Number of Parties with access to tools that are capable of detecting unauthorized LMOs</p>	<p>35/141 = 25% (Yes) 73/141 = 52% (Yes, to some extent)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 34: Does your country have the capacity to detect and identify LMOs?</p>

<p>24. Number of Parties using guidance developed for the handling, transport and packaging of LMOs</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Data not available</p>
<p><b>1.7 Socioeconomic considerations</b></p>		
<p>25. Number of peer reviewed research papers published, made available and used by Parties in considering socioeconomic impacts of LMOs</p>	<p>159 records</p>	<p>Source BCH: number of records available in the BCH-BIRC (Biosafety Information Resource Centre) on the thematic area “socioeconomic and trade issues”.</p> <p>It is impossible to know how many of these are peer reviewed and how many are used by Parties in considering socioeconomic impacts of LMOs.</p>



28. Number of Parties using guidelines on socioeconomic considerations	N/A	Data not available  (Guidelines referred to are those to be developed as an outcome of the relevant objective. These guidelines have not yet been developed.)
<b>1.8 Transit, contained use, unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures</b>		
29. Percentage of Parties having in place measures to manage LMOs in transit	69/163 = 42% (Parties)  80/143 = 56% (Yes)	Source BCH: number of Parties having submitted information under “Law or Agreement” with “Subject areas” including “Transit”  Source 2nd NR - Q 25: Does your country regulate the transit of LMOs?
30. Percentage of Parties having in place measures for contained use	76/163 = 47% (Parties)  96/143 = 67% (Yes)	Source BCH: number of Parties having submitted information under “Law or Agreement” with “Subject areas” including “Contained Use”  Source 2nd NR - Q 26: Does your country regulate the contained use of LMOs?
31. Percentage of Parties using the guidance to detect occurrence of unintentional releases of living modified organisms and being able to take appropriate response measures	57/163 = 35% (Parties)  80/143 = 56% (Yes)	Source BCH: number of Parties having submitted information under “Law or Agreement” with “Subject areas” including “Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures”  Source 2nd NR - Q 101: Has your country established a mechanism for addressing emergency measures in case of unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs that are likely to have significant adverse effect on biological diversity?

<b>Focal area 2: Capacity-building</b>		
<b>2.1 National Biosafety Frameworks</b>		
<p>32. Number of Parties with operational regulatory frameworks</p>	<p>52/143 = 36% (A domestic regulatory framework is fully in place)</p> <p>56/143 = 39% (A domestic regulatory framework is partially in place)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 15: Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol?</p> <p>25 Parties (17%) have only a draft framework in place, 9 (6%) have only temporary measures and 2 (1%) have no measures at all in place.</p>
<p>33. Number of Parties with functional administrative arrangements</p>	<p>46/137 = 34% (Yes)</p> <p>66/137 = 48% (Yes, to some extent)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 122: Has your country established adequate institutional capacity to enable the competent national authority(ies) to perform the administrative functions required by the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety?</p> <p>25 Parties (18%) reported that they lack such capacity.</p>
<b>2.2 Risk assessment and risk management</b>		
<p>34. Ratio of risk assessment summary reports as against number of decisions on LMOs on the BCH</p>	<p>536/647 = 83% (BCH records)</p>	<p>Source BCH: number of records submitted by Parties under “Country's Decision or any other Communication” with “Subject” including “Decision on LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment (according Article 10 or domestic regulatory framework)” and/or “Decision on LMOs for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11, LMOs-FFPs)” with at least one LMO and a risk assessment summary attached.</p>

35. Number of risk assessment summary reports in the BCH that are in compliance with the Protocol	N/A	Data not available  It is understood that for a risk assessment summary to be “in compliance with the Protocol”, it must summarize a risk assessment that was carried out in a scientifically sound and transparent basis and on a case-by-case manner for each LMO, its intended use and the likely potential receiving environment. Information related to the number of risk assessment summaries in the BCH that comply with these principles is not available.
36. Number of people trained in risk assessment, as well as in monitoring, management and control of LMOs	56/142 = 39% (Yes)	Source 2nd NR - Q 85: Has your country established a mechanism for training national experts to conduct risk assessments?
37. Number of Parties that have infrastructure, including laboratories for monitoring, management and control	56/143 = 39% (Yes)	Source 2nd NR - Q 94(a): Has your country established and maintained appropriate and operational mechanisms, measures and strategies to regulate, manage and control risks identified in risk assessments for LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment?
38. Number of Parties that are using the developed training materials and technical guidance	N/A	Data not available



<p>39. Number of Parties that are of the opinion that the training materials and technical guidance are sufficient and effective</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Data not available</p>
<p><b>2.3 Handling, transport, packaging and identification</b></p>		
<p>40. Number of customs officers and laboratory personnel trained</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Data not available</p>
<p>41. Percentage of Parties that have established or have reliable access to detection laboratories</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Data not available</p>
<p>42. National and regional laboratories certified with the capacity to detect LMOs</p>	<p>32 (records)</p> <p>35/141 = 25% (Yes) 73/141 = 52% (Yes, to some extent)</p>	<p>Source BCH: Number of records submitted under “Biosafety Organization, including Laboratory for detection and identification of LMOs” and stated to be (or include) a laboratory for the detection/ identification of LMOs</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q34: Does your country have the capacity to detect and identify LMOs?</p>
<p>43. Number of certified laboratories in operation</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Data not available</p> <p>The distinction between this indicator and the previous one is very narrow. It is suggested that this indicator be deleted.</p>

<b>2.4 Liability and Redress</b>		
44. Number of eligible Parties that received capacity-building support in the area of liability and redress involving living modified organisms	N/A	Data not available
45. Number of domestic administrative or legal instruments identified, amended or newly enacted that fulfil the objective of the international rules and procedures in the field of liability and redress	N/A	Data not available
<b>2.5 Public awareness, education and participation</b>		
46. 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	64/143 = 45% (Yes) 27/143 = 19% (Yes, to a limited extent)	Source 2nd NR - Q 154: Has your country established a mechanism to consult the public in the decision-making process regarding LMOs?
47. Percentage of Parties that inform their public about existing modalities for participation	N/A	Data not available

<p>48. Number of Parties having in place national websites and searchable archives, national resource centres or sections in existing national libraries dedicated to biosafety educational materials</p>	<p>81/142 = 57% (Yes)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 152: Has your country established a biosafety website?</p>
<p><b>2.6 Information sharing</b></p>		
<p>49. Number of submissions to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition</p>	<p>1,406 / 3,621 = 38.8% (records)</p>	<p>Source BCH: number of BCH records, submitted by non-(WEOG &amp; Japan) countries</p>
<p>50. Amount of traffic from users to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition</p>	<p><i>Year 2010:</i> 50,624 / 126,202 = 40% (Visits) 32,786 / 830,810 = 39% (Unique Visitors)</p> <p><i>Year 2011:</i> 80,184 / 146,493 = 55% (Visits) 47,042 / 87,456 = 54% (Unique Visitors)</p>	<p>Source Google Analytics: number of visits and unique visitors per year from non-(WEOG &amp; Japan) countries</p>
<p><b>2.7 Biosafety education and training</b></p>		
<p>51. Number of academic institutions by region offering biosafety education and training courses and programmes</p>	<p>31 Institutions Africa: 3 Asia-Pacific: 3 CEE: 1 GRULAC: 4 WEOG: 20</p>	<p>Source BCH: total number and breakdown by region of institutions, submitting records about “formal academic training” under “Capacity-building Activities, Projects and Opportunities</p>

<p>52. Number of biosafety training materials and online modules available</p>	<p>106 modules available</p> <p>Risk assessment: 1 (training course)</p> <p>BCH: 96 (Video tutorials 5, Training Materials 91: Using BCH training modules to meet stakeholder needs 1; Stakeholder curricula 8; Training Modules 9; Interactive Modules 2; Case-Studies 27; Ready Reference Guide 14; Discussion Points with answer Key 2; Quiz Questions with Answer keys 3; Operational Handbook 4; Promotional Materials 2; Exercises 1; HERMES BCH Development Tool 16; AJAX BCH Development Tool 2)</p> <p>Art. 18: 1 training module</p> <p>Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress: 8 training modules</p>	<p>Source: BCH</p>
<p><b>Focal area 3: Compliance and review</b></p>		
<p><b>3.1 Compliance with the Protocol</b></p>		
<p>53. Number of Parties that have identified and addressed their non-compliance issues</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Source: Compliance Committee</p>
<p>54. Number of Parties having approved and functional national legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol</p>	<p>52/143=36% (A domestic regulatory framework is fully in place)</p> <p>56/143=39% (A domestic regulatory framework is partially in place)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 15: Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol?</p>

<p>55. Percentage of Parties that have designated all national focal points</p>	<p>159/163 = 97% (CPB-NFPs) 161/163 = 99% (BCH-NFPs) 72/163 = 44% (A17-CPs)</p> <p>142/142 = 100% (Yes)</p> <p>140/143 = 98% (Yes)</p> <p>93/143 = 65% (Yes)</p>	<p>Source BCH</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q 116: Has your country designated one national focal point for the Cartagena Protocol to be responsible for liaison with the Secretariat?</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q 117: Has your country designated one national focal point for the Biosafety Clearing-House to liaise with the Secretariat regarding issues of relevance to the development and implementation of the BCH?</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q 100: Has your country made available to the BCH the relevant details setting out its point of contact for the purposes of receiving notifications under Article 17?</p>
<p>56. Number of Parties having in place a system for handling requests including for Advance Informed Agreement</p>	<p>83/143 = 58% (Parties)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 29: Has your country adopted law(s) / regulations / administrative measures for the operation of the AIA procedure of the Protocol?</p>
<p>57. Percentage of Parties that have published all mandatory information via the BCH</p>	<p>8/163 = 5% (Parties)</p> <p>71/138 = 51% (Parties)</p>	<p>Source BCH: Number of Parties having provided all mandatory information in all the records submitted</p> <p>Source 2nd NR - Q 130: Is the information submitted by your country to the BCH complete and up to date?</p>

58. Number of Parties having in place a monitoring and enforcement system	52/143 = 36% (A domestic regulatory framework is fully in place) 56/143 = 39% (A domestic regulatory framework is partially in place)	Source 2nd NR - Q 15: Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol?
59. Number of national reports received under each reporting cycle	143/161 = 89% (2nd NR) 76/141 = 54% (1st NR) 44/121 = 36% (Interim NR)	Source BCH
60. Number of Parties able to access financial resources to fulfil their obligations under the Protocol	88/143 = 61% (Yes)  86 (Parties)	Source 2nd NR - Q 135: Has your country received external support or benefited from collaborative activities with other Parties in the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety?  Source UNEP: Number of Parties having accessed GEF funds for the preparation of their second national report
<b>3.2 Assessment and review</b>		
61. Number of assessment reports submitted and reviews published	None	Source SCBD
62. Number of Parties modifying their national biosafety frameworks to correspond with amendments to the Protocol adopted to address new challenges	None	Source SCBD: no amendments to the Protocol have been adopted.

<b>Focal area 4: Information sharing</b>		
<b>4.1 BCH effectiveness</b>		
63. Ratio of risk assessment summary reports as against number of decisions on LMOs	536/647 = 83% (BCH records)	Source BCH: number of records submitted by Parties under “Country's Decision or any other Communication” with “Subject” including “Decision on LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment (according Article 10 or domestic regulatory framework)” and/or “Decision on LMOs for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11, LMOs-FFPs)” with at least one LMO and a risk assessment summary attached.
64. Number of publications contained in the Biosafety Information Resource Centre	1,223 (BCH records)	Source BCH: number of records available in the BCH-BIRC
65. Amount of traffic from users to the BCH	<i>Year 2010:</i> 126,202 (Visits) 83,081 (Unique Visitors):  <i>Year 2011:</i> 146,493 (Visit) 87,456 (Unique Visitors)	Source: Google Analytics; total visits and unique visitors per year
66. Number of references to the BCH	289,176 (Links to the BCH): 3,372 (Pages linked to the BCH) 75,100 (Google references to the BCH)	Sources: Google and Google Webmaster Tools; links count = net of cbd.int, chm-cbd.net and biodiv.org
67. Number of countries with focal points registered on the BCH	176/196 = 90% (CPB-NFP) 192/196 = 98% (BCH-NFP) 72/196 = 37% (Art17-CP)	Source BCH
68. Number of countries/regions having published biosafety laws and or regulations on the BCH	155/196 = 79% (Countries)	Source BCH: Number of countries having submitted information under “Laws and Regulations”

<p>69. Number of AIA/domestic decisions available through BCH</p>	<p>903 (BCH records)</p>	<p>Source BCH: number of records submitted by Parties under “Country’s Decision or any other Communication” with “Subject” including “Decision on LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment (according Article 10 or domestic regulatory framework)” and/or “Decision on LMOs for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11, LMOs-FFPs)”</p>
<p>70. Number of users of the BCH requesting improvement on accuracy, completeness or timeliness of information</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Data not available</p>
<p><b>4.2 BCH as a tool for online discussions and conferences</b></p>		
<p>71. Percentage of Parties participating in online discussions and real-time conferences on the BCH</p>	<p>45/163 = 28% (Parties)                      Risk Assessment: 50                      Detection: 18                      Custom Officers: 15                      Socioeconomic: 34                      BCH on BCH: 163                      BCH-IAC: 15                      BCH-UNEP-GEF-II: 23</p>	<p>Source BCH: average and breakdown of participating parties in BCH forums and real-time conferences (2010-2012)</p>
<p>72. Number of participants in online discussions and conferences, their diversity and background</p>	<p>1,166 Participants                      Risk Assessment: 281                      Detection: 34                      Custom Officers: 21                      Socioeconomic: 92                      BCH on BCH: 681                      BCH-IAC: 20                      BCH-UNEP-GEF-II: 37</p>	<p>Source BCH: total number and breakdown participants to BCH forums and real-time conferences (2010-2012)</p>
<p>73. Number of capacity-building activities aimed to increase the transparency, inclusiveness and equity of participation in the BCH</p>	<p>6 thematic areas (Risk assessment, BCH, Detection, Custom officers, Capacity-building, Socioeconomic issues)                       34 discussion groups                       9 real-time conferences (2 rounds)</p>	<p>Source BCH: BCH forums and real-time conferences (2010-2012)</p>



<b>4.3 Information sharing other than through the BCH</b>		
74. Number of events organized in relation to biosafety	114 seminars, and 167 workshops	Source BCH
75. Number of biosafety related publications shared	1,223 (BCH records)	Source BCH: number of records available in the BCH-BIRC
<b>Focal area 5: Outreach and cooperation</b>		
<b>5.1 Ratification of the Protocol</b>		
76. Percentage of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity that become Parties to the Protocol	161/193 = 83% (Parties)	Source BCH; Data as of 31 December 2011. Two additional CBD Parties, Uruguay and Bahrain, to become Parties to the Protocol on 31 January 2012 and 7 May 2012 respectively.
<b>5.2 Cooperation</b>		
77. Number of established relationships with other conventions as reflected in joint activities	N/A	Data not available
<b>5.3 Communication and outreach</b>		
78. Number of national awareness and outreach programmes on biosafety	165 (BCH records)	Source BCH: number of BCH records obtained by searching information on "Capacity-building" with "Awareness" as a keyword
79. Percentage of Parties that have in place national communication strategies on biosafety not later than 3 years after having adopted national biosafety laws	N/A	Data not available

<p>80. Percentage of Parties that have in place national biosafety websites, including national BCH nodes that are accessible to and searchable by the public</p>	<p>81/142 = 57% (Yes)</p>	<p>Source 2nd NR - Q 152: Has your country established a biosafety website?</p>
<p>81. Number of Parties with awareness and educational materials on biosafety and the Protocol available and accessible to the public, including the diversity of these materials</p>	<p>N/A 110 (BCH records)</p>	<p>Data not available Source BCH: number of records available in the BCH-BIRC on thematic area: "Public awareness, education and participation".</p>

-----