



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/Add.2
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 9 of the provisional agenda*

REPORT ON THE USE OF THE ROSTER OF BIOSAFETY EXPERTS

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In its decision BS-IV/4 the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety adopted a number of measures aimed at improving the quality and operations of the roster of biosafety experts and agreed to evaluate its performance at the present meeting.
2. In decision BS-V/4, the Parties to the Protocol requested the Executive Secretary, in preparation for the evaluation of the performance of the roster, to review the experience with the use of the roster, identify the challenges faced and assess future needs, on the basis of the information provided by Parties and other Governments. The Executive Secretary was also requested to propose, as appropriate, amendments to the nomination form based on the operational experience with the roster.
3. The present note provides, in section II, a brief report on the current status of the roster of experts and the voluntary fund for the roster. Section III synthesizes information on the views and experiences of Parties and other Governments on the use of the roster, including the challenges faced and their future need for the roster. Section IV analyses the performance of the roster and proposes measures to improve and maximise its use. The last section presents proposed elements of a possible decision.

II. REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE ROSTER OF EXPERTS AND THE VOLUNTARY FUND FOR THE ROSTER

4. The guidelines for the roster of biosafety experts adopted in decision BS-IV/4 require the Secretariat to provide, at each regular meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, a report on the status and use of the roster, including information on the number of experts on the roster, a breakdown of its composition by region, gender and discipline; and the contacts initiated by Parties to use experts on the

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

roster, directly or through the Secretariat and the results of those contact, including the experts contracted by the requesting Party, a description of the assignment and the results of the work undertaken.

A. *Composition and Use of the Roster of Experts*

5. As of 30 June 2012, the roster contained a total of 129 experts nominated by 38 Parties and 2 non-Parties.¹ The regional breakdown of the composition of the roster is as follows:

<i>Region</i>	<i>No. of Parties and Governments that have made nominations</i>	<i>No. of experts nominated</i>	<i>Percentage of the total number of nominations</i>
Africa	9	23	18%
Asia and the Pacific	8	37	29%
Central and Eastern Europe	8	17	13%
Latin America and the Caribbean	8	34	26%
Western Europe and Others	7	18	14%
TOTAL	40	129	100%

6. The composition of the roster by gender is follows:

<i>Gender</i>	<i>Number of experts</i>	<i>Percentage of total no. of experts</i>
Female	48	37%
Male	81	63%
Total	129	100%

7. The composition of the roster by discipline/main areas of expertise is as follows:

<i>Area of expertise</i>	<i>No. of experts*</i>	<i>% of the total no. of experts in the roster*</i>
1. Scientific and technical expertise		
• Botany, forestry and plant agricultural sciences	46	36%
• Zoology, aquaculture and animal agricultural sciences	7	6%
• Microbial sciences	16	12%
• Human health sciences	7	6%
• Ecological and environmental sciences	9	7%
• Socio-economic sciences	0	0%
• Information and communication technology	1	1%
• Biosafety Clearing-House	7	6%
• Other	4	3%
2. Legal expertise	4	3%
3. Policy and regulatory expertise	5	4%
4. Biosafety systems development and implementation	21	16%

* *Note: some experts indicated multiple areas of expertise.*

¹ Parties which have made nominations are: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Barbados, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, European Union, Ghana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kenya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe. The non-Parties which made nominations are: Australia and the United States of America.

8. From the above data, it is clear that currently the roster of experts is not well balanced in terms of gender composition and the coverage of the different areas of expertise. The majority of experts on the roster (63 per cent) are men. In terms of disciplines/main areas of expertise, most experts (97 experts or 77 per cent) have scientific and technical expertise. Among these, the majority (46 experts or 36 per cent) have background in botany, forestry and plant agricultural sciences, and 16 experts (12 per cent) have background in microbial sciences. So far, the roster has no single expert with background in socio-economic sciences. Approximately 21 per cent of the experts on the roster have expertise in the development and implementation of biosafety systems and about 7 per cent have policy, regulatory and legal expertise.

9. During the current reporting period, the Secretariat did not receive any requests for assistance from Parties or other Governments to identify and/or initiate contact with experts from the roster on their behalf. As well, the Secretariat did not receive information regarding contacts made directly by Parties and other Governments with experts on the roster or reports regarding any assignments carried out by experts the selected from the roster.

B. Status of the Voluntary Fund for the Roster of Experts

10. During the last biennium no Party or other Government made contributions to the voluntary fund for the roster of experts and no new requests for funding from the voluntary fund was received from any developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to pay for the use of experts selected from the roster.

11. The Secretariat received reports on the assignments undertaken with funding from the Voluntary Fund for the Roster of Experts from the two Parties, Cambodia and Uganda, which received the support just before the last meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. The reports are available through the Biosafety Clearing-House.

III. VIEWS AND EXPERIENCES OF PARTIES ON THE ROSTER OF EXPERTS

12. Pursuant to decision BS-V/4, paragraph 4, the Executive Secretary sent out notification 2012-035 on 23 February 2012 inviting Parties and other Governments to submit information regarding their experiences and challenges in nominating to, and using experts from, the roster of experts; a projection of their future need for the use; as well as suggestions for improving the nomination processes and the nomination form. In response, submissions were received from Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Japan, Saint Lucia and Slovak Republic.

13. In their submissions four Parties indicated that to date they have not had any need to use the roster of experts and as such their only has experience with regard to making nominations to the roster. Nevertheless, two Parties noted the roster is a very valuable and user-friendly resource particularly for Parties searching for experts. The system enables one to conduct a simple search using different criteria (e.g. country, main areas of expertise, language spoken etc.) to find an expert.

14. With regard to the procedure for nominations to the roster, however, three Parties noted that process is laborious and not user-friendly. Quite a lot of data needs to be entered for a single record which can be time-consuming. One the three Parties noted some of the information requested on the nomination form (e.g. date and place of birth) may not be necessary for the first contact. In this regard it was suggested that the nomination form be revised to remove detailed and sometimes redundant information to make form clearer and more user-friendly. For example, it was noted that with regard to personal information only the country of birth would suffice and with regard to the present and past employment the start and end year would be enough instead of the exact start and end dates. It was also

suggested to the listing publications produced be limited number to only a few (e.g. up to 20) most important ones in the order of priority.

15. One Party noted that the function in the BCH to regularly save entered data as a draft record is a valuable tool. The notice that associated records need to be created beforehand to be able to connect the information smoothly to the main record of a Roster of Biosafety Expert is similarly important and should also be emphasized in the information to users, who want to avoid loss of entered data during submission due to failure of internet connection or other technical reasons.

16. Another Party suggested that it would be beneficial if the Secretariat informed Parties and other Governments periodically about the composition of the roster and in which areas of expertise is a shortage of experts. This would allow the Parties to adjust their nominations in a way that would address the specific needs at a given time. In addition, it would be helpful if the procedure for nomination of experts could be simplified.

17. One Party noted that the current timeframe of 4 years for confirmation of the records in the Roster is too long as many changes can take place on the expert's side within four years. There is also a possibility that the expert can forget to update his/her record in the roster, especially in the current situation when the roster is not being actively used by Parties. Therefore it is suggested this period be shortened. Sending an automatically generated e-mail reminding the BCH-NFP of the expiration of the record would be a valuable tool to keep the roster updated.

18. In accordance with paragraph 7 of decision BS-V/4, the Executive Secretary has, based on the operational experience and the views received from Parties and other Governments, proposed a revised nomination form for the roster of experts annexed hereto, for consideration by the present meeting.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE PERFORMANCE OF THE ROSTER OF EXPERTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR MAXIMISING ITS USE

19. As noted in section II above, the number of experts nominated to the roster has increased to 129 experts from 87 experts, since the last meeting of the Parties, marking an increase of 48 per cent. As well the number of Parties and other Governments that made nominations to the roster increased from 30 to 40, (or 33 per cent). In terms of nominations, the performance of the roster has been generally good.

20. However, as described in paragraph 9 above, the roster of experts has not been actively used by Parties and other Governments to date. In the submissions made in response to paragraph 4 of decision BS-V/4, all the four developing country Parties and Parties with economies that made submissions indicated that to date they have not had any need to use the roster of experts (see paragraph 13 above).

21. One of the main reasons for the limited use of the roster to date is the lack of funds to enable developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to pay for the using the experts selected from the roster. The voluntary fund for the roster, which was established for this purpose, currently has no money it to support Parties that wish to use the roster.

22. Another possible reason for the limited use of the roster to date could be because many Parties are not yet actively dealing with living modified organisms (LMOs). As noted in the analysis of information contained in the second national reports (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/16), 86 Parties (71 percent of those that responded to the question on this issue), mostly developing country Parties and Parties with economies, reported that they have not received an application/notification regarding import of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment and a similar number reported that they have not taken any decisions on such applications (paragraphs 34 and 35). Also, only 46 Parties (32 percent) reported that they have conducted a risk assessment of an LMO for intentional introduction into the

environment, including: 12% of the respondents from Africa, 26% from Asia and the Pacific, 37 % from Central and Eastern Europe, 33% from Latin America and the Caribbean, 89% from Western Europe and others Group (WEOG), 8% from the least developed countries (LDCs) and 5% from Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Furthermore, most developing country Parties and Parties with economies have national biosafety frameworks still in draft form and only very few have not operational biosafety laws and functional administrative systems to handle LMOs. However, this situation is expected to change and the demand for experts from the roster to assist developing country Parties and Parties with economies to conduct risk assessment and make informed decisions is likely to increase in the coming few years.

23. In order to maximise the use of the roster of experts in the meantime, it may be advisable to expand its mandate beyond providing advice and other support, as appropriate and upon request, to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition *per se*.² In this regard, it is proposed that the experts on the roster also be considered:

(a) To serve on the relevant Ad Hoc Technical Expert Groups (AHTEGs), Informal Advisory Committees (IACs) and other similar groups established under the Protocol;

(b) To serve as resource persons or facilitators of training activities (workshops, courses or interactive online training modules) organised by the Secretariat and other partners;

(c) To act as lead discussants or moderators of relevant online discussion forums and/or online real-time conferences organised under the Protocol; and

(d) To undertake technical activities commissioned by the Secretariat (e.g. conduct of expert studies or reviews or development of training materials), in response to the decisions of the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

24. The meeting of the Parties may wish to expand the mandate of the roster of experts and invite Parties and other Governments to consideration selecting experts on the roster to serve on Ad Hoc Technical Expert Groups (AHTEGs), Informal Advisory Committees (IACs) and other relevant bodies under the Protocol and/or to attend technical meetings under the Protocol. The meeting of the Parties may also wish to invite Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and the Executive Secretary, to consider using experts on the roster as resource persons or facilitators of training workshops or courses and other capacity-building activities for the effective implementation of the Protocol.

V. PROPOSED ELEMENTS OF A DRAFT DECISION

25. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety may wish to:

(a) Take note of the report on the current status and operations of the roster of experts and the voluntary fund for the roster contained in this document (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/Add.2);

(b) Further urge Parties and other Governments that have not yet done so to nominate experts to the roster;

² The Conference of the Parties established the roster of experts nominated by Governments to provide advice and other support, as appropriate and upon request, to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition, to conduct risk assessment, make informed decisions, develop national human resources and promote institutional strengthening, associated with the transboundary movements of living modified organisms (Decision EM-I/3, paragraph 14).

(c) Adopt the revised nomination form for the roster of experts annexed hereto and authorise the Executive Secretary to update the form based on operational experience;

(d) Decide to expand the mandate of the roster of experts to include supporting, as appropriate and upon request, the work of the Secretariat, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and other bodies under the Protocol;

(e) Invite Parties and other Governments to consideration nominating experts on the roster to serve on Ad Hoc Technical Expert Groups (AHTEGs), Informal Advisory Committees (IACs) and other relevant bodies under the Protocol and/or to attend technical meetings under the Protocol;

(f) Invite Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and the Executive Secretary, to consider using experts on the roster as resource persons and/or facilitators of training workshops, courses and other capacity-building activities;

(g) Invite experts on the roster to actively participate in relevant online discussion forums and/or online real-time conferences organised under the Protocol, including as moderators; and

(h) Reiterate its invitation to developed country Parties and other donors to make contributions to the voluntary fund in order to fully operationalize the roster to facilitate the implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol for the period 2011-2020.

Annex

REVISED NOMINATION FORM FOR THE ROSTER OF EXPERTS

Fields/sections marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.

Nominating Government:*	<Country name>
-------------------------	----------------

I. BRIEF PROFILE (150 words)*

II. BASIC PERSONAL INFORMATION*

Please provide full names rather than only acronyms or initials

Title: Ms. Mr. Other: _____
 Professor Dr.

First and Last Name: _____

Employer / Organization: _____

Job Title: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____

Facsimile: _____

Email: _____

Web Site: _____

Year of Birth: _____

Gender: Male Female

Country of Birth: _____

Nationality: _____

Second Nationality: _____

III. DETAILS OF CURRENT EMPLOYMENT*

Name of Employer /Organization/Company:*

Department/Division/Unit:*

Start Date (YYYY):*

Type of Organization:*

Academic or research institute

Private sector (business and industry)

Government agency

Regional economic integration organization

Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO)

UN and other specialized agency of the UN Common System

Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)

Other: _____

Main Areas of Responsibility: *(Briefly describe how your work relates to biosafety and the area(s) of expertise for which you are being nominated)*

IV. EMPLOYMENT HISTORY*

Countries or regions where you have worked:

Please give details of previous employment beginning with the most recent previous employer.

Previous professional experience 1

Name of Employer /Organization/Company:*

Department/Division/Unit:*

Start and End Date (YYYY – YYYY):

Type of Organization:*

Academic/ research institute

Private sector (business and industry)

Government agency

Regional economic integration organization

Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO)

UN and other specialized agency of the UN Common System

Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)

Other: _____

Main Areas of Responsibility and Accomplishments: *(Briefly describe how your work related to biosafety and the area(s) of expertise for which you are being nominated)*

Previous professional experience 2

Name of Employer / Organization:*

Department/Division/Unit:*

Start and End Date (YYYY – YYYY):

Type of Organization:*

- Academic or research institute Private sector (business and industry)
 Government agency Regional economic integration organization
 Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO) UN and other specialized agency of the UN Common System
 Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) Other: _____

Main Areas of Responsibility: *(Briefly describe how your work related to biosafety and the area(s) of expertise for which you are)*

Previous professional experience 3

Name of Employer / Organization:*

Department/Division/Unit:*

Start and End Date (YYYY – YYYY):

Type of Organization:*

- Academic or research institute Private sector (business and industry)
 Government agency Regional economic integration organization
 Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO) UN and other specialized agency of the UN Common System
 Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) Other: _____

Main Areas of Responsibility: *(Briefly describe how your work related to biosafety and the area(s) of expertise for which you are)*

V. EDUCATION

A. Formal Education*

First Degree (e.g. B.Sc. in Microbiology)*

Title of the first Degree or other academic distinction and subject:*	<Text entry>
Name of academic institution:*	<Text entry>
Dates (from / to):*	From <YYYY> to <YYYY>

Second Degree (e.g. M.Sc. in Microbiology)*

Title of the second degree or other academic distinction and subject:*	<Text entry>
Name of academic institution*:	<Text entry>

Dates (from / to):	<i>From <YYYY> to <YYYY></i>
Third Degree (e.g. Ph.D. in Microbiology)	
Title of the third Degree or other academic distinction and subject:	<Text entry>
Name of academic institution:	<Text entry>
Dates (from / to):	<i>From <YYYY> to <YYYY></i>
B. Other professional qualifications	
List a maximum of three other relevant professional qualifications: (<i>e.g. specialized training, certifications obtained, etc.</i>)	a. <Text entry> b. <Text entry> c. <Text entry>

VI. AREAS OF EXPERTISE*

Please select one main area of expertise and up to 3 specific fields in which your academic and professional expertise may assist Parties in implementing the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety:

- Biosafety policy and legal expertise
- Biosafety law
 - Biosafety policy
 - Biotechnology policy
 - Compliance and Enforcement
 - Handling of LMO applications (AIA procedure)
 - Import / Export control
 - Liability and redress
 - Multilateral agreements
- Capacity development expertise
- Institutional capacity development
 - Project design, monitoring and evaluation
 - Resource mobilization
- Information and knowledge management expertise
- Biosafety Clearing-House
 - Biosafety database management
 - Biosafety website development
 - IT network development
- Public awareness, education and participation expertise
- Access to information

<input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety education <input type="checkbox"/> Media communication <input type="checkbox"/> Public awareness-raising <input type="checkbox"/> Public participation <input type="checkbox"/> Risk communication <input type="checkbox"/> Scientific and technical expertise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Food and feed safety <input type="checkbox"/> Human health <input type="checkbox"/> LMO monitoring <input type="checkbox"/> LMO sampling and detection <input type="checkbox"/> Risk assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Risk management <input type="checkbox"/> Socio-economic and trade expertise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Bioethics <input type="checkbox"/> Coexistence <input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual property rights <input type="checkbox"/> Social and/or economic assessments <input type="checkbox"/> Trade rules and standards <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) <Text entry>

VII. PUBLICATIONS	
List your three most important publications related to your main field of expertise:	1. <Text entry> 2. <Text entry> 3. <Text entry>
List other publications (<i>please list up to 20 most relevant citations of peer-reviewed articles, books, book chapters, conference papers and other publications; Attach a separate list of publications if the space provided here is not sufficient</i>):	1. <Text entry> 2. <Text entry> 3. <Text entry> 4. <Text entry> 5. <Text entry> and/or <Attachment>

VIII. AWARDS AND PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS	
Awards received <i>List up to three scientific / professional awards received that are related to your main field of expertise:</i>	1. <Text entry> 2. <Text entry> 3. <Text entry>

X. PROFESSIONAL REFERENCES	
<p>Please indicate <i>at least one but not more than three</i> references with detailed contact information:*</p> <p><i>For each reference please attach a "Contact details" common format(s)*</i></p>	<p>Reference 1:* <Text entry></p> <p>Reference 2: <Text entry></p> <p>Reference 3: <Text entry></p>

XI. ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION
<p><i>Please provide any other information relevant to your role as an expert (max. 300 words)</i></p> <p><Text entry></p>

RECORD VALIDATION	
Date*:	<YYYY-MM-DD>
Country*:	<Country name>
Name of the Cartagena protocol National Focal Point*:	<Text entry>
<i>I hereby confirm the nomination of the above named person to the Roster of Expert and that the information contained in this form is correct.</i>	
Signature of the Cartagena Protocol National Focal Point*:	
Name of the BCH National Focal Point*:	<Text entry>
<i>I hereby agree to the inclusion of the above information in the Biosafety Clearing-House.</i>	
Signature of the BCH National Focal Point*:	
