



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/18
21 November 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

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

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION	4
I. Organizational matters	5
ITEM 1. Opening of the meeting.....	5
1.1. Opening statement by Mr. Masamichi Saigo, speaking on behalf of the outgoing President of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.....	5
1.2. Opening statement by Ms. Jayanthi Natarajan, Minister of Environment and Forests of the Government of India and incoming President of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the parties to the Protocol.....	6
1.3. Opening statement by Mr. Braulio Ferreira De Souza Dias, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity	7
1.4. Opening statement by Mr. Bakary Kante on behalf of Mr. achim steiner, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme	7
1.5. Opening statement by Mr. E.S.L. Narasimhan, governor of Andhra Pradesh.....	8
1.6. Opening statement by Mr. Tishya Chatterjee, Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Forests of the Government of India	8
1.7. Opening statements by parties and observers	8
ITEM 2. Organization of the meeting	9
2.1. Officers	9
	/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a C-Neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

2.2.	Adoption of the agenda.....	9
2.3.	Organization of work.....	11
ITEM 3.	Report on the credentials of representatives to the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on Biosafety.....	11
II.	Standing items.....	12
ITEM 4.	Report of the Compliance Committee	12
ITEM 5.	Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House	14
ITEM 6.	Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources	15
ITEM 7.	Cooperation with other organizations, Conventions and initiatives.....	17
ITEM 8.	Report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Protocol and on budgetary matters.....	18
III.	Substantive issues arising from the programme of work and previous decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	19
ITEM 9.	Status of capacity-building activities and the use of the roster of biosafety experts.....	19
ITEM 10.	Handling, transport, packaging and identification (Article 18).....	21
10.1	Article 18, paragraphs 2 (b) and (c).....	21
10.2	Article 18, paragraph 3	21
ITEM 11.	Notification requirements (Article 8)	22
ITEM 12.	Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	23
ITEM 13.	Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (Article 17)	24
ITEM 14.	Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16).....	25
ITEM 15.	Subsidiary bodies (Article 30).....	27
ITEM 16.	Socio-economic considerations (Article 26)	27
ITEM 17.	Monitoring and reporting (Article 33).....	28
ITEM 18.	Second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 35)	29
IV.	Final matters	30
ITEM 19.	Other matters.....	30
ITEM 20.	Date and venue of the seventh meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety	30
ITEM 21.	Adoption of the report	31

ITEM 22. Closure of the meeting..... 31

INTRODUCTION

A. *Background*

1. Following the offer made by the Government of India, which was welcomed by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in decision X/46, the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was held at the Hyderabad International Convention Centre, Hyderabad, India, from 1 to 5 October 2012, back-to-back with the eleventh ordinary meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, which was held at the same venue from 8 to 19 October 2012.

B. *Attendance*

2. All States were invited to participate in the meeting. The following Parties to the Protocol attended: Antigua and Barbuda; Armenia; Austria; Bahrain; Bangladesh; Belarus; Belgium; Benin; Bhutan; Bolivia (Plurinational State of); Botswana; Brazil; Burundi; Cambodia; Cameroon; Central African Republic; Chad; China; Colombia; Comoros; Congo; Costa Rica; Croatia; Cuba; Cyprus; Czech Republic; Democratic People's Republic of Korea; Democratic Republic of the Congo; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Ecuador; Egypt; Ethiopia; European Union; Fiji; Finland; France; Georgia; Germany; Ghana; Grenada; Guatemala; Guinea; Guinea-Bissau; Guyana; Honduras; Hungary; India; Indonesia; Ireland; Italy; Japan; Jordan; Kenya; Kiribati; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Lesotho; Liberia; Libya; Lithuania; Madagascar; Malaysia; Maldives; Mali; Mauritania; Mexico; Mongolia; Morocco; Mozambique; Namibia; Nauru; Netherlands; New Zealand; Nicaragua; Niger; Nigeria; Norway; Oman; Pakistan; Panama; Paraguay; Peru; Philippines; Poland; Portugal; Qatar; Republic of Korea; Republic of Moldova; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saudi Arabia; Senegal; Serbia; Seychelles; Slovakia; Solomon Islands; Somalia; South Africa; Spain; Sri Lanka; Sudan; Swaziland; Sweden; Switzerland; Tajikistan; Thailand; Togo; Tonga; Trinidad and Tobago; Tunisia; Turkey; Uganda; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United Republic of Tanzania; Uruguay; Viet Nam; Yemen; Zambia; Zimbabwe.

3. The following States not party to the Protocol were also represented: Argentina; Canada; Haiti; Iraq; Kuwait; United States of America.

4. Observers from the following United Nations bodies, Secretariat units, specialized agencies and related organizations also attended: Global Environment Facility; International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat (FAO/IPPC); United Nations Development Programme – Equator Initiative; United Nations Environment Programme; World Trade Organization.

5. The following other organizations were represented: African Biosafety Network of Expertise; African Centre for Biosafety; African Union; Andhra Pradesh Biodiversity Board; Andhra Pradesh Department of Tourism; Andhra Pradesh General Administration Department; Andhra Pradesh National Green Corps; Andhra Pradesh State; Andhra Pradesh State Biodiversity Board; Aranya Agricultural Alternatives; Asociación Desarrollo Medio Ambiental Sustentable; Biotechnology Coalition of the Philippines; Bombay Natural History Society; Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University; CBD Alliance; CBD Alliance Kalpavriksh; Center for Biodiversity Studies; Centre for Environment Education; Centre for International Sustainable Development Law; Centre for Sustainable Agriculture; Centre for World Solidarity; Climate Leaders India Network; College of the Atlantic; Commission des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale; Communication, Education and Public Awareness Japan; Congress Corporation; C.P.R. Environmental Education Centre; CropLife International; CropLife International Compact Executive Committee; Dr Panjabrao Deshmukh Agricultural University; Econexus; ECOROPA; European Network of Scientists for Social Environmental Responsibility; Franciscans

International; Genøk-Centre for Biosafety; Geoecology Energy Organisation; Geo-ecology Energy Organization (India); Global Industry Coalition; Go4BioDiv-International Youth Forum; Godavari Institute of Engineering and Technology; Government of Andhra Pradesh Environment, Forest, Science and Technology Department; Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation; Greenpeace International; Institute for International Trade Negotiations; Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture; International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-arid Tropics; International Food Policy Research Institute; International Grain Trade Coalition; International Life Sciences Research Foundation; International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications; International University Network on Cultural and Biological Diversity; ISAAA Afri Center; Japan Citizens' Network for Planet Diversity; Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development; Osmania University; PAN Asia and the Pacific; PRACISIS; Public Research and Regulation Initiative; RAEIN-Africa; Salim Ali Centre for Ornithology and Natural History; Sociedad Peruana de Derecho Ambiental; South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme; Southeast Asia Regional Initiatives for Community Empowerment; Terra de Direitos; Third World Network; University of Bremen; University of Canterbury; Washington Biotechnology Action Council/49th Parallel Biotechnology Consortium; WWF International; Youth for Action.

I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

6. The sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was opened at 10 a.m. on 1 October 2012.

7. At the opening session, statements were made by Mr. Masamichi Saigo, on behalf of the outgoing President of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol; Ms. Jayanthi Natarajan, Minister of Environment and Forests of the Government of India and incoming President of the Conference of the Parties; Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity; Mr. Bakary Kante, on behalf of Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); Mr. E.S.L. Narasimhan, Governor of Andhra Pradesh; and Mr. Tishya Chatterjee, Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Forests of the Government of India.

1.1. Opening statement by Mr. Masamichi Saigo, speaking on behalf of the outgoing President of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol

8. Speaking on behalf of the outgoing President of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, Mr. Saigo, Deputy Director General of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of the Government of Japan, said that key decisions taken at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety included the adoption of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress; the adoption of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020; a request for the establishment of online forums to facilitate exchange of information and experiences on the implementation of the programme of work; and a call for information on the implementation of the Protocol to be collected and analysed with a view to facilitating the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol. Intersessional work had been conducted on issues such as risk assessment and risk management, documentation and identification of living modified organisms, the Biosafety Clearing-House, and implementation of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress. Public awareness-raising, education and training on living modified organisms had

been identified as crucial areas of work. The work accomplished would serve as a basis for deliberations and for decisions to be adopted by the current meeting.

9. In conclusion, he recalled that the rules of procedure for meetings of the Conference of the Parties provided that the Presidency of the Conference of the Parties began at the commencement of the first session of each ordinary meeting of the Conference of the Parties and continued until the commencement of the next ordinary meeting. For that reason, Japan still held the presidency of the Conference of the Parties and thus also the President of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. It had, however, become a customary practice for international meetings to be conducted by the host country. The Japanese delegation was honoured to cede the chairmanship to the Indian hosts of the meeting, whom he wished much success for the current meeting and over the subsequent years. He invited Ms. Jayanthi Natarajan, Minister of Environment and Forests of the Government of India, to take over the proceedings.

1.2. Opening statement by Ms. Jayanthi Natarajan, Minister of Environment and Forests of the Government of India and incoming President of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol

10. Welcoming those present, Ms. Natarajan said that her Government was honoured to host the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The meeting would provide a unique opportunity to respond to the global challenge of preserving biological diversity and to address sustainable development for present and future generations.

11. Balancing the use of living modified organisms with the protection of the environment and human health was not straightforward, but progress had been made since the signing of the Cartagena Protocol in 2000. Following the adoption of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol in 2010, greater consideration had been given to liability and redress within biosafety regulations. However, it was important to ensure that response measures did not become a barrier to innovation. As a megadiverse country that invested heavily in biotechnology, India was committed to implementing the Protocol and had initiated the process of ratifying the Supplementary Protocol. She urged other States Parties to expedite ratification of the Supplementary Protocol.

12. Given the divergent views on the long-term impact of living modified organisms on biodiversity, human health and socio-economics, methodologies for assessing the potential benefits and adverse effects of such organisms should be developed taking into account the diversity of needs and priorities of the countries concerned.

13. Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol was slow and compliance inconsistent; the adoption of the Strategic Plan for the period 2011–2020 should help to resolve those issues, and the task of the Parties was to take that process forward. The main barrier to implementation was a lack of capacity and resources, as an increasing number of countries had begun to integrate biotechnology into their development efforts. International agencies had played a key role in building capacity with regard to regulation, biosafety assessment and policy-making, but greater cooperation between States Parties was required. Certain developing countries had acquired considerable expertise in implementing biosafety regulatory regimes, and investment in biotechnology was rapidly increasing in the Asia-Pacific region. Further information-sharing and biosafety research were essential in order to ensure that innovation in that area was balanced with science-based regulation and compliance with internationally accepted biosafety standards and protocols.

14. Discussions over the coming days would review the progress made since the previous meeting and help resolve outstanding issues, including risk assessment and risk management of living modified

organisms, which would ultimately facilitate effective implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the early entry into force of the Supplementary Protocol. She informed the meeting that, at some sessions, she would be represented as President by Mr. M.F. Farooqui, Special Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India. In closing, she reiterated India's commitment to contributing to the global conservation and development agenda in its capacity as President of the Conference of the Parties and wished the meeting every success in its deliberations.

1.3. *Opening statement by Mr. Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity*

15. Welcoming participants to the meeting, Mr. Dias said that, since the last meeting of the Parties, Bahrain, Morocco and Uruguay had become Parties to the Protocol, and Jamaica had recently ratified it, bringing the total number of Parties to 164. Furthermore, the Czech Republic, Latvia and Mexico had ratified the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress, and a number of other countries were in the process of doing so. Paying tribute to the outgoing President and his deputy, Mr. Dias expressed his appreciation for the leadership shown by Japan over the past two years. He also commended the work of the Government of India in planning and preparing for the current meeting and in hosting a number of meetings under the Convention and the Protocol during the intersessional period.

16. With regard to the agenda for the current meeting, he drew attention to the revised and expanded Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms, which was now before the Parties for use in their national implementation of the Protocol. The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management had also proposed that further work be undertaken to develop guidance on a number of new topics, and he had no doubt that the Parties would consider those suggestions carefully at the current meeting. On socio-economic considerations, he said that the results of intersessional work on the subject indicated that it was an area of great interest for many countries, but one in which they were struggling in terms of understanding and implementation. They would benefit from discussions at the international level. He expressed both his gratification at the high rate of submission of second national reports under the Protocol and his appreciation to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and UNEP for their supportive role in that respect. He hoped that such support could be counted upon in the future. Turning to the second assessment and review of the Protocol, he said that it appeared that many Parties remained at a relatively early stage in the implementation of their national biosafety frameworks. The Compliance Committee had noted that the overall level of compliance with the obligation to put in place the measures necessary for the implementation of the Protocol continued to fall short of expectations. In conclusion, he congratulated Parties on the progress made since the entry into force of the Protocol and urged them to maintain their efforts, as part of a common resolve for sustainable development.

1.4. *Opening statement by Mr. Bakary Kante on behalf of Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme*

17. Speaking on behalf of Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of UNEP, Mr. Kante expressed appreciation to the Government of India for hosting the meeting. There were wide-ranging views on the issue of living modified organisms, and it was vital that developing countries had the skills and capacity required to choose their own paths with regard to such technologies. UNEP provided much support in that area. Although countries that imported living modified organisms were often the most vulnerable to the impacts of such organisms, many of them had yet to implement their national biosafety frameworks, particularly developing countries and countries with economies in transition. However, it was important to note that significant progress had been made in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol through the development and use of legal, administrative and institutional measures and an increase in human resources for biosafety issues. The full impact of implementation would only be known when all

countries had the necessary human resources and institutional capacity to implement the Protocol fully, and UNEP stood ready to provide assistance in that regard.

18. As part of the joint UNEP–GEF Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH-II Global Project), a number of activities had been carried out, including 90 training workshops involving Parties, stakeholders and civil society. UNEP had focused on the implementation of decision BS-V/16 and, in accordance with decision BS-V/2, had drafted a report and guidance on the Biosafety Clearing-House project. UNEP had also provided support in the second national reporting process to countries eligible for GEF funding in Africa, Asia and Latin America through the development and provision of presentations, toolkits and guidance on the national reporting process. As a result, between 110 and 120 eligible countries had uploaded their national reports. He urged Parties to take steps to ratify the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Protocol on Liability and Redress and to continue to build capacities and strengthen the implementation of the Protocol. There had been many achievements in the decade since the signing of the Cartagena Protocol, but it remained a work in progress. He expressed appreciation for the work, support and leadership of the outgoing President of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

1.5. Opening statement by Mr. E.S.L. Narasimhan, Governor of the State of Andhra Pradesh

19. Mr. E.S.L. Narasimhan, Governor of the State of Andhra Pradesh, welcomed participants to Hyderabad and said that the State of Andhra Pradesh was privileged to host the sixth meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. He quoted a benediction from the Vedas and said that deliberations at the present meeting would address the concerns and tap the collective wisdom of all continents. The present generation had witnessed a quantum movement that had changed life for the better. However, that prosperity was due to the bounty of Mother Nature, whose gifts were the common heritage of all life forms and of humanity's past, present and future; it did not belong to any one species or generation. A habitat robbed of its richness of life forms, some of which faced extinction, was not a safe and sustainable abode for life. There was a need to use biotechnology wisely. Andhra Pradesh had the technological resources to help address the challenges being faced by the world.

1.6. Opening statement by Mr. Tishya Chatterjee, Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Forests of the Government of India

20. Mr. Chatterjee, Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, said that Ms. Natarajan had testified to the Governments of India's commitment to steering the global agenda on biodiversity. He conveyed the thanks of the Government of India to the Executive Secretary for his commitment to supporting multilateral cooperation. He also welcomed the contribution of UNEP and other donors in providing financial support and assisting developing countries in their efforts to meet their obligations under the Protocol. He thanked the Governor and people of the State of Andhra Pradesh for their support in hosting the present meeting in Hyderabad. He also thanked his colleague Mr. M.F. Farooqui, Special Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Mr. Hem Pande, Joint Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, the members of the organizing committee and those who had provided logistical support for their hard work in making the meeting possible.

1.7. Opening statements by Parties and observers

21. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, general statements were made by representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Grenada (on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean countries), Japan, Kenya, Liberia (on behalf of the African Group), Saudi Arabia, Serbia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern Europe Group), the United States of America and Uruguay.

22. The speakers expressed gratitude to the Government of India for hosting the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, and special thanks were extended for the efficiency with which visas had been issued.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

2.1. *Officers*

23. In accordance with Article 29, paragraph 3, of the Protocol, the current Bureau of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention served as the Bureau for the meeting. The meeting was also informed that, at its tenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention had elected a representative of Argentina, a non-Party to the Protocol, as a member of the Bureau. In accordance with Article 29, Mr. Reynaldo Ariel Alvarez-Morales (Mexico) would substitute for the representative of Argentina in the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

24. On the proposal of the Bureau, it was agreed that Ms. Kauna Betty Schroder (Namibia), a Vice-President of the Bureau, should serve as Rapporteur for the meeting.

25. The meeting was chaired by Mr. M.F. Farooqui (India) representing the incoming President of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

2.2. *Adoption of the agenda*

26. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 1 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted the following agenda, amended on the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Executive Secretary in consultation with the Bureau (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/1):

I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organization of the meeting:
 - 2.1 Officers;
 - 2.2 Adoption of the agenda;
 - 2.3 Organization of work.
3. Report on the credentials of representatives to the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

II. STANDING ISSUES

4. Report of the Compliance Committee.
5. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House.
6. Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources.

7. Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives.
8. Report of the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Protocol and on budgetary matters.

III. SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES ARISING FROM THE PROGRAMME OF WORK AND PREVIOUS DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

9. Status of capacity-building activities and the use of the roster of biosafety experts.
10. Handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms (Article 18):
 - 10.1 Article 18, paragraphs 2 (b) and (c);
 - 10.2 Article 18, paragraph 3.
11. Notification requirements (Article 8).
12. Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.
13. Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (Article 17).
14. Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16).
15. Subsidiary bodies (Article 30).
16. Socio-economic considerations (Article 26).
17. Monitoring and reporting (Article 33).
18. Assessment and review (Article 35).

IV. FINAL MATTERS

19. Other matters.
20. Date and venue of the seventh meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.
21. Adoption of the report.
22. Closure of the meeting.

2.3. *Organization of work*

27. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 1 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol approved the organization of the work of the meeting on the basis of the proposals contained in annex I to the revised annotations to the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/1/Add.1/Rev.1). Following the suggestion made by the Bureau, the plenary agreed to move item 16 on socio-economic considerations from Working Group II to Working Group I.

28. Accordingly, the meeting established two working groups: Working Group I, under the chairmanship of Ms. Ines Verleye (Belgium) to consider agenda items 4 (Report of the Compliance Committee), 10 (Handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms (Article 18)), 11 (Notification requirements (Article 8)), 12 (Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress), 13 (Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures (Article 17)), 15 (Subsidiary bodies (Article 30)), and 16 (Socio-economic considerations (Article 26)); and Working Group II, under the chairmanship of Mr. Spencer Thomas (Grenada), to consider agenda items 5 (Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House), 6 (Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources), 9 (Status of capacity-building activities and the use of the roster of biosafety experts), 14 (Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16)), 17 (Monitoring and reporting (Article 33)) and 18 (Assessment and review (Article 35)).

29. Working Group I held seven meetings from 1 to 5 October 2012. It adopted its report (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/WG.1/L.1), as orally amended, at its 7th meeting, on 5 October 2012.

30. Working Group II held seven meetings from 1 to 4 October 2012. It adopted its report (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/WG.2/L.1) at its 7th meeting, on 4 October 2012.

31. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 3 October 2012, progress reports were presented by the Chairs of Working Groups I and II.

32. The final reports of the working groups (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.1/Add.1 and 2) were presented to the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, with a view to their inclusion in the final report of the meeting under the relevant agenda items.

ITEM 3. REPORT ON THE CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

33. Agenda item 3 was taken up at the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 1 October 2012. The President drew attention to rule 19 of the rules of procedure of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, according to which the Bureau was to examine the credentials of representatives to the meeting and submit a report thereon to the plenary for appropriate decision. Pursuant to that requirement, the Bureau had designated Ms. Snežana Prokić (Serbia), a Vice-President of the Bureau, to examine and report on the credentials of representatives. He urged delegations that had not submitted their credentials to do so as soon as possible during the course of the day.

34. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 3 October 2012, Ms. Prokić informed the meeting that 116 Parties to the Protocol were registered as attending the meeting. The credentials of 85 delegations had been found to be in full compliance with the provisions of rule 18 of the rules of procedure. In keeping with past practice, the 31 delegations who had not yet fully complied with the

provisions of rule 18 had been requested to provide the Executive Secretary with their credentials in good order by 10 a.m. on 4 October 2012, so that they could be reviewed by the Bureau.

35. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, Ms. Prokić informed the meeting that 120 Parties to the Protocol were now registered as attending the meeting. Pursuant to rule 19 of the rules of procedure, the Bureau had examined the credentials of the representatives of 98 delegations, 91 of which had been found to be in full compliance with the provisions of rule 18. The credentials of seven delegations were not in full compliance with those provisions, and a further 19 delegations had not submitted their credentials. In keeping with past practice, the 26 delegations concerned were requested to sign a declaration to the effect that they would provide the Executive Secretary with their credentials, in good order, within 30 days of the closure of the meeting, and no later than 5 November 2012, so that they could be reviewed by the Bureau.

36. The President expressed the hope that all the delegations that had been requested to provide their credentials to the Executive Secretary would do so no later than 5 November 2012.

37. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol took note of the report on the credentials of representatives.

II. STANDING ITEMS

ITEM 4. REPORT OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

38. Agenda item 4 was taken up at the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 1 October 2012. In considering the item, the meeting had before it the report of the Compliance Committee on the work of its eighth and ninth meetings, including a recommendation to the meeting of the Parties (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/2).

39. Mr. Jürg Bally, Chair of the Compliance Committee, outlined the issues considered by the Committee at its eighth and ninth meetings, as set forth in its report. He reported that the Committee, after having reviewed the outcomes of the fifth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, and in line with decision BS-V/1, had adopted, at its eighth meeting, a work plan that enhanced its supportive role in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. The Committee would organize its future work in line with the four-year reporting cycle, taking into account priority areas set by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol for each cycle. Thus, it would focus on issues prioritized by the Parties themselves, while making best use of limited resources. At its ninth meeting, the Committee had reviewed the analysis conducted by the Secretariat on the basis of information obtained from the second national reports. He reported that the Committee had sent letters to six Parties that had not yet submitted any national report, enquiring about the reasons and offering assistance. Significant implementation gaps persisted in the establishment of legal, administrative and other measures necessary for the implementation of the Protocol, the sharing of information through the Biosafety Clearing-House, and the promotion of public awareness and participation.

40. The President invited the meeting to take note of the report of the Compliance Committee and said that recommendations 1 to 5 (agenda item 4) would be considered by Working Group I, while the remaining recommendations would be considered by Working Group II under the relevant agenda items.

41. Following its introduction at the opening plenary session of the meeting, agenda item 4 was taken up by Working Group I at its 1st meeting, on 1 October 2012. The Chair of Working Group I reminded the delegates that the Group was required to consider the first five recommendations of the Compliance Committee, as contained in its report.

42. Statements were made by the representatives of Colombia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Mexico, Oman and Uganda.

43. The Chair of the Compliance Committee replied to questions by the Working Group regarding the Committee's recommendations.

44. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Chair of Working Group I said that she would prepare a draft text for consideration by the Working Group, taking into account the views expressed and the recommendations contained in the report of the Compliance Committee.

45. At its 3rd meeting, on 2 October 2012, Working Group I took up a draft decision on the first five recommendations from the report of the Compliance Committee, submitted by the Chair of the Working Group.

46. Statements were made by the representatives of Colombia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), India, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group) and Uganda.

47. The Working Group approved the draft decision on the first five recommendations from the report of the Compliance Committee, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.2.

48. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.2 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/1. The text of the decision is given in the annex to the present report.

Election of members of the Compliance Committee

49. At the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 1 October 2012, the President drew attention to the need to elect ten new members to the Compliance Committee (two from each of the five regions) in order to replace those members whose term was due to expire at the end of 2012.

50. The President invited each region to nominate two people to serve on the Committee from the beginning of 2013. He reminded the meeting that outgoing members who had served two terms of office were not eligible for re-election.

51. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 3 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol received, from some of the regional groups, nominations for membership in the Compliance Committee to replace, as appropriate, those whose term expired by the end of 2012.

52. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol received, from the remaining regional groups, nominations for membership in the Compliance Committee. The meeting then elected by acclamation the following nominees to serve as members of the Compliance Committee from the beginning of 2013: (a) Africa group: Mr. Johansen Voker (Liberia) and Ms. Kaouthar Tliche Aloui (Tunisia); (b) Asia and the Pacific: Mr. Rai S. Rana (India) and Mr. Bampot Napompeth (Thailand); (c) Central and Eastern Europe group (CEE): Ms. Dubravka Stepić (Croatia) and Ms. Angela Lozon (Republic of Moldova); (d) Group of Latin American and Caribbean countries (GRULAC): Ms. Jimena Nieto (Colombia) and Mr. Hector Conde Almeida (Cuba); (e) Western European and Others Group (WEOG): Mr. Geoff Ridley (New Zealand) and Mr. Ruben Dekker (Netherlands).

ITEM 5. OPERATION AND ACTIVITIES OF THE BIOSAFETY CLEARING-HOUSE

53. Agenda item 5 was taken up by Working Group II at its 1st meeting, on 1 October 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on progress made in implementing the Biosafety Clearing-House (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/3). It also had before it, as an information document, a report on the two intersessional meetings held by the Biosafety Clearing-House Informal Advisory Committee (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/1).

54. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat drew attention to the information contained in the note by the Executive Secretary. Section II of the note contained a progress report on information-sharing objectives under the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020, while Section III provided a preliminary assessment of the Biosafety Clearing-House, based on information from the second national reports and using indicators from the Strategic Plan. Section IV contained a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group. The annex to the document contained a breakdown of records submitted to the Biosafety Clearing-House, bar charts produced from the information in the second national reports and a preliminary assessment of indicators in the Strategic Plan of relevance to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

55. Statements were made by the representatives of Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Colombia, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Fiji, India, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Niger, Nigeria, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, Sudan and Togo.

56. A statement was also made by the representative of UNEP.

57. A further statement was made by the representative of the Public Research and Regulation Initiative.

58. The Chair said that he would prepare a draft decision, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

59. At its 4th meeting, on 3 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on the operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House, submitted by the Chair. Statements were made by the representatives of Benin, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Grenada, Malaysia, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

60. A statement was also made by the representative of GEF.

61. The Working Group resumed its consideration of the draft decision at its 5th meeting, on 3 October 2012. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil and Paraguay.

62. The Working Group continued its consideration of the draft decision at its 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012. Statements were made by the representatives of Benin, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Ghana and Nigeria.

63. Following the exchange of views, the Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.6.

64. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered the draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.6 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/2. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 6. MATTERS RELATED TO THE FINANCIAL MECHANISM AND RESOURCES

65. Agenda item 6 was taken up at the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 1 October 2012. In considering the item, the meeting had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/4). It also had before it the report by the GEF to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/8).

66. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat drew attention to the note by the Executive Secretary. Section II of the document provided a brief report on the status of the GEF response to the guidance from the Conference of the Parties contained in paragraph 20 of decision X/25 and on the experience of Parties in accessing funding from GEF. Section III discussed the funding requirements and programme priorities for the sixth GEF replenishment period (2014–2018). Section IV reviewed the status of countries that had received GEF funding before becoming parties to the Protocol, and section V discussed possible means of mobilizing additional resources for the implementation of the Protocol.

67. A representative of GEF reported on the support provided for implementation of the Protocol. During the first two years of the fifth GEF replenishment period (GEF-5), GEF support had focused on helping countries to produce their second national reports through three global umbrella projects implemented by UNEP. Those three projects were designed to provide timely support to 123 Parties eligible for GEF funding. A total of 110 Parties, or 89 per cent, had presented their national reports as a result of that support. GEF fully understood the request for an extension of the BCH-II Global Project and would consider it once an independent evaluation of that project had been conducted. GEF had continued to implement all previous guidance to the financial mechanism through the third objective of the GEF-5 Biodiversity Strategy, which focused on biosafety capacity-building. That objective had an estimated allocation of US \$40 million under GEF-5, an estimate that was based on past country demand. GEF would welcome submissions from countries that had not yet submitted National Biosafety Framework implementation projects during the second phase of GEF-5 and would approve such projects as appropriate.

68. It was decided that, in view of the limited time available for the plenary session, the agenda item would be discussed in Working Group II.

69. Accordingly, the item was taken up by Working Group II at its 2nd meeting, on 2 October 2012.

70. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Peru and the Republic of Moldova (on behalf of the Central and Eastern Europe region).

71. The Chair said that he would prepare a draft decision, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

72. At its 4th meeting, on 3 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources, submitted by the Chair.

73. Statements were made by the representatives of Benin, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Grenada, Guatemala, India, Malaysia, Niger, Nigeria, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, South Africa, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

74. The representative of Cuba requested that the following statement be reflected in the report:

“In view of its importance, biosafety is a permanent area of work for the Global Environment Facility, which acts as the financial mechanism for the Cartagena Protocol and is the primary means by which developing countries can build their capacity to apply the Protocol.

In such a complex area as the implementation of the Protocol, in which the process of capacity-building is gradual and covers various areas of work, no State Party to the Protocol should be deprived of the opportunity to access the funds available in a particular cycle merely because it has previously benefited from more than one project in this field.

Furthermore, the delegation of Cuba recalls that States Parties have the sovereign right to identify priorities in allocating resources received, in accordance with the programme priorities established for the application of the Protocol.

The delegation of Cuba reiterates its willingness to work in cooperation with the Global Environment Facility in support of the application of the Protocol, based on the flexible, agile and transparent use of funds available for capacity-building and, in particular, on the merits of specific projects proposed for each programme priority.”

75. The Working Group resumed its consideration of the draft decision at its 5th meeting, on 3 October 2012. Statements were made by the representatives of the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), the Philippines and Zambia.

76. The Working Group continued its consideration of the draft decision at its 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012. Statements were made by the representatives of Benin, Brazil, Egypt, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Ghana, India, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, Togo and Zambia.

77. At the suggestion of the Chair, an open-ended group of the Friends of the Chair was established to consider the outstanding issues in the draft decision.

78. At its 7th meeting, on 4 October 2012, the Working Group heard a report from the group of the Friends of the Chair and took up a revised version of the draft decision. Statements were made by the representatives of Egypt, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Norway and Zambia (on behalf of the African Group).

79. Following the exchange of views, the Working Group approved the draft decision, as amended, for transmission to plenary in draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.14.

80. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.14. Statements were made by Liberia (on behalf of the African Group), Norway and Paraguay.

81. Following the exchange of views, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted the draft decision, as orally amended, as decision BS-VI/5. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 7. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS, CONVENTIONS AND INITIATIVES

82. Agenda item 7 was taken up at the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 1 October 2012. In considering the item, the meeting had before it a note by the Executive Secretary providing an update on cooperative activities between the Secretariat and other organizations, conventions and initiatives relevant to the implementation of the Protocol (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/5). The note also included suggested elements for a draft decision.

83. In introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat said that the note by the Executive Secretary provided an overview of the actions taken by the Executive Secretary during the intersessional period pursuant to decision BS-V/6. It also contained an updated overview of cooperative activities between the Secretariat and other organizations, conventions and initiatives, including the Secretariat's partnership in the Green Customs Initiative; its cooperation with the International Plant Protection Convention; the interlinking of the Biosafety Clearing-House with the European Union Reference Laboratory for Genetically Modified Food and Feed and the CropLife International Detection Methods Database; and the organization, jointly with the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, of an online forum on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms through the Biosafety Clearing-House.

84. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Grenada (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group), Japan, Kenya, Liberia (on behalf of the African Group), Saudi Arabia, Serbia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern Europe region), the United States of America and Uruguay.

85. Statements were also made by the representatives of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the World Trade Organization.

86. Following the exchange of views, the President said that he would prepare a text, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the meeting of the Parties.

87. At its 2nd plenary session, on 3rd October 2012, the meeting of the Parties took up a draft decision on cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia) and the Republic of Moldova.

88. Following the exchange of views, the President said that he would prepare a revised version of the draft decision, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the meeting of the Parties.

89. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered the revised version of the draft decision (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.5), and adopted it as decision BS-VI/6. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 8. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROTOCOL AND ON BUDGETARY MATTERS

90. Agenda item 8 was taken up at the opening plenary session of the meeting, on 1 October 2012. In considering the item, the meeting had before it notes prepared by the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Protocol and on budgetary matters (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/6 and Add.1). It also had before it, as an information document, a report by the Executive Secretary on the administration of the Convention and the budget for the trust funds of the Convention and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/36).

91. In introducing the item, the Executive Secretary said that the assessed contributions paid as at 31 December 2011 had amounted to 88 per cent of the total core budget for 2011 approved by the Parties at their fifth meeting. As at 31 July 2012, only 70 per cent of contributions to the core budget for the present year had been received. He also noted that pledges to the voluntary funds had been disappointingly low. As requested by the Parties to the Protocol at their fifth meeting, the Executive Secretary had prepared three possible budget scenarios. One entailed an increase of 14.2 per cent compared with 2011–2012, which represented the amount required to fund programme activities. The second included a nominal increase of 10 per cent. The third option was not to increase the budget at all for 2013–2014.

92. It was agreed to establish a contact group on budgetary matters, under the chairmanship of Mr. Conrod Hunte (Antigua and Barbuda), to examine the budget scenarios proposed by the Executive Secretary.

93. The chair of the contact group reported to the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 3 October 2012, that the contact group had reviewed the budget proposals and draft decision presented by the Secretariat. The contact group had held two meetings. Taking into account the global economic situation, it had discussed the possibility of reducing the time allocated for the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to two weeks. It had also considered the option of a three-year meeting cycle and, in that case, the potential need for a three-year budget cycle. The contact group would meet again once its members had had a chance to consult on those issues.

94. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the chair of the contact group on budgetary matters gave a report on the consultations within the group. Concerns had been expressed that a number of priority issues identified by States Parties were not included in the core budget, but instead relied on funding from the Special Voluntary Trust Fund for additional voluntary contributions for approved activities. Moreover, although there had been agreement on the establishment of an ad hoc technical expert group on socio-economic considerations, funding would have to come from the Special Voluntary Trust Fund, and a pledge from a Party was required to fund such activity. A draft decision (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.17) had been prepared in the contact group for consideration by the meeting of the Parties. The draft decision included provisions to ensure that funding would be available, if it were decided to hold the seventh meeting of the Parties in 2015.

95. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.17 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/7. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

III. SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES ARISING FROM THE PROGRAMME OF WORK AND PREVIOUS DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

ITEM 9. STATUS OF CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF THE ROSTER OF BIOSAFETY EXPERTS

96. Agenda item 9 was taken up by Working Group II at its 1st meeting, on 1 October 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it three documents: a note by the Executive Secretary outlining the status of capacity-building activities under the Protocol, including the status of implementation of the Coordination Mechanism (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7); a note by the Executive Secretary to facilitate the comprehensive review of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Protocol, taking into account the findings of the independent evaluation of the Action Plan, submissions by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations and the information provided in the second national reports (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/Add.1); and a note by the Executive Secretary providing both an update on the current status of the roster and its voluntary fund, and a synthesis of submissions by Parties and other Governments regarding their experiences and challenges in nominating experts for the roster and using them, their projected future needs, and their views for improving the nomination process and nomination form (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/Add.2).

97. It also had before it, as information documents: (i) a report on the independent evaluation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/2); (ii) the report of the online forum on strategic approaches to capacity-building in biosafety (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/3); (iii) a compilation of the submissions by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations made in accordance with paragraphs 13 and 15 of decision BS-V/3 (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/4); (iv) reports of the eighth and ninth meetings of the Liaison Group on Capacity-building for Biosafety (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/5); and (v) reports of the seventh and eighth coordination meetings for Governments and organizations implementing and/or funding biosafety capacity-building activities (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/6).

98. At the suggestion of the Chair, it was agreed that the two aspects of the item—status of capacity-building activities and the roster of biosafety experts—should be considered separately.

Status of capacity-building activities

99. Introducing the first part of the item, a representative of the Secretariat drew attention to the information contained in documents UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7 and Add.1. Section II of document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7 included a summary on the status of capacity-building under the Protocol, based on submissions received from Parties and other stakeholders and on the second national reports. In Section III of the document, there was an analysis of potential strategic approaches to improving capacity-building for the effective implementation of the Protocol. Section IV contained a report on the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism and proposed measures to improve and streamline that Mechanism. Section V contained a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group. Document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/Add.1 included a summary of views and proposals submitted to the Secretariat and feedback from the online forum on capacity-building on the Action Plan. A draft framework and action plan for capacity-building for the effective implementation of the Protocol were also included for consideration.

100. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, China, Colombia, Cuba, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Fiji, Grenada, India, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda and Viet Nam.

101. A statement was also made by the representative of the Public Research and Regulation Initiative.

102. The Chair said that he would prepare a draft decision, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

103. At its 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on the status of capacity-building activities, submitted by the Chair. Statements were made by the representatives of Benin, Ecuador, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Guatemala, Mexico and Saint Lucia.

104. Following the exchange of views, the Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.7.

105. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.7 and adopted it, as orally amended, as decision BS-VI/3. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

Roster of experts on biosafety

106. Introducing the second part of agenda item 9, a representative of the Secretariat drew attention to document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/Add.2. Section II of the document contained a list of biosafety experts on the roster and information on the status of the roster and its voluntary fund. Section III provided a summary of views and experiences provided by Governments and other stakeholders regarding the use of the roster. Section IV analysed the functioning of the roster and included suggestions for maximizing its use. Section V contained a draft decision for consideration by the Working Group.

107. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Japan, Malaysia, Niger, Nigeria and Paraguay.

108. The Chair said that he would prepare a draft decision, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

109. At its 4th meeting, on 3 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on the roster of experts on biosafety, submitted by the Chair. Statements were made by the representatives of Benin, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Cambodia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), India, Malaysia, Mexico, Niger, Nigeria, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Sudan and the United Republic of Tanzania.

110. The Working Group resumed its consideration of the draft decision at its 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012. Statements were made by the representatives of Benin, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia) and Niger.

111. Following the exchange of views, the Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.8.

112. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.8 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/4. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 10. HANDLING, TRANSPORT, PACKAGING AND IDENTIFICATION (ARTICLE 18)

10.1 Article 18, paragraphs 2 (b) and (c)

10.2 Article 18, paragraph 3

113. Agenda items 10.1 and 10.2 were taken up by Working Group I at its 1st meeting, on 1 October 2012. Under item 10.1, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary synthesizing the relevant information from the second national reports regarding Article 18, paragraphs 2 (b) and (c) (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/8). Under item 10.2, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary presenting a summary of the results from the study commissioned under paragraph 1 (d) of decision BS-V/9 (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/9), the full version of which had been made available as an information document (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/24). It also had before it, as information documents, notes by the Executive Secretary summarizing developments on existing rules and standards (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/7) and on the electronic network of detection and identification laboratories in the Biosafety Clearing-House (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/9).

114. Introducing item 10.1, a representative of the Secretariat recalled that, in paragraph 2 of decision BS-IV/8, the Parties had decided to review the implementation of requirements under paragraphs 2 (b) and (c) of Article 18 at their sixth meeting on the basis of the information in the second national reports. The information was summarized in a note by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/8), which also contained suggested elements for a draft decision.

115. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Colombia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines and Uganda.

116. Introducing item 10.2, a representative of the Secretariat said that the full report of the consultant commissioned to carry out the work requested in paragraph 1(d) of decision BS-V/9 was contained in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/24. A summary of that report was contained in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/9, which also included suggested elements for a draft decision.

117. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), India, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay.

118. Following the exchange of views under items 10.1 and 10.2, the Chair recalled the history of discussions on Article 18, including the adoption of separate decisions on different paragraphs thereof. She suggested that it might be time to draw back together the different parts of Article 18. It was agreed that, as a number of the suggested elements for a draft decision from the two working documents were closely related, she would prepare a single text that took into account the points raised during the discussion and reflected both sets of suggested elements.

119. At its 4th meeting, on 3 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms. Statements were made by the

representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Ecuador, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Ghana, India, Japan, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Paraguay, the Philippines, Uganda and Uruguay.

120. A statement was made by the representative of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

121. A statement was also made by the representative of the International Grain Trade Coalition.

122. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a revised text, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for the Working Group's consideration.

123. At its 5th meeting, on 3 October 2012, the Working Group took up a revised version of the draft decision on handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Liberia, Mexico, and Paraguay.

124. At its 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012, the Working Group resumed consideration of the revised version of the draft decision on handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms. Statements were made by Brazil, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), India, Japan, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Namibia, Paraguay and Uganda.

125. The Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L12.

126. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.12 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/8. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 11. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS (ARTICLE 8)

127. Agenda item 11 was taken up by Working Group I at its 1st meeting, on 1 October 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note prepared by the Executive Secretary providing information on the implementation of the notification requirements under Article 8 of the Protocol, as synthesized from the second national reports (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/10).

128. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat gave a brief overview of developments in implementing notification requirements under Article 8 since the adoption of decision BS-II/8. Section II of the note by the Executive Secretary UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/10 presented a synthesis of information derived from the second national reports received. Section III contained suggested elements for a draft decision.

129. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Ghana, India, Japan, Malaysia and Mexico.

130. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a draft decision, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

131. At its 3rd meeting, on 2 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on notification requirements submitted by the Chair. Statements were made by the representatives of the

Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), India, Japan, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Mexico and Paraguay.

132. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a revised text, incorporating the points raised during the discussion.

133. At its 4th meeting, on 3 October 2012, the Working Group took up a revised version of the draft decision on notification requirements. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Namibia and Paraguay.

134. At its 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012, the Working Group resumed consideration of the revised version of the draft decision on notification requirements. Statements were made by Brazil, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), India, Japan, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Namibia, Paraguay and Uganda.

135. The Working Group approved the draft decision on notification requirements, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.11.

136. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.11 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/10. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 12. NAGOYA – KUALA LUMPUR SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

137. Agenda item 12 was taken up by Working Group I at its 1st meeting, on 1 October 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the status of signature, ratification and accession to the Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/11).

138. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat said that 51 Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had signed the Supplementary Protocol by the closing date for signature, i.e. 6 March 2012. Three countries had deposited their instruments of ratification to date, and some others had initiated internal processes towards accession or ratification. A total of 40 instruments of ratification or accession were required for the Supplementary Protocol to enter into force. With financial support from the Government of Japan, the Secretariat had conducted four regional workshops, one inter-regional workshop and several briefing events aimed at promoting signature, ratification and implementation of the instrument. Resource materials from and reports of those workshops were available on the Secretariat's website. At the 14th session of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, a decision had been adopted urging expeditious ratification of or accession to the Supplementary Protocol by African countries. The Secretariat had prepared publications on liability and redress, and on the Supplementary Protocol in particular. The Working Group was invited to consider the suggested elements for a draft decision contained in section IV of the note by the Executive Secretary.

139. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway and Uganda.

140. A statement was also made by the representative of the Public Research and Regulation Initiative.

141. The Chair said that she would prepare a text, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

142. To support discussion on the item during the meeting, she encouraged interested Parties to attend a side event organized by the Secretariat and the Governments of Japan and India, entitled “Promoting the ratification of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol”, to be held on 2 October 2012.

143. At its 3rd meeting, on 2 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol, submitted by the Chair. Statements were made by Colombia, India, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group) and Uganda.

144. The Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.3.

145. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.3 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/11. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 13. UNINTENTIONAL TRANSBOUNDARY MOVEMENTS AND EMERGENCY MEASURES (ARTICLE 17)

146. Agenda item 13 was taken up by Working Group I at its 2nd meeting, on 2 October 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary containing information from the second national reports with regard to the unintentional transboundary movement of living modified organisms (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/12).

147. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat said that decision BS-V/16 provided that the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties of the Cartagena Protocol take up the issue of unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms, in order to consider the development of tools and guidance that facilitated appropriate responses and necessary actions, including the emergency measures envisaged in Article 17 of the Protocol and operational objective 1.8 of the Strategic Plan for the period 2011–2020. The document before the Working Group provided information on implementation measures concerning the unintentional transboundary movement of living modified organisms, as reflected in Parties’ second national reports. It also highlighted deliberations, decisions and guidance material under the Protocol that were relevant to the agenda item and suggested elements for a draft decision.

148. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), India, Japan, Jordan, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Tunisia, Uganda and the United States of America.

149. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a text, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

150. At its 5th meeting, on 3 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures, submitted by the Chair. Statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, Colombia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), India, Japan, Malaysia and Paraguay.

151. At its 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012, the Working Group approved the draft decision on unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.13.

152. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, following an exchange of views, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.13 and adopted it, as orally amended, as decision BS-VI/16. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 14. RISK ASSESSMENT AND RISK MANAGEMENT (ARTICLES 15 AND 16)

153. Agenda item 14 was taken up by Working Group II at its 1st meeting, on 1 October 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary summarizing the activities on risk assessment and risk management coordinated by the Secretariat during the intersessional period, including possible future activities based on elements drawn from the Strategic Plan for the period 2011–2020 and the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/13/Rev.1 and Add.1). It also had before it, as information documents, the final report of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/10), an analysis report of the open-ended online expert forum on risk assessment and risk management (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/11) and the revised training manual “Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms” (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/12).

154. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat drew attention to the information contained in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/13/Rev.1 and the revised Guidance in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/13/Add.1. The four main aspects of the item, covered in sections II to V of the report, respectively, were: further guidance on specific aspects of risk assessment and risk management; capacity-building on risk assessment and risk management; identification of living modified organisms that might have or were not likely to have adverse effects to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, taking into account risks to human health; and mechanisms for gathering information on the status of implementation of the risk assessment and risk management provisions of the Protocol in the context of the Strategic Plan for the period 2011–2020. The Working Group was invited to consider the suggested elements of a draft decision contained in section VI of document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/13/Rev.1.

155. The Chair of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management, Mr. Helmut Gaugitsch (Austria), presented a report on the outcome of the work of the Group and the open-ended online expert forum.

156. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Colombia, Nigeria, Paraguay and Senegal.

157. The Working Group resumed its consideration of the item at its 2nd meeting, on 2 October 2012.

158. Statements were made by the representatives of Benin, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria (on behalf of the African Group), Norway, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova (also on behalf of the Central and Eastern Europe region), South Africa, Sudan, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

159. Statements were also made by the representatives of the Centre for Integrated Research and Biosafety, the European Network of Scientists for Social and Environmental Responsibility, and the Public Research and Regulation Initiative.

160. The Chair said that he would prepare a text, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

161. At its 5th meeting, on 3 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on risk assessment and risk management, submitted by the Chair. Statements were made by the representatives of Benin, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, China, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), India, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, South Africa and Uganda.

162. At the suggestion of the Chair, a contact group was established to resolve outstanding issues in the draft decision, under the joint chairmanship of Mr. Helmut Gaugitsch (Austria) and Ms. Eliana Fontes (Brazil).

163. At its 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012, the Working Group heard a progress report from Mr. Gaugitsch, as co-chair of the contact group.

164. The representative of Colombia requested that the following statement be reflected in the report:

“The delegation of Colombia referred to paragraph 35 of document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/13/Rev.1 in order to clarify that the decision by Colombia not to grant the authorization to the import of maize MON-88017-3 was not based on the living modified organism having adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. The decision was taken on the basis that the benefits to the country should outweigh the risks; and the pest to which this living modified organism is tolerant is not of economic importance in maize-growing areas of Colombia. Finally, it was informed that the same event was approved in Colombia for food in 2011 and for feed in 2010.”

165. At its 7th meeting, on 4 October 2012, the Working Group heard a further report from Mr. Gaugitsch, as co-chair of the contact group, on the group's work. The Working Group took up a revised version of the draft decision on risk assessment and risk management, which had been circulated following consultations in the contact group. Statements were made by the representatives of Benin, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, China, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay and the Republic of Moldova.

166. The representative of Honduras requested that the following statement be reflected in the report:

“As the process of selecting experts on risk assessment of modified living organisms for the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group is not currently clear, we do not support that selection process.”

167. The Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.16.

168. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.16 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/12. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 15. SUBSIDIARY BODIES (ARTICLE 30)

169. Agenda item 15 was taken up by Working Group I at its 2nd meeting, on 2 October 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on subsidiary bodies (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/14), which included suggested elements for a draft decision.

170. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat said that, in decision BS-IV/13 the Parties had decided to consider, at the present meeting, the need to establish a permanent subsidiary body that would provide scientific and technical advice under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. In the light of experience gained in recent years with ad hoc technical expert groups established by the Parties under the Protocol, it did not appear necessary to establish such a subsidiary body at present; however, the Parties might wish to continue to establish ad hoc technical expert groups with specific mandates to address scientific and technical issues, as needed, in accordance with decision BS-IV/13.

171. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Ghana, Guatemala, India, Japan, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Malaysia and Norway.

172. Following the exchange of views, the Chair said that she would prepare a text, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

173. At its 5th meeting, on 3 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on subsidiary bodies, submitted by the Chair. Statements were made by the representatives of Canada, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia and Paraguay.

174. The Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.4.

175. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.4 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/9. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 16. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (ARTICLE 26)

176. Agenda item 16 was taken up by Working Group I at its 2nd meeting, on 2 October 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary summarizing the outcomes of intersessional activities on socio-economic considerations and providing an analysis of relevant information from the second national reports (UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/6/15). The Working Group also had before it, as an information document, the report of the Workshop on Capacity-building for Research and Information Exchange on Socio-economic Impacts of Living Modified Organisms held in New Delhi from 14 to 16 November 2011 (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/13). Suggested elements for a draft decision were set out in section IV of document UNEP/CBD/COP-MOP/6/15.

177. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat said that, in decision BS-IV/6, the Parties had agreed to review, at the present meeting, experience of cooperating on research and information exchange on any socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms, based on the information provided in the second national reports. The Executive Secretary had also been requested, in decision BS-V/3, to convene regional online conferences on socio-economic considerations and a workshop on capacity-building, the outcomes of which were also to be submitted to the present meeting. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary had prepared a document (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/15) which synthesized

the information from the second national reports and summarized the activities that had taken place in the intersessional period.

178. Statements were made by the representatives of Belarus (on behalf of the Central and Eastern Europe region), the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya (on behalf of the African Group), Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Saudi Arabia and Uruguay.

179. A statement was also made by the representative of the Public Research and Regulation Initiative.

180. At its 3rd meeting, on 2 October 2012, the Working Group established a contact group, on the proposal of the Chair, to be chaired jointly by Mr. Gurdial Singh Nijar (Malaysia) and Mr. Ruben Dekker (Netherlands) to examine further the issues raised during discussion of the agenda item.

181. At the Working Group's 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012, Mr. Dekker, co-chair of the contact group on socio-economic considerations, reported that the contact group had held three meetings. Agreement had been reached on a wide range of issues, and the group had produced a draft decision on socio-economic considerations, which the co-chairs submitted for consideration by the Working Group.

182. Statements were made by the representatives of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Ethiopia, Georgia (on behalf of the Central and Eastern Europe region), India, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, South Africa and Swaziland.

183. The representative of the Republic of Korea said that his country would be prepared to host a meeting of the ad hoc technical expert group on socio-economic considerations. The representative of Norway said that his country would explore the possibility of contributing to such a group.

184. At its 7th meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Working Group resumed consideration of the draft decision on socio-economic considerations submitted by the co-chairs of the contact group. Statements were made by the representatives Brazil, Colombia and Ethiopia.

185. The Working Group approved the draft decision on socio-economic considerations, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.15.

186. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.15 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/13. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 17. MONITORING AND REPORTING (ARTICLE 33)

187. Agenda item 17 was taken up by Working Group II at its 3rd meeting, on 2 October 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary containing a synthesis of the main results of the analysis of second national reports (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/16).

188. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat drew attention to the note by the Executive Secretary. Section II presented a summary of the second national reports, while Section IV set out the general trends that had emerged. Elements of a draft decision could be found in Section V of the

document. He explained that 14 States Parties had not yet submitted their second national reports. Five of those Parties had never fulfilled their reporting obligations under Article 33 of the Protocol.

189. Statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Guatemala, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand and Niger.

190. The Chair said that he would prepare a draft decision, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

191. At its 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on monitoring and reporting, submitted by the Chair. A statement was made by the representative of the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia).

192. The Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary as draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.9.

193. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.9 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/14. The text of the decision is contained in the annex to the present report.

ITEM 18. SECOND ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROTOCOL (ARTICLE 35)

194. Agenda item 18 was taken up by Working Group II at its 3rd meeting, on 2 October 2012. In considering the item, the Working Group had before it a note by the Executive Secretary on the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and an analysis of information on the implementation of the Protocol (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/17 and Add.1), including the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Second Assessment and Review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which were aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of the Protocol (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/17, annex I).

195. Introducing the item, a representative of the Secretariat drew attention to the main elements contained in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/17. Suggested elements for a draft decision could be found in section V thereof.

196. Statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Guatemala, Malaysia, Mexico, Norway, the Philippines and South Africa.

197. Statements were also made by the representatives of the Public Research and Regulation Initiative and the Third World Network.

198. The Chair said that he would prepare a draft decision, incorporating the points raised during the discussion, for consideration by the Working Group.

199. At its 6th meeting, on 4 October 2012, the Working Group took up a draft decision on the second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, submitted by the Chair. Statements were made by the representative of the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia).

200. The Working Group approved the draft decision, as orally amended, for transmission to plenary in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.10.

201. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol considered draft decision UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.10 and adopted it as decision BS-VI/15. The text of the decision is given in the annex to the present report.

IV. FINAL MATTERS

ITEM 19. OTHER MATTERS

202. At the 2nd plenary session of the meeting, on 3 October 2012, a representative of the Washington Biotechnology Action Council paid tribute to American scientist Barry Commoner, who had died on 30 September 2012. Mr. Commoner had been instrumental in promoting greater involvement of scientists and technical experts in social concerns, thereby empowering civil society to demand accountability from decision-makers. A key figure in modern ecology and citizens' mobilization for environmental issues and responsible genetics, Mr. Commoner had been among the first to make biosafety a topic of discussion.

Tribute to the Government and people of India

203. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol expressed its sincere gratitude to the Government and people of India for the cordial hospitality accorded to participants in the meeting and for their contribution to its success. In that connection, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol adopted the following tribute:

“We, the participants of the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Having met in Hyderabad from 1 to 5 October 2012 at the gracious invitation of the Government of India,

Deeply appreciative of the excellent arrangements made for the meeting and the especial courtesy extended to participants by the Government of India and its people,

Express our sincere gratitude to the Government and people of India for their warm hospitality and contribution to the success of this meeting.”

ITEM 20. DATE AND VENUE OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

204. At the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, the Parties to the Protocol decided that their seventh meeting would be held in conjunction with the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the date and venue of which would be determined by the Conference of the Parties at their forthcoming eleventh meeting.

205. The representative of the Republic of Korea informed the meeting of his country's intention to host the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He said that his country was committed to the conservation of biodiversity, and that the hospitality of the Korean people and the country's natural beauty would create a favourable environment to furthering the cause of global biodiversity and sustainable development. He was confident that, with the support of the Parties, the meetings would be a success.

ITEM 21. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

206. The present report was adopted at the 3rd plenary session of the meeting, on 5 October 2012, on the basis of the draft report presented by the Rapporteur (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.1) and the reports of Working Group I and Working Group II (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/L.1/Add.1 and 2).

ITEM 22. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

207. The Executive Secretary congratulated participants on the progress achieved, particularly with regard to agreement on further work on the implementation of Articles 15 and 16 of the Protocol. Progress had been made in discussions of the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms, and he urged Parties to consider using that Guidance. He welcomed the request for establishment of ad hoc technical expert groups, one on risk assessment to provide input for testing the Guidance and the other on socio-economic considerations. He also welcomed the approval of the new framework and action plan on capacity-building. He noted that the focus on socio-economic considerations was a significant step forward. He expressed regret that it had not been possible to include funding within the core budget to convene the two ad hoc technical expert groups and that no specific pledges had been received. He hoped that pledges would soon be forthcoming from Parties to support such important areas of work. Lastly, he paid tribute to the host country and incoming President of the meeting, India; the outgoing President of the meeting, Japan; the Chairs of the two working groups; and the chair of the contact group on budgetary matters.

208. Representatives of Benin (on behalf of the African Group), the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the European Union and its 27 member States (also on behalf of Croatia), Japan, Mexico (on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean countries), New Zealand, the Republic of Moldova (on behalf of the Central and Eastern Europe Group) and the Asia and Pacific group expressed their thanks to all those who had made the meeting a success and paid tribute to the hospitality of the people and the Government of India.

209. The representative of Mexico (on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean countries) requested that the following statement be reflected in the report:

“The Mexican delegation has the honour to speak on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC). GRULAC reiterates its commitment to the strengthening and consolidation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and to the process of implementing this important multilateral environment instrument. The Group considers it essential to provide the Protocol with the necessary resources to attain the Parties’ objectives; the countries in the region reaffirm their political commitment to this process in compliance with their obligations. We are deeply concerned about the restrictive and austerity-centred approach adopted by developed countries, given that the resources made available to the core budget of the Protocol are insufficient for the effective implementation of the Strategic Plan agreed in Nagoya. We are concerned about the expectation to finance the operational activities exclusively through voluntary contributions. GRULAC advocates increased strengthening of the multilateral nature of this instrument and its core budget. We wish to draw attention to the fact that the Cartagena Protocol is an instrument undergoing a clear process of consolidation, and we therefore consider that the two-year meeting cycle of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of Parties to the Protocol should be maintained, further to the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011–2020.”

210. The representative of Benin (speaking on behalf of the African Group) stressed a preference for maintaining a two-year meeting cycle for meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.

211. The representative of the Plurinational State of Bolivia informed the meeting of his country's willingness to host the first meeting of the ad hoc technical expert group on socio-economic considerations. His country was committed to the protection of Mother Earth, and science and technology should continue to be harnessed as part of any protection efforts.

212. A statement was also made by the representative of the Public Research and Regulation Initiative.

213. The President said that, during the week, significant progress had been made in resolving many difficult issues, thanks to the prevailing spirit of cooperation and hard work of all participants. Socio-economic considerations had to be taken into account in the development and transfer of technology, while regulatory processes had to reflect the different concerns of stakeholders. He welcomed the offer by the Plurinational State of Bolivia to host the first meeting of the ad hoc technical expert group on socio-economic considerations. On risk assessment of living modified organisms, he stressed the importance of testing the revised Guidance and of building capacity for that task. In closing, he thanked all those who had contributed to the success of the meeting, which had helped to operationalize the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020.

214. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the President declared the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety closed at 9.30 p.m. on Friday, 5 October 2012.

Annex

**DECISIONS ADOPTED BY SIXTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO
THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE
PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSFETY**

Hyderabad, India, 1-5 October 2012

BS-VI/1	Compliance	34
BS-VI/2.	Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House	35
BS-VI/3.	Capacity-building.....	36
BS-VI/4.	Capacity-building: roster of experts	58
BS-VI/5.	Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources	66
BS-VI/6.	Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives.....	69
BS-VI/7.	Programme budget for the costs of the secretariat services and the biosafety work programme of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the biennium 2013-2014.....	70
BS-VI/8.	Handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms (Article 18).....	84
BS-VI/9.	Subsidiary bodies (Article 30).....	85
BS-VI/10.	Notification requirements (Article 8)	86
BS-VI/11.	Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.....	87
BS-VI/12.	Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16).....	88
BS-VI/13.	Socio-economic considerations	93
BS-VI/14.	Monitoring and reporting (Article 33).....	95
BS-VI/15.	Second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 35)	97
BS-VI/16.	Unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms (Article 17).....	99

BS-VI/1 Compliance

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling its decision BS-V/1, in which it which improved the supportive role of the Compliance Committee,

Recognizing the gaps that still exist regarding compliance with the Protocol by a number of Parties, in particular as regards the obligation to put in place legal, administrative and other measures that are necessary and appropriate to implement obligations under the Protocol,

Recognizing also that the fulfilment, by each Party of the obligation to introduce legal, administrative and other measures necessary for the implementation of the Protocol, as required in paragraph 1 of Article 2 of the Protocol, is the topmost priority in the domestic implementation of the Protocol,

Taking note of the recommendation of the Compliance Committee contained in the annex to its report (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/2),

1. *Calls upon* Parties, consistent with the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol for the period 2011–2020 adopted under decision BS-V/16, which identifies the task of putting operational biosafety frameworks in place as the topmost priority area, to expedite their efforts and to put in place the legal and administrative frameworks necessary to meet their obligations under the Protocol;

2. *Requests* Parties that have not yet put in place operational biosafety frameworks to submit information on the challenges they are faced with in this regard, and the plans and timelines, as appropriate, that they envisage for the purpose of taking the necessary measures;

3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to compile the information submitted in accordance with paragraph 2 above by the Parties concerned and to submit it to the Compliance Committee for consideration and appropriate action;

4. *Reminds* Parties experiencing challenges putting in place legal, administrative and other measures necessary for the implementation of the Protocol that they may submit their difficulties to the Compliance Committee in order to seek assistance in this regard, as indicated in paragraph 1(a) of decision BS-V/1;

5. *Reiterates* its invitation to Parties to make use of the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms, contained in the annex to decision BS-V/13, in order to facilitate the fulfilment of their obligations to promote public awareness and participation, as specified in Article 23 of the Protocol, including for the purposes of developing their own awareness programmes;

6. *Encourages* Parties to use, as appropriate, the procedures and mechanisms on compliance set out in the Protocol to promote compliance with the requirements of the Protocol.

BS-VI/2. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Welcoming the improvements made to the central portal of the Biosafety Clearing-House by the Secretariat, in line with the strategic objectives on information-sharing set out in the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020,

Further welcoming the significant increase in the number of records, particularly summaries of risk assessments, registered by Parties in the Biosafety Clearing-House during the last two years,

Also welcoming the successful contribution of the Project for Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House (the BCH-II Global Project), funded by the Global Environment Facility and implemented by the United Nations Environment Programme,

Recalling the importance of providing, in a timely manner, complete and accurate information to the Biosafety Clearing-House, in accordance with paragraph 1 of decision BS-V/2;

1. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to:
 - (a) Collect, through Biosafety Clearing-House national focal points and online tools made available in the Biosafety Clearing-House, feedback from Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations on existing capacity and experiences in using the Biosafety Clearing-House and the submission and retrieval of data, and to take this experience into account for future improvements to the Biosafety Clearing-House;
 - (b) Continue its collaboration with other biosafety databases and platforms (such as those of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) with a view to improving the utility of the Biosafety Clearing-House as a global mechanism for sharing information on biosafety;
 - (c) Continue to organize online forums and real-time online conferences on topics relevant to biosafety and the implementation of the Protocol and encourage Parties to make use of them; and
 - (d) Encourage greater use of the Biosafety Clearing-House to further promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation of relevant stakeholders regarding the use of living modified organisms.
2. *Urges* Parties and invites other Governments to fulfil their obligations under the Protocol and the decisions of the meeting of the Parties, by updating all incomplete published national records with the mandatory fields required by the common formats;
3. *Expresses gratitude* to the Government of the Republic of Korea for its financial and technical contributions and for hosting subregional training workshops on the Biosafety Clearing-House and *welcomes* its offer to host a new training workshop, in partnership with the United Nations Environment Programme.

BS-VI/3. Capacity-building

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling its decisions BS-III/3, BS-IV/3 and BS-V/3,

Noting the current status of capacity-building activities, as described in the note prepared by the Executive Secretary (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7),

Recognizing that the lack of capacity among developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition still remains a major obstacle to the effective implementation of the Protocol,

Noting with concern the general decline in the level of bilateral and multilateral funding available for biosafety capacity-building activities and its likely adverse effect on the implementation of the Protocol,

Mindful of the current global economic slowdown and the economic difficulties facing many countries,

Underscoring the need to prioritize capacity-building needs and actions in the short, medium and long term in order to facilitate targeted investment of the limited resources available,

Recognizing the need for a strategic, focused, integrated and all-inclusive results-oriented approach to capacity-building for effective implementation of the Protocol,

I. Capacity-building activities

1. *Takes note* of the report of the Independent Evaluation of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/2);

2. *Also takes note* of the working document (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/Add.1) prepared by the Executive Secretary to facilitate the comprehensive review and possible revision of the Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

3. *Adopts* a new Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, as contained in annex I to this decision, to replace the updated Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

4. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, and relevant organizations to implement the framework and Action Plan for capacity-building referred to in paragraph 3 above and to share their experiences through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

5. *Also invites* developed country Parties and donors and relevant organizations to take into account the above Framework and Action Plan in providing financial and technical support to developing countries, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition;

6. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to prepare, for consideration by the regular meetings of the Parties, reports on the status of implementation of the above Framework and Action Plan, on the basis of the submissions made by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations;

7. *Decides* to review the above Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building in conjunction with the mid-term review of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020 and the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol;

8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to raise awareness of the above Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building and encourage regional stakeholders and donors to play a greater role in supporting its implementation by Parties;

9. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to continue supporting Parties through strategic capacity-building activities, including regional and subregional training workshops and the development of online training modules, subject to the availability of funds;

II. Strategic approaches to capacity-building

10. *Takes note* of the analysis of strategic approaches to capacity-building contained in section III of the note by the Executive Secretary on the status of capacity-building activities (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7);

11. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to adopt, as appropriate and in a timely manner, the strategic approaches to capacity-building outlined in section 3.6 of the capacity-building framework and action plan referred to in paragraph 3 above with a view to improving the design, delivery, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of biosafety capacity-building initiatives;

12. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to provide, as appropriate and subject to the availability of funding, technical support to Parties to implement the strategic approaches to capacity-building outlined in section 3.6 of the Framework and Action Plan for capacity-building referred to in paragraph 3 above;

III. Coordination Mechanism

13. *Takes note* of the report by the Executive Secretary on the implementation of the Coordination Mechanism (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7, section IV) and *decides* to adopt the restructured and streamlined elements of the Coordination Mechanism contained in annex II to the present decision;

14. *Invites* donor countries and agencies and other organizations providing capacity support in biosafety to participate actively in the Coordination Mechanism;

15. *Decides* to restructure and streamline the Coordination Mechanism, as set out in annex II to the present decision.

*Annex I***FRAMEWORK AND ACTION PLAN FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY****I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Article 22 of the Protocol requires Parties to cooperate in the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety, including biotechnology to the extent that it is required for biosafety, for the purpose of ensuring the effective implementation of the Protocol, taking fully into account the needs of developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition for financial resources and access to and transfer of technology and know-how.

2. At their first meeting, held in 2004, the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) adopted an Action Plan for Building Capacities for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. In 2006, the Parties to the Protocol adopted a revised version of the Action Plan and decided to conduct a comprehensive review every five years, based on independent evaluations. In 2010, the Parties adopted terms of reference for the comprehensive review and requested the Executive Secretary to commission the independent evaluation of the Action Plan and to also prepare a working document to facilitate the comprehensive review of the Action Plan, taking into account the information and suggestions submitted by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, the information provided in the second national reports, and the findings of the independent evaluation.

3. The independent evaluation of the Action Plan, which was conducted in late 2011 and early 2012, recommended the development of a new document to replace the current Action Plan, comprising two components: (i) a “framework for capacity-building”, which would serve as a reference and guidance tool; and (ii) a “results-based Action Plan” consisting of prioritized actions, specific expected results/targets and a limited set of measurable indicators. Furthermore, the independent evaluation, as well as the submissions from governments and relevant organizations, recommended that the Action Plan or its replacement be aligned with the Strategic Plan for the Protocol for the period 2011-2020.

4. The present Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was prepared on the basis of the information provided in the second national reports on the implementation of the Protocol, the findings and recommendations of the independent evaluation of the Action Plan and the views and suggestions submitted by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to the Secretariat and through the online forum on capacity-building. It also takes into account recommendations of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building for Biosafety.

II. SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS AND BASIS FOR ACTION

5. The effective implementation of the Protocol continues to be hampered by the lack of capacity in many developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition. In their second national reports on the implementation of the Protocol, 114 Parties of the 143 Parties (80%) that submitted their reports by 31 December 2011 reported that they lack capacity in various areas. In particular, most Parties expressed a need for capacity-building in risk assessment, risk management, detection and identification of living modified organisms, public awareness and participation, and in measures to address unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms (LMOs). Many

Parties also expressed the need for institutional building; human resources development; scientific, technical and institutional collaboration; and information exchange and data management, including participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House.

6. A review of the status of implementation of the Protocol¹ noted that in their second national reports, many developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States among them and Parties with economies in transition reported that they do not have in place fully established and functioning biosafety regulatory frameworks that meet the requirements of the Protocol. Many reported that they have no practical experience as yet and lack appropriate legal, institutional and technical capacity for decision-making on LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment or for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (LMOs-FFP). They do not have in place a mechanism for handling requests, have no procedures for decision-making, and have limited capacity to review applications, including capacity to undertake or review risk assessments prior to making a decision. Only 63 Parties reported that they had acquired the necessary capacity to conduct risk assessments. Many developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States among them, also noted a lack of legal frameworks and technical capacity to prevent, detect and/or appropriately respond to illegal and unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs where they occur. Furthermore, 42 Parties reported that they have no capacity to enforce the requirements of identification and documentation of LMOs, and 63 Parties stated that they have such capacity only to some extent.

7. According to various reports² there are major weaknesses in the current approaches to capacity-building under the Protocol. For example, in a number of countries biosafety capacity-building activities are implemented in an ad hoc and fragmented (“piecemeal”) manner and are not mainstreamed into broader national development plans and relevant sectoral policies and programmes. Furthermore, many initiatives lack rigorous appraisal at the design stage and are not based on comprehensive systematic stocktaking and needs assessments. A number of initiatives have also been designed with unrealistic and overly ambitious expectations and with insufficient inputs. Also, some initiatives are being designed in a top-down manner, with limited involvement of relevant stakeholders to ensure local ownership and commitment. Besides, a number of initiatives have a short-term to medium-term horizon (ranging from 1 to 3 years) which is often too short to ensure effective delivery and sustainable results. Moreover, many biosafety projects have not incorporated measures to ensure the sustainability of their activities and outcomes at the end of the funding period. Finally, a number of initiatives are currently poorly tracked, evaluated and reported and often there is a lack of objective baseline data upon which to assess the progress made.

8. In terms of delivery, seminars and workshops are the main mechanisms used for human resource development in the vast majority of capacity-building initiatives. There are very few formal biosafety education and training programmes leading to academic qualifications. A number of initiatives have developed standardized training packages, toolkits and guidelines on different topics. Furthermore, in spite of the efforts being made through the Coordination Mechanism for the Implementation of the Action Plan, the level of coordination and communication between different initiatives and donors remains poor, leading to incoherence in capacity-building delivery and duplication of effort in certain areas and little or no attention to others.

¹ The review of the status of implementation of the Protocol is presented in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/17/Add.1.

² These include reports of the independent evaluation of the Action Plan (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/2) and the “Expert Review of the Effectiveness of Various Approaches to Biosafety Capacity-Building” submitted to the fifth meeting of the Parties by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/5/INF/9).

9. This capacity-building framework and action plan aims to advance implementation of the capacity-building components of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol and to assist Parties to address their capacity-building needs and challenges, including the shortcomings identified above. In particular, it seeks to guide and assist Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to develop, implement and evaluate biosafety capacity-building activities in a strategic, systematic, and forward-looking manner. The framework and action plan sets the overall vision; provides basic guiding principles; proposes strategic steps and tasks that Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations could take at the national, regional and international levels; and presents a results-oriented action plan to translate the ideas in the strategic plan into concrete actions and results.

10. In the context of this framework and action plan, capacity-building is described as the process of developing, strengthening and maintaining the capabilities needed to elaborate and implement measures to ensure the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology.³ This encompasses development of capacities at (i) the individual level (including the knowledge, skills, and competencies of individuals); (ii) the organizational level (including the institutional structures, processes and procedures; the infrastructure (facilities, equipment and materials, inter-institutional networks and partnerships, and human resources); and (iii) the systemic level (including the enabling policy and legal frameworks, governance systems, external partnerships and externalities that affect the effectiveness and sustainability of capacity-building efforts).

III. FRAMEWORK FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING

11. This framework has been developed within the context of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol. It is designed to serve both as a strategic document and as a reference or guidance tool. As a strategic document it sets the overall vision, direction, objectives and scope of capacity-building under the Protocol, including key areas requiring urgent action. As a reference or guidance tool it provides a general conceptual and operational framework for capacity-building, including the guiding principles and approaches, strategic processes and steps that may be taken, and general guidance on key tools, good practices and lessons learned that Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations could use or apply in designing and implementing their own capacity-building interventions.

12. The framework is relevant to a wide range of individuals and organizations involved in the design, implementation and/or funding of biosafety capacity-building initiatives. It can be adapted to many situations and contexts to address specific capacity-building needs and challenges. It is a living tool that will be updated on the basis of the experiences gained and lessons learned from previous and ongoing global efforts.

3.1 *Vision*

13. By 2020 all Parties will have in place the requisite human resources and institutional capacities for 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.

³ A number of institutions use the term “capacity development” rather than “capacity-building” noting that the latter has a narrower scope and gives the impression that no capacity exists before the intervention. Nevertheless, this framework and action plan will continue with the term “capacity-building” to be consistent with the terminology used in the Protocol.

3.2 Objectives

14. Consistent with Strategic Objective 2 of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol, the objective of the capacity-building framework is to further develop and strengthen the capacity of Parties to implement the Protocol. The purpose of the framework is to guide, catalyse and facilitate the capacity-building initiatives of Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, by providing a strategic framework aiming to:

- (a) Promote a common understanding of the key issues, priorities, guiding principles and approaches regarding capacity-building for the effective implementation of the Protocol;
- (b) Foster a strategic, focused, coherent and coordinated approach to capacity-building in biosafety, including biotechnology to the extent that it is required for biosafety;
- (c) Guide the identification and prioritization of capacity-building needs by Parties, and catalyze the development and implementation of targeted, synergistic and integrated biosafety capacity-building initiatives at the national, regional and international levels;
- (d) Facilitate the engagement of donors and the coordinated design and implementation of development assistance and technical cooperation programmes in the area of biosafety;
- (e) Facilitate the mobilization and leveraging of financial, technical and technological resources and expertise;
- (f) Promote regional and international cooperation and coordination with respect to capacity-building in biosafety to foster synergy and complementarity among various initiatives.

15. The capacity-building framework also seeks to guide the provision of financial, technical and technological support to developing countries, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, as well as countries with economies in transition, including countries among these that are centres of origin and centres of genetic diversity.

3.3 Guiding principles

16. In light of the operational experience and lessons learned from various capacity-building processes and programmes, capacity-building initiatives undertaken in line with this framework should, as appropriate:

- (a) Be country-driven, i.e., based on the needs and priorities identified by the recipient countries themselves;
- (b) Ensure national ownership and leadership, including the setting of priorities and the design, implementation and evaluation of the initiatives;
- (c) Ensure broad, informed and timely participation of relevant stakeholders in the design, implementation and evaluation of capacity-building interventions;
- (d) Recognize that capacity-building is a dynamic, progressive and long-term process, applying an adaptive and learning-by-doing approach;
- (e) Maximize synergy and complementarity among biosafety capacity-building initiatives;
- (f) Apply a results-oriented approach, focusing on achieving specific capacity-building results and outcomes;

(g) Promote policy dialogue with donors and organizations providing biosafety capacity-building assistance and encourage the participation of civil society and the private sector in such dialogue;

(h) Apply a holistic approach, integrating biosafety activities with relevant sectoral and national policies, strategies and programmes;

(i) Encourage the development and implementation of nationally-designed and resourced activities that address the specific needs and priorities of each country;

(j) Promote regional and subregional approaches to capacity-building;

(k) Build the political will and commitment for the implementation of the Protocol.

3.4 Focal areas for capacity-building

17. In line with Strategic Objective 2 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the priority focal areas for capacity-building for the period 2011-2020, in the context of this capacity-building framework and action plan, will be the following:

- (1) National biosafety frameworks;
- (2) Risk assessment and risk management;
- (3) Handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms;
- (3) Liability and redress;
- (5) Public awareness, education, and participation;
- (6) Information sharing; and
- (7) Biosafety education and training.

18. It is recognized that capacity-building needs vary from country to country. It is also noted that some of the above focal areas may not be priorities for some Parties. Therefore, the prioritization of specific capacity needs must be a country-driven process. In addition to the above focal areas, Parties may wish to determine their specific priority needs and communicate the information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

3.5 Strategic actions

19. The activities listed here are generic strategic tasks that may be undertaken at the national, regional and international levels to facilitate effective design, implementation and evaluation of the capacity-building initiatives across the various focal areas of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The tasks are not listed in any order of priority. The specific activities relating to the priority focal areas are outlined in the Action Plan described in section IV below.

3.5.1 National level

20. Tasks that may need to be undertaken at the national level include:

(a) Assessment of existing human resource and institutional capacity, including existing tools and mechanisms as well as completed and ongoing projects to identify the capacity needs and gaps;

(b) Development of a national biosafety capacity-building strategy and action plan, prioritizing the capacity-building needs and defining specific objectives based on the key elements provided above, including development of timelines, outputs, and targets;

(c) Development of a resource mobilization strategy to guide national efforts to mobilize existing capacities and ensure their effective utilization;

(d) Establishment and/or strengthening of a national coordination mechanism in order to promote synchronized and synergistic implementation of capacity-building activities and the harmonized use of external financial and technical assistance at the national level;

(e) Assessment of existing funding from national, bilateral and multilateral sources and assessment of short-term and long-term funding needs;

(f) Integration of biosafety into broader national development strategies and plans, including country Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), country assistance strategies and/or other similar instruments and relevant sectoral policies and programmes, including the national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

3.5.2 Subregional and regional levels

21. Tasks that may need to be undertaken at the subregional/regional level include:

(a) Establishment of regional websites and databases;

(b) Establishment of mechanisms for regional and subregional coordination of biosafety regulatory framework implementation, as appropriate;

(c) Development of subregional and regional mechanisms for human-resources development and training in biosafety, including through regional courses, staff exchanges, and joint research;

(d) Development of subregional or regional infrastructure and/or administrative mechanisms for the assessment and management of risks of living modified organisms;

(e) Establishment of a forum for the exchange of information on public awareness, education and participation;

(f) Promotion of regional and subregional collaborative initiatives on biosafety;

(g) Establishment of regional and subregional advisory mechanisms;

(h) Establishment and/or strengthening of regional centres of excellence and training.

3.5.3 International level

22. Tasks that may need to be undertaken at the international level include:

(a) Ensuring the effective functioning of the Biosafety Clearing-House;

(b) Enhancing the mobilization of financial resources from multilateral, bilateral and other donors to assist developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition, including those that are centres of origin and centres of genetic diversity;

(c) Identification and maximization of opportunities for collaborative initiatives and partnerships to enhance synergies, leverage resources and achieve greater impact;

- (d) Ensuring effective use of the roster of experts;
- (e) Strengthening South-South cooperation;
- (f) Development/updating of international guidance on various technical issues;
- (g) Development of indicators for evaluating capacity-building measures at different levels;
- (h) Regular review and provision of further guidance by the Parties to the Protocol.

3.6 *Strategic approaches to capacity-building*

23. In addition to the general guiding principles outlined in section 3.3 above, Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations are encouraged to adopt, as appropriate, the following strategic approaches to improve the effectiveness, impact and sustainability of their capacity-building initiatives:

- (a) Ensure that the design of capacity-building initiatives is based on systematic stocktaking and needs assessments in order to ensure that they are strategic, demand-driven and cost-effective;
- (b) Diversify approaches to human resources development beyond seminars and workshops to include formal education and training programmes, learning-by-doing approaches, staff exchanges, peer-to-peer learning through professional networking, and self-instruction;
- (c) Promote formal academic training in biosafety at graduate and post-graduate levels in order to develop a cadre of biosafety experts in various fields at the national level;
- (d) Broaden the scope and depth of training activities in specific areas of professional responsibilities (including risk assessment, risk management, LMO detection and others);
- (e) Adopt a systematic approach to training in biosafety, including, *inter alia*, conduct of training needs assessments, setting of clear training objectives, use of a wide of a range of customized training methods and tools, systematic evaluation and follow-up of the training activities;
- (f) Promote the “training-of-trainers” approach and ensure that the trained trainers have the necessary pedagogical skills, institutional support, structures, facilities and resources to be able train others;
- (g) Maximize existing opportunities for distance-learning, including interactive e-learning modules available online and on CD-ROM, in order to increase the number of participants benefiting and help to reduce the cost of training;
- (h) Institutionalize short-term biosafety trainings (including seminars and workshops), which are currently offered on an ad hoc one-off basis by various government departments and organizations, under designated national or regional training institutions, to facilitate their delivery in a systematic, integrated and efficient manner;
- (i) Review the criteria for selection of target audiences for training and other capacity-building activities to ensure that a wide range of participants (from both government and non-government organizations), who are in most need, have the requisite background and are in a position to readily apply the acquired knowledge and skills, are given due consideration;
- (j) Adopt a long-term and phased approach to capacity-building within the context of the national capacity-building strategies, the national biosafety frameworks (NBFs) and the Strategic Plan for the Protocol;

(k) Adopt a regional or subregional approach to capacity-building in biosafety to, *inter alia*, facilitate the sharing of information and technical resources, enhance coherence and synergy of capacity-building activities, and maximize the use of existing institutional, technical and human resources;

(l) Incorporate in all biosafety capacity-building projects sustainability measures, including strategies for retention of the knowledge and capacity built and continued use of the projects outputs, once the external funding and other support ends;

(m) Ensure that all biosafety capacity-building projects are systematically tracked and evaluated based on prior agreed indicators, and share evaluation reports through the Biosafety Clearing-House.

3.7 *Sustainability strategies and measures*

24. The essence of capacity-building is to ensure that Parties have lasting capabilities to fulfil their obligations under the Protocol. In this regard, Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations are encouraged to incorporate into the design and delivery of capacity-building initiatives strategies and measures that would foster ongoing action, sustainable results and long-term impact beyond the “lifespan” of the initiatives. It is advisable to develop sustainability plans at the design stage and not in the final months of capacity-building interventions. It is also advisable to build sustainability elements into the various modes of delivery of capacity-building initiatives.

25. Among other things, Parties, other governments and relevant organizations are encouraged to:

- (a) Set realistic objectives for their capacity-building initiatives;
- (b) Ensure active involvement of relevant stakeholders to foster a sense of ownership and commitment to long-term action;
- (c) Create effective linkages among different sectors; establish strategic partnerships to leverage and maximize resources;
- (d) Build strong institutions and coordination mechanisms that involve relevant stakeholders;
- (e) Mainstream biosafety into broader development plans and relevant sectoral programmes;
- (f) Adopt modes of delivery such as “training of trainers” that create a “multiplier effect”; incorporate biosafety management costs into the national budgets;
- (g) Ensure that the design of capacity-building initiatives is based on realistic assessments of the domestic resources available to sustain the activities; and
- (h) Diversify the sources of funding and technical support.

26. Another important strategy to promote sustainability is to institutionalize the implementation of capacity-building activities to ensure that the knowledge, skills and other capacities developed as part of capacity-building interventions are retained and integrated into existing institutional programmes. In this regard, it is important to ensure that the institutions selected to implement initiatives are well managed and appropriately resourced to take-over and sustain the initiatives’ activities. It is also crucial to ensure that the institutions selected are recognized in the national regulatory frameworks, have permanent staff and supportive leadership, rely on local personnel and resources to implement the activities and have strong support from the government. The latter may require deliberate awareness-raising and outreach to senior management and political leadership to help muster the necessary political will and commitment.

27. In addition, a consistent and objective approach to monitoring and evaluation would help to ensure the sustainability of initiatives by enabling Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to determine adjustments that need to be made during the implementation process.

28. Finally, promotion of regional and South-South cooperation, establishment of inter-agency partnerships and networks, establishment or strengthening of regional centres of excellence, and the development of adaptable capacity-building products, such as online training modules or e-learning courses and online databases or virtual libraries, are important strategies that could facilitate sustained access to technical support and assistance and ongoing knowledge-sharing and learning.

IV. THE RESULTS-ORIENTED CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTION PLAN (2012-2020)

29. The Action Plan below is designed to facilitate the implementation of the capacity-building components of the Strategic Plan of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020. It includes an indicative list of expected results and a set of activities to be implemented, as appropriate, by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations at the international, regional, and national levels to contribute to capacity-building for the effective implementation of the Protocol in a strategic and focused manner. The proposed activities are not meant to be prescriptive or exclusive. Rather they are illustrative of the kinds of core activities that would need to be undertaken, as appropriate, in order to achieve the desired results by 2020. The Action Plan is meant to complement other relevant initiatives and plans, including the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-Building.

4.1 Objectives, activities and expected results

Focal area 1: National biosafety frameworks

Operational objective 1

To further support the development and implementation of national regulatory and administrative systems.

Outcomes

- National biosafety frameworks developed and implemented;
- Functional national biosafety systems.

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Parties with operational regulatory frameworks (biosafety laws and regulations) • Number of Parties with functional administrative arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) National biosafety policies, laws and regulations in place and being implemented (b) National institutions and administrative systems for handling LMO applications in place (c) Standard operating procedures for handling LMO applications in place (d) Provisions made in the national annual budgets for operationalizing the national biosafety system (e) Trained staff in place to administer the national biosafety system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Development and implementation/enforcement of national biosafety policies and laws and the implementing regulations or guidelines 1.2 Development of a best practice guide on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Implementation of national biosafety frameworks; (ii) Enforcement of national biosafety laws and regulations; (iii) Establishment and management of administrative systems; and (iv) Mainstreaming of biosafety into relevant policies/plans 1.3 Development of training modules based on elements of the above guide 1.4 Organization of training-of-trainers workshops on the elements of the best

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
	(f) Biosafety is mainstreamed into broader development plans and sectoral policies and programmes, including the national biodiversity strategies and action plans	<p>practice guide</p> <p>1.5 Development and/or implementation of an electronic system for:</p> <p>(i) handling of notifications and</p> <p>(ii) registration of applications and approvals/decisions taken</p> <p>1.6 Organization of training courses and on-the-job training programmes for personnel responsible for administering the biosafety regulatory systems</p>

Focal area 2: Risk assessment and risk management

Operational objective 2

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 living modified organisms (LMOs).

Outcomes

- Resources, including human resources, and the administrative mechanisms required to assess risks of LMOs are available;
- Training materials and technical guidance on risk assessment and risk management developed and used by Parties;
- Infrastructure and administrative mechanisms established for the management of risks of LMOs at national, subregional or regional levels.

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratio of risk assessment summary reports as against number of decisions on LMOs on the BCH • Number of people trained on risk assessment of LMOs as well as in monitoring, management and control of LMOs • Number of Parties that have infrastructure including laboratories for monitoring, management and control of LMOs • Number of Parties using the training materials and technical guidance developed • Number of Parties that are of the opinion that the training materials 	<p>(a) Parties have trained experts in fields relevant for risk assessment and risk management</p> <p>(b) Guidance on risk assessment and risk management of LMOs readily available and being used by Parties</p> <p>(c) Local experts conducting risk assessments and/or risk assessment audits as part of decision-making regarding LMOs</p> <p>(d) Parties submitting risk assessment summaries to the BCH</p> <p>(e) Baseline data on biodiversity relevant for risk assessment and risk management available</p> <p>(f) Parties have the necessary infrastructure for risk assessment and risk management</p>	<p>2.1 Establishment of institutional arrangements (e.g., technical and advisory committees or other arrangements) for conducting or reviewing risk assessments</p> <p>2.2 Organization of training-of-trainers workshops on risk assessment and risk management</p> <p>2.3 Development of guidance documents on risk assessment and risk management</p> <p>2.4 Development or strengthening of technical infrastructure for risk assessment and risk management</p> <p>2.5 Conducting scientific biosafety research relating to LMOs</p> <p>2.6 Review of existing data and/or conducting new research to acquire data on biodiversity for specific ecological areas (e.g., botanical files, consensus documents, national inventories, etc.) relevant to risk assessment and risk management</p> <p>2.7 Establishment and maintenance of user-friendly databases to facilitate easy</p>

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
and technical guidance are sufficient and effective	(g) Parties using science-based risk assessment methods (h) Parties have LMO monitoring programmes based on defined protection goals, risk hypotheses and relevant assessment endpoints	access to data on biodiversity relevant for risk assessment and risk management 2.8 Development of LMO monitoring frameworks and programmes, including post-release monitoring of LMOs 2.9 Training of scientists, phytosanitary officers, inspectors and other relevant officials on LMO monitoring, enforcement and emergency response

Focal area 3: Handling, transport, packaging and identification

Operational objective 3

To develop capacity for handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms.

Outcomes

- Customs/border control officials and other officials are able to enforce the Protocol's requirements related to handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs;
- Personnel are trained and equipped for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs.

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of customs/border control officers and laboratory personnel trained • Percentage of Parties that have established or have reliable access to detection laboratories • Number of national and regional certified laboratories with the capacity to detect LMOs • Number of certified laboratories in operation 	(a) National systems for implementing the Protocol's requirements on the handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs in place and are operational (b) National systems, including standard operating procedures, for detection and identification of LMOs in place (c) Local experts able to detect and identify LMOs in shipments (d) Capacity for verification and certification of documentation accompanying LMO shipments at the points of entry in place (e) Certified LMO testing facilities established at national and (sub)regional levels (f) Systems for traceability and labelling of LMOs in place (g) Regional and subregional networks of laboratories for LMO detection and	3.1 Establishment of national systems for implementing the Protocol's requirements on the handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs 3.2 Development of national systems to implement international rules and standards for sampling and detection of LMOs to facilitate mutual recognition of LMO identification results within and between countries 3.3 Establishment of mechanisms for auditing the efficacy of the national systems for handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs 3.4 Organization of national and (sub)regional training workshops on LMO documentation and identification requirements for customs and border control officials and other relevant stakeholders 3.5 Development of standardized forms and checklists on identification requirements for use in verification of the documentation accompanying LMO shipments 3.6 Development of methodologies and protocols for sampling and detection of LMOs and/or adapting existing ones 3.7 Organization of trainings for local scientists and laboratory technicians in LMO detection and analysis 3.8 Establishment of infrastructure for detection

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
	identification established	and identification of LMOs, including accredited laboratories 3.9 Establishment of (sub)regional networks of laboratories for LMO detection

Focal area 4: Liability and redress

Operational objective 4

To assist Parties to the Protocol to establish and apply rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage resulting from the transboundary movements of living modified organisms, in accordance with the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

Outcomes

- Institutional mechanisms or processes identified or established to facilitate the implementation of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of eligible Parties that received capacity-building support in the area of liability and redress involving LMOs • Number of domestic administrative or legal instruments identified, amended or newly enacted that fulfil the objectives of international rules and procedures in the field of liability and redress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Existing national policies, laws and administrative systems identified and used, and/or amended, to implement the Supplementary Protocol requirements (b) Guidance available and being used by competent authorities in the discharge of their responsibilities under the Supplementary Protocol (c) National capacity for determining appropriate response measures in the event of damage developed (d) User-friendly databases/ knowledge management systems in place and being used to establish baselines and to monitor the status of biodiversity (e) Financial and other support being provided by the GEF, bilateral and multilateral donors and relevant organizations for the ratification and implementation of the Supplementary Protocol (f) Best practices and lessons learned in the implementation of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 Analysis of existing national policies, laws and institutional mechanisms to determine how they address or could address the requirements of the Supplementary Protocol 4.2 Establishment of new, or amendment of existing, domestic legal and administrative frameworks to implement the requirements of the Supplementary Protocol 4.3 Development of guidance to assist competent authorities in discharging their responsibilities under the Supplementary Protocol 4.4 Organization of training activities to strengthen the scientific and technical capacity of the competent authorities to be able to evaluate damage, establish causal links and determine appropriate response measures 4.5 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 4.6 Strengthening national capacity to provide for administrative or judicial review of decisions on response measures to be taken by the operator in accordance with Article 5.6 of the Supplementary Protocol 4.7 Compilation and exchange of information on experiences and lessons learned in the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol through the BCH 4.8 Mobilization of financial and other support for ratification and implementation of the

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
	Supplementary Protocol available through the BCH	Supplementary Protocol

Focal area 5: Public awareness, education and participation

Operational objective 5

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 living modified organisms.

Outcomes

- Parties have access to guidance and training materials on public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs;
- Parties are enabled to promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation in biosafety.

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Percentage of Parties that inform their public about existing modalities for participation • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Programmes for promoting public awareness are being implemented (b) Guidance materials and toolkits including methodologies and best practices for promoting public awareness, and promote education and participation in place and being used by Parties (c) Improved mechanisms for public awareness, and promote education and participation (d) Effective implementation of public awareness, and promote education and participation at national, regional and international level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1 Collection of information on legal frameworks and mechanisms put in place and actual experiences on public awareness, education and participation 5.2 Development and dissemination of training packages/online modules, guidance materials and other tools for different target groups 5.3 Organization of regional and national workshops on the implementation of the above guidance/toolkit in order to strengthen or establish national mechanisms for public awareness, education and participation, interlinking with complementary international agreements 5.4 Organization of training-of-trainers workshops for biosafety educators, communicators and other government and non-government personnel at national and (sub)regional levels 5.5 Establishment of mechanisms to inform the public about existing opportunities and modalities for participation 5.6 Establishment of national biosafety websites, searchable databases and national resource centres 5.7 Development and implementation of biosafety public-awareness programmes

Focal area 6: Information-sharing**Operational objective 6**

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

Outcomes

- 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;
- Tools to facilitate implementation of the Protocol are easily accessible through the BCH;
- Information on the BCH is easily accessible to stakeholders, including the general public.

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of submissions to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition • Amount of traffic from users to the BCH from developing countries and countries with economies in transition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Parties able to register mandatory information in the BCH (b) Parties, non-Parties and other stakeholders are able to post non-mandatory information to the BCH (c) Improved coordination and sharing of experiences on the BCH at national, (sub)regional, and global levels (d) Increased awareness and capacity of relevant stakeholders and general public to access information through BCH (e) National systems set up to gather, manage and upload onto the BCH all the information required under the Protocol 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1 Establishment/maintenance of national and regional infrastructure for accessing the BCH 6.2 Development of national and (sub)regional systems for gathering/managing information for submission to the BCH 6.3 Creation of national websites using, as appropriate, AJAX and Hermes tools 6.4 Organization of BCH training for specific target groups, using the BCH Regional Advisors' network 6.5 Enhancement of cooperation between relevant international organizations on the further development and population of the BCH to maximize use of existing resources, experiences and expertise and to minimize duplication of activities 6.6 Organization of training for information management experts on the BCH and putting in place mechanisms to facilitate use of the BCH by various stakeholders 6.7 Establishment of mechanisms to enable countries to monitor the use of the BCH at the national level and to address gaps 6.8 Continuation of the BCH capacity-building projects at national and (sub)regional levels 6.9 Enhancement of the BCH coordination mechanism at the national level, including interministerial and interagency collaboration with relevant stakeholders

Focal area 7: Biosafety education and training**Operational objective 7**

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

Outcomes

- A sustainable pool of biosafety professionals with various competencies available at national/international levels;
- Improved biosafety education and training programmes;
- Increased exchange of information, training materials and staff and students among academic institutions and relevant organizations.

Indicators	Results/Outputs	Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of academic institutions by region offering biosafety education and training courses and programmes • Number of biosafety training materials and online modules available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Improved identification of training needs and target audiences (b) Information on the current situation with regard to existing biosafety-related education and training initiatives available (c) Relevant documentation (including real-life dossiers and full risk assessment reports) made available for biosafety education and education purposes (d) Compilations of existing biosafety training and education initiatives and trainers are made available (e) E-learning courses and other distance education and training programs on biosafety are available (f) Scientific and professional conferences and workshops support exchange of information and experiences (g) Biosafety regulators continuously trained through on-the-job and off-the-job training programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1 Undertaking of periodic training needs assessments to ascertain the demand for biosafety education and training programme, and to identify target audiences 7.2 Development and/or strengthening of biosafety education and training programs at national and (sub)regional levels, including online and continuing education programs 7.3 Exchange of information on existing biosafety education and training courses and programmes through the BCH 7.4 Integration of biosafety into the curricula of existing relevant academic programs and courses 7.5 Establishment of national and (sub)regional coordination mechanisms or networks for institutions involved in biosafety education and training to facilitate the sharing experiences and best practices 7.6 Exchange of biosafety training and research materials among academic institutions 7.7 Development of academic exchange and fellowship programs to facilitate the sharing of expertise, including through North-South and South-South cooperation 7.8 Expansion and maintenance of the database in the BCH on existing biosafety training and education programmes/courses, academic staff/experts on relevant subjects and training materials. 7.9 Strengthening the capacity of existing universities, research institutes and centres of excellence to deliver biosafety education and training

4.2 Roles and responsibilities

30. The primary responsibility of implementing this Action Plan rests with Parties and other Governments. Other entities will play a supporting role, including providing financial and technical assistance. Parties and other Governments will, *inter alia*, be responsible for:

- (a) Identifying and communicating their capacity-building needs to the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH);
- (b) Designing and implementing specific capacity-building interventions;
- (c) Mobilizing local resources and availing themselves of financial and technical support available through bilateral and multilateral channels;
- (d) Providing to the BCH reports on their capacity-building activities;
- (e) Providing an enabling environment and leadership to encourage the development of capacity-building initiatives by other entities; and
- (f) Providing direction to and coordination for capacity-building activities of other entities, including donors, within the framework of the national capacity-building strategy or action plan.

31. Other entities, including the Global Environment Facility (GEF), United Nations agencies and other intergovernmental organizations, regional bodies, bilateral and multilateral donors, academic and research institutions, non-governmental organizations and the private sector will play different roles in support of Parties and other Governments, based on their comparative advantage and expertise, taking into account the indicative roles identified in annex II to decision BS-I/5.

32. In addition to the roles specified in annex II to decision BS-I/5, the Secretariat will, subject to the availability of resources, undertake the following tasks:

- (a) Assist Parties in identifying their capacity-building needs by providing appropriate needs assessment tools, providing advice upon request and organizing (sub)regional workshops in this regard;
- (b) Organize (sub)regional workshops on project proposal development;
- (c) Prepare toolkits on good practices and lessons learned in biosafety project design, management and evaluation;
- (d) Organize training workshops for Parties on resource mobilization for biosafety to, *inter alia*, facilitate sharing of experiences and good practice and the development of resource mobilization strategies, in the context of activities to facilitate implementation of the Convention's strategy for resource mobilization.

33. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol has an overall responsibility to provide guidance on the implementation of this Action Plan and to review its effectiveness and relevance.

4.3 Resources for implementation

34. The Action Plan will be implemented with financial support from various sources, including GEF, bilateral and multilateral funding, and voluntary financial contributions through the Secretariat. Parties are also encouraged to include in their national budgets allocations to finance biosafety capacity-building activities.

35. Parties will be invited to assess and submit to the Secretariat their funding requirements related to the implementation of the Action Plan as part of the overall process to assess the amount of financial resources needed by developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition to implement the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020. In addition, Parties and other Governments are encouraged to identify and maximize opportunities for technical assistance and cooperation from regional and international sources for the implementation of the Action Plan.

36. The ability to mobilize adequate financial, human and technical resources in a predictable manner and on a sustainable basis will be critical to the successful implementation of the Action Plan. In this regard, Parties are encouraged to develop and implement national strategies for resource mobilization and exchange, through the BCH, information on the experiences, good practices and lessons learned.

4.4 Monitoring and evaluation

37. Monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Action Plan will be done by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. The Secretariat will prepare, on the basis of submissions by Parties and other Governments, a report on the status of implementation of the Action Plan and on how the framework is being used by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations in the planning, implementation and monitoring of their biosafety capacity-building activities or in supporting or financing biosafety programmes. The report will be submitted to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol for its consideration and guidance on measures for improvement.

38. The reports on the status of implementation of the Action Plan will outline the activities implemented and the key results achieved in order to provide a clearer sense of the overall progress made at different levels. In this regard, governments and relevant organizations would be requested to make submissions on both their activities and the results achieved. This would serve as a good measure of the outcomes for the capacity-building focal area of the Strategic Plan of the Protocol.

39. The indicators provided in the Action Plan will be used to monitor and evaluate the progress made. A more elaborate monitoring framework, describing, *inter alia*, the indicators and the data collection methodology, including how and where the data will be collected, will be developed by the Secretariat.

V. REVIEW OF THE FRAMEWORK AND ACTION PLAN

40. A comprehensive review of the Framework and Action Plan will be carried out for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol in conjunction with the mid-term review of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol and the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, its procedures and annexes mandated by Article 35 of the Protocol.

Annex II

**COORDINATION MECHANISM FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING EFFORTS UNDER THE
CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY**

A. Objective

1. The objective of the Coordination Mechanism is to facilitate coordination, cooperation and exchange of information with a view to promoting complementarity and maximizing synergies between various capacity-building initiatives in order to minimize duplication of effort and foster efficient utilization of available resources.

B. Guiding Principles

2. The Coordination Mechanism will be guided by the following basic principles:

(a) The purpose of the mechanism will be to facilitate the sharing of information regarding biosafety capacity-building initiatives and not to supervise, control or evaluate different initiatives;

(b) Participation in, and exchange of information through the Coordination Mechanism will be voluntary and open to all interested stakeholders;

(c) The mechanism will be a simple, flexible and easily accessible system and its operation will involve minimal additional resource requirements;

(d) The mechanism will be operationalized in a phased and incremental manner;

(e) The mechanism will complement and add value to, and not compete with, existing coordination and networking initiatives at national, regional and international levels.

C. Elements of the Coordination Mechanism

3. The Coordination Mechanism will consist of the following core elements:

(a) Liaison Group on capacity-building in biosafety;

(b) Biosafety capacity-building databases;

(c) Information-sharing and networking mechanism; and

(d) Coordination meetings.

1. Liaison Group on Capacity-building in Biosafety

4. The Liaison Group will be a small ad hoc group of experts (not a standing body) constituted and convened by the Executive Secretary in a transparent manner to address specific capacity-building issues/topics, as need arises. It will be composed of no more than fifteen experts selected from among Parties, with due regard to equitable geographical representation and gender balance, and a limited number of experts from relevant organizations not exceeding one third of experts from Parties. Members of the Liaison Group will serve in their individual capacity and not as representatives of their Governments or organizations. Every effort will be made to ensure any one meeting of the Group includes some members that attended previous meetings in order to maintain some level of continuity and institutional memory.

5. The mandate of the Liaison Group will be to provide expert advice to the Executive Secretary on ways and means to enhance the coordination and effective implementation of the capacity-building components of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol.

6. Operations of the Liaison Group will follow the guidance on the expert and liaison groups contained in the consolidated *modus operandi* of SBSTTA (annex III to decision VIII/10 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention). To the extent possible, the Liaison Group will conduct its work using electronic means, including e-mail, online discussions through a restricted collaborative portal and teleconferences. However, face-to-face meetings of the Group may be organized, subject to availability of resources.

2. *Biosafety capacity-building databases*

7. The capacity-building databases will serve as a central repository of information on biosafety capacity-building initiatives around the world (including projects, one-off activities and opportunities, and academic courses), as well as information on country needs and available tools and resource materials. Reports and/or web links to reports on completed initiatives, including summaries of major accomplishments and lessons learned will be incorporated into the database for capacity-building initiatives.

8. The databases will facilitate timely and structured access to information on completed, ongoing and planned initiatives. This will allow users to identify overlaps and gaps in the geographic and thematic coverage of existing capacity-building initiatives, in order to minimise duplication of efforts and resources, facilitating leverage of resources, and identifying opportunities for collaboration, joint actions and synergies.

9. The databases will be maintained through the BCH. Common formats will be used to facilitate submission of information in a structured and consistent manner and also facilitate customized searching of the databases. Persons designated by governments or relevant organizations will be able to register and update information in the databases through the BCH management centre using a password system.

3. *Information-sharing and networking mechanism*

10. The focus of this element will be to facilitate informal but systematic sharing of information, experiences, good practices and lessons learned from capacity-building initiatives as well as exchange ideas on how to address identified needs, challenges and emerging issues. This will be done primarily through the “online forum on capacity-building” but also, as appropriate and subject to the availability of funds, through face-to-face coordination meetings.

11. The online forum and the face-to-face coordination meetings will provide a platform for individuals interested in or involved in biosafety capacity-building and research activities to interact, build relations, network and share information, and learn from each others’ operational experiences. They will also give stakeholders an opportunity to brainstorm, share their views and suggest innovative ideas to improve the design and delivery of capacity-building initiatives. Furthermore, they will provide participants an opportunity to build a common understanding of the general capacity-building issues, needs and the strategic approaches to address those needs, and to foster dialogue and consensus on key issues.

12. A wide range of online tools including online discussion groups, collaborative portals and restricted workspaces for specific groups or expert networks, and e-mail listservs as well as through real-time online conferences will be used, as appropriate.

4. *Coordination meetings*

13. The face-to-face coordination meetings will complement the online forum by allowing individuals from relevant organizations, Government agencies and donors involved in designing, implementing or funding biosafety capacity-building activities to meet face-to-face, in an informal setting, to exchange information and review operational experience and lessons learned regarding their capacity-building efforts. They will also provide an opportunity to review and consider ways of addressing gaps or overlaps between existing activities and foster synergies and partnerships. Furthermore, coordination meetings will facilitate the improvement of planning and delivery of capacity-building assistance to countries while improving the provision of assistance to countries with specific defined needs. These meetings will be organized by the Secretariat in collaboration with relevant organizations, subject to the availability of funding.

D. Administration of the Coordination Mechanism

14. The Coordination Mechanism will be administered by the Executive Secretary, whose primary functions will include the following:

- (a) Maintaining the capacity-building databases, including their regular updating based on submissions received from Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and donors;
- (b) Facilitating the dissemination of information and lessons learned shared through the Coordination Mechanism;
- (c) Convening and servicing meetings of the liaison group on capacity-building in biosafety, and coordination meetings, as necessary;
- (d) Preparing reports on operations of the Coordination Mechanism for consideration by the meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol;
- (e) Promoting awareness of the Coordination Mechanism and encouraging various stakeholders, including donor countries and agencies and organizations providing capacity-building support, to participate more actively in its activities.

BS-VI/4. Capacity-building: roster of experts

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling its decisions BS-IV/4 and BS-V/4,

Taking into account the views and experiences of Parties and other Governments on the use of the roster of experts, including the challenges faced and their projected future need for the (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/Add.2),

1. *Takes note* of the report on the current status and operations of the roster of experts and the voluntary fund for the roster (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/7/Add.2);
2. *Reiterates* its earlier call to Parties and other Governments that have not yet done so to nominate experts to the roster;
3. *Adopts* the revised nomination form for the roster of experts annexed hereto and *authorizes* the Executive Secretary to update the form based on operational experience;
4. *Decides* 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, in relation to capacity-building for developing countries and countries with economies in transition;
5. *Invites* Parties and other Governments to consider nominating experts on the roster to serve on ad hoc technical expert groups, informal advisory committees and other relevant bodies under the Protocol and/or to attend technical meetings under the Protocol;
6. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and the Executive Secretary to consider using experts on the roster as resource persons and/or facilitators for training workshops, courses and other capacity-building activities;
7. *Invites* experts on the roster to participate actively in relevant online discussion forums and online real-time conferences organized under the Protocol; and
8. *Reiterates* its invitation to developed country Parties and other donors to make contributions to the voluntary fund in order to fully operationalize the roster, so as to facilitate implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena 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:*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Academic or research institute | <input type="checkbox"/> Private sector (business and industry) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Government agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Regional economic integration organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO) | <input type="checkbox"/> UN and other specialized agency of the UN Common System |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) | <input type="checkbox"/> 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:*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Academic/ research institute | <input type="checkbox"/> Private sector (business and industry) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Government agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Regional economic integration organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO) | <input type="checkbox"/> UN and other specialized agency of the UN Common System |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) | <input type="checkbox"/> 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:*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Academic or research institute | <input type="checkbox"/> Private sector (business and industry) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Government agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Regional economic integration organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO) | <input type="checkbox"/> UN and other specialized agency of the UN Common System |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) | <input type="checkbox"/> 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:*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Academic or research institute | <input type="checkbox"/> Private sector (business and industry) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Government agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Regional economic integration organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO) | <input type="checkbox"/> UN and other specialized agency of the UN Common System |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) | <input type="checkbox"/> 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):	From <YYYY> to <YYYY>

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):	From <YYYY> to <YYYY>
B. Other professional qualifications	
List a maximum of three other relevant professional qualifications: (e.g. <i>specialized training, certifications obtained, etc.</i>)	a. <Text entry> b. <Text entry> c. <Text entry>

VI. AREAS OF EXPERTISE*
<p>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:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety policy and legal expertise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety law <input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety policy <input type="checkbox"/> Biotechnology policy <input type="checkbox"/> Compliance and Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/> Handling of LMO applications (AIA procedure) <input type="checkbox"/> Import / Export control <input type="checkbox"/> Liability and redress <input type="checkbox"/> Multilateral agreements <p><input type="checkbox"/> Capacity development expertise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional capacity development <input type="checkbox"/> Project design, monitoring and evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Resource mobilization <p><input type="checkbox"/> Information and knowledge management expertise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety Clearing-House <input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety database management <input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety website development <input type="checkbox"/> IT network development <p><input type="checkbox"/> Public awareness, education and participation expertise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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>
Professional memberships <i>List up to three relevant professional societies or organizations of which you are a member:</i>	1. <Text entry> 2. <Text entry> 3. <Text entry>

<p>Technical committees, expert panels or advisory bodies served <i>List up to three relevant technical committees, expert panels or advisory bodies on which you have served and briefly describe your specific responsibilities:</i></p>	<p>1. <Text entry> 2. <Text entry> 3. <Text entry></p>
--	--

IX. LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY*

<p>Mother tongue:*</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Arabic <input type="checkbox"/> English <input type="checkbox"/> Russian <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese <input type="checkbox"/> French <input type="checkbox"/> Spanish Other (specify): <Text entry></p>
------------------------	--

Other languages

<p>Speaking:*</p>	<p>Arabic: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Chinese: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair English: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair French: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Russian: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Spanish: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Other (specify): <Text entry> <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair</p>
-------------------	---

<p>Reading:*</p>	<p>Arabic: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Chinese: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair English: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair French: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Russian: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Spanish: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Other (specify): <Text entry> <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair</p>
------------------	---

<p>Writing:*</p>	<p>Arabic: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Chinese: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair English: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair French: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Russian: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Spanish: <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair Other (specify): <Text entry> <input type="checkbox"/>Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>Good <input type="checkbox"/>Fair</p>
------------------	---

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>
<p><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></p>	
Signature of the Cartagena Protocol National Focal Point:*	
Name of the BCH National Focal Point:*	<Text entry>
<p><i>I hereby agree to the inclusion of the above information in the Biosafety Clearing-House.</i></p>	
Signature of the BCH National Focal Point:*	

BS-VI/5. Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling decisions BS-I/5, BS-II/5, BS-III/5, BS-IV/5 and BS-V/5,

Noting with concern the drastic decline in the level of bilateral and multilateral funding available for biosafety capacity-building activities,

1. *Urges* Parties to give priority to national biosafety plans and projects under the Global Environment Facility's System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) to ensure support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

I. Guidance to the financial mechanism

2. *Recommends* to the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its further guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, that it invite the Global Environment Facility to:

(a) Support regional and multi-country thematic capacity-building projects for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety using Focal Area Set-aside resources under the biodiversity focal area, outside national STAR allocations;

(b) Allow for more flexibility in the utilization of funds provided for capacity-building to address emerging needs within the overall framework of approved projects;

(c) Further streamline, simplify and expedite, to the extent possible, the process of accessing funds from the GEF trust fund;

(d) Consider developing a new strategy for financing biosafety, incorporating the priorities and objectives of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011–2020 and other developments that have taken place since 2006;

(e) Set aside the guidance contained in paragraph 21 (b) of decision VII/20, which allowed Parties to the Convention that are not yet Parties to the Protocol to receive GEF funding for certain capacity-building activities related to biosafety after providing a clear political commitment towards becoming Parties to the Protocol;

(f) Provide further support to all eligible Parties for capacity-building in the use of the Biosafety Clearing-House, based on experiences or lessons learned during the Project or Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House and using resources under the biodiversity focal area;

(g) Make available, in a timely manner, adequate and predictable financial resources to eligible Parties to facilitate the preparation of their third national reports under the Protocol;

(h) Provide support to eligible Parties that have not yet done so to initiate implementation of their legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol;

(i) Take into account the new Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in providing financial support to developing countries and countries with economies in transition;

(j) Provide financial and technical assistance to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to undertake, as appropriate, the testing activities referred to in paragraph 3 of decision BS-VI/12 on risk assessment and risk management;

(k) Provide financial and technical assistance to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to implement the capacity-building activities referred in paragraph 9 of decision BS-VI/12 on risk assessment and risk management;

(l) Make financial resources available with a view to supporting awareness-raising, experience-sharing and capacity-building activities in order to expedite the early entry into force and implementation of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Protocol;

(m) Cooperate with and support developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to build capacity to implement the detection and identification requirements of paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of Article 18 of the Protocol and related decisions, including by facilitating the transfer of technology

(n) Consider, within the four-year outcome-oriented framework of programme priorities for biodiversity for the sixth GEF replenishment period (2014–2018), the following programme priorities with respect to biosafety:

1. National biosafety frameworks;
2. Risk assessment and risk management;
3. Handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms;
4. Liability and redress;
5. Public awareness, education, access to information and participation;
6. Information sharing, including full participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House;
7. Biosafety education and training;
8. Activities recommended by the Compliance Committee to assist eligible Parties to comply with their obligations under the Protocol; and
9. Socio-economic considerations;

(o) In providing support for priority 9 specified in subparagraph (n) above, take into account the outcome of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations and the decision on the appropriate further steps towards fulfilling operational objective 1.7 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety 2011-2020, recognizing that further work to develop conceptual clarity on the issue is under way;

(p) In allocating resources under the biodiversity focal area, consider making a notional allocation which improves the biosafety share of the biodiversity focal area to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety during the sixth replenishment period (2014–2018);

II. *Mobilization of additional resources*

3. *Emphasizes* the need to include financing for biosafety as part of sustainable development financing in the context of the outcomes of the Rio+20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development that relate to finance, especially section VI.A;

4. *Urges Parties and invites* other Governments to implement, as appropriate, the following measures within the overall framework of the Strategy for Resource Mobilization in support of the Convention on Biological Diversity, with a view to mobilizing additional financial resources for implementation of the Protocol and in accordance with Articles 20 and 21 of the Convention and Article 28 of the Protocol:

(a) Identify and seek funding support from diverse sources including regional and international donor agencies, foundations and, as appropriate, through private-sector involvement;

(b) Establish strategic partnerships with other Parties and other Governments and with various organizations, regional bodies or centres of excellence with a view to pooling resources and/or widening opportunities and possibilities for mobilizing resources from various sources;

(c) Identify and maximize opportunities for technical cooperation with regional and international organizations, institutions and development assistance agencies;

(d) Mainstream biosafety into national development plans and relevant sectoral policies, strategies and programmes, including development assistance programmes and national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

(e) Consider designating dedicated staff for resource mobilization and building internal capacity to mobilize resources for the implementation of national biosafety activities in a systematic, coordinated and sustainable manner;

(f) Ensure efficient use of available resources and adopt cost-effective approaches to capacity-building;

5. *Invites* Parties and other Governments to exchange, through the Biosafety Clearing-House, information on their experiences, good practices and lessons learned on the mobilization of resources at the national and regional levels;

6. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to include resource mobilization for the Protocol in activities to facilitate the implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization in support of the Convention on Biological Diversity, including in regional and subregional workshops to assist Parties to elaborate country-specific resource mobilization strategies for the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans;

7. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to further communicate with the GEF Secretariat before the meeting of the GEF Council in November 2012 in order to discuss the possibility of opening a special financial support window for implementation of the Protocol, and to report on the outcome to the Parties to the Protocol.

BS-VI/6. Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling its decisions BS-II/6 and BS-V/6,

Welcoming the information provided by the Executive Secretary on activities undertaken to improve cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/5),

Also welcoming the Executive Secretary's cooperation with, *inter alia*, the Green Customs Initiative, the World Trade Organization, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the International Plant Protection Convention and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (the Aarhus Convention),

Underlining the contribution of cooperation and coordination among relevant organizations, multilateral agreements and initiatives to the effective implementation of the Protocol and the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020, adopted at the fifth meeting of the Parties to the Protocol,

Requests the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of funds, to:

- (a) Further pursue cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives with a view to meeting the strategic objective in focal area 5 of the Strategic Plan, on outreach and cooperation;
- (b) Continue efforts to gain observer status in those committees of the World Trade Organization that are relevant to biosafety.

BS-VI/7. Programme budget for the costs of the secretariat services and the biosafety work programme of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the biennium 2013-2014

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

1. Welcomes the contribution of US\$ 1,126,162 for 2012, to be increased by 2 per cent per year, from the host country Canada and the Province of Quebec to the operation of the Secretariat, of which 16.5 per cent has been allocated per annum to offset contributions from the Parties to the Protocol for the biennium 2013-2014;

2. Approves a core programme budget (BG) of US\$ 2,922,100 for the year 2013 and of US\$ 2,963,100 for the year 2014, for the purposes set out in table 1 below;

3. Approves the secretariat staffing as set out in table 2 below;

4. Adopts the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the costs under the Protocol for 2013 and 2014 set out in table 5 below;

5. Decides to maintain the working capital reserve at a level of 5 per cent of the core programme budget (BG) expenditure, including programme support costs;

6. Authorizes the Executive Secretary to enter into commitments up to the level of the approved budget, drawing on available cash resources, including unspent balances, contributions from previous financial periods and miscellaneous income;

7. Agrees to share the costs for secretariat services between those that are common to the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Protocol on an 85:15 ratio for the biennium 2013-2014;

8. Noting that as a contingency plan and in the event that the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity decides at its eleventh meeting that its twelfth meeting will take place in early 2015 a provisional budget for 2015 to allow for the funding of the seventh meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the operations of the Secretariat in 2015 should be agreed upon by the current meeting of the Parties, adopts on a provisional basis the alternative tables 6-7 which will replace tables and figures mentioned above should the Conference of the Parties decide to hold its twelfth meeting in 2015 rather than 2014;*

9. Invites all Parties to the Protocol to note that contributions to the core programme budget (BG) are due on 1 January of the year in which these contributions have been budgeted for, and to pay them promptly, and urges Parties in a position to do so, to pay by 1 December of the year 2012 for the calendar year 2013 and by 1 October 2013 for the calendar year 2014, the contributions set out in table 5 and in this regard requests that Parties be notified of the amount of their contributions for 2014 by 1 August 2013;

10. Notes with concern that a number of Parties have not paid their contributions to the core budget (BG Trust Fund) for 2012 and prior years;

* Note by the Secretariat. Following the adoption of this decision, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, by paragraph 1 of its decision XI/10, decided "to maintain the current periodicity of its meetings until 2020, and that its future meetings will take place in 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020".

11. *Urges* Parties that have still not paid their contributions to the core budget (BG Trust Fund) for 2012 and prior years; to do so without delay and *requests* the Executive Secretary to publish and regularly update information on the status of contributions to the Protocol's Trust Funds (BG, BH and BI);

12. *Decides* that with regard to contributions due from 1 January 2005 onwards, Parties whose contributions are in arrears for two (2) or more years will not be eligible to become a member of the bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol; this will only apply in the case of Parties that are not least developed countries or small island developing States;

13. *Authorizes* the Executive Secretary to enter into arrangements with any Party whose contributions are in arrears for two or more years to mutually agree on a 'schedule of payments' for such a Party, to clear all outstanding arrears, within six years depending on the financial circumstances of the Party in arrears and pay future contributions by the due date, and report on the implementation of any such arrangement to the next meeting of the Bureau and to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

14. *Decides* that a Party with an agreed arrangement in accordance with paragraph 13 above and that is fully respecting the provisions of that arrangement will not be subject to the provisions of paragraph 12 above;

15. *Requests* the Executive Secretary and *invites* the President of the COP-MOP through a jointly signed letter to notify Parties whose contributions are in arrears and to invite them to take timely action.

16. *Agrees with* the funding estimates for activities under the Protocol to be financed from:

(a) The Special Voluntary Trust Fund (BH) for Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities for the biennium 2013-2014, as specified by the Executive Secretary (see resource requirements in table 3 below);

(b) The Special Voluntary Trust Fund (BI) for Facilitating Participation of the Developing Country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States, and Parties with Economies in Transition, for the biennium 2013-2014, as specified by the Executive Secretary (see resource requirements in table 4 below);

and *urges* Parties to make contributions to these funds;

17. *Invites* all States not Parties to the Protocol, as well as governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and other sources, to contribute to the trust funds for the Protocol (BH, BI) to enable the Secretariat to implement approved activities in a timely manner especially capacity-building priorities and activities identified by developing countries and small island developing States, and Parties with economies in transition in respect of risk assessment and risk management and the effective operation of the Biosafety Clearing-House;

18. *Notes with concern and regret* that the core programme budget (BG) does not contain adequate finance for all activities identified by the Parties, including the priorities of developing country Parties. This has resulted in finance for technical Expert Groups to be dependent on voluntary funding which could have in particular a deleterious effect on capacity building for developing countries. Therefore agrees that the allocation of funds for the technical Expert Groups from the BH should not become standard practice in future budgets;

19. *Reaffirms* the importance of full and active participation of the developing country parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States, as well as Parties with economies in transition in the activities of the Protocol and requests the Secretariat to remind Parties of the need to contribute to the Special Voluntary Trust Fund (BI) at least six months prior to the ordinary meetings of the Conference of the Parties, and urges Parties in the position to do so to ensure that the contributions are paid at least three months before the meeting;

20. *Noting* the low level of contributions to the BI Trust Fund, which facilitates participation in the meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, and with a view to increasing finance for such participation, *requests* the Conference of the Parties to explore the possibility of merging the BI special voluntary Trust Fund with the BZ Voluntary Trust Fund, which facilitates participation of Parties in the Convention process, taking into account advice to be provided by the Executive Secretary and the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, and in the event of such a merger, *further requests* the Executive Secretary to ensure transparency when reporting expenditure for the Protocol and the Convention under the merged Trust Fund;

21. *Decides* that the trust funds for the Protocol (BG, BH, BI) shall be extended for a period of two years, beginning 1 January 2014 and ending 31 December 2015; and requests the Executive Director of UNEP to seek the approval of the Governing Council of UNEP for their extensions;

22. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to prepare and submit a programme budget for secretariat services, and the biosafety work programme of the Protocol and the Supplementary Protocol, including terms of reference for any proposals for new staff, and *agrees* to upgrade a post for the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol for the biennium 2015-2016 to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol; and to provide three alternatives for the budget based on:

(a) The Executive Secretary's assessment of the required rate of growth for the programme budget;

(b) Increasing the core programme budget (BG Trust Fund) from the 2013-2014 level by 7.5 per cent in nominal terms;

(c) Maintaining the core programme budget (BG Trust Fund) at the 2013-2014 level in nominal terms;

23. *Welcomes* the action taken by the Executive Secretary in response to paragraph 25 of decision BS-V/7 on providing all relevant financial information to the MOP, and further requests that the related COP papers are also posted on the MOP document website;

24. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to seek further operational efficiencies in the biennium 2013-2014 and in the organization of the Convention of the Parties serving as the meeting of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol given that it is held in conjunction with the meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and to report thereon at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.

Table 1. Biosafety Protocol resource requirements from the core budget (BG Trust Fund) for the biennium 2013-2014

Expenditures		2013	2014	TOTAL
		(US\$ thousands)	(US\$ thousands)	(US\$ thousands)
A.	Staff costs*	1,875.2	1,916.7	3,791.9
B.	Biosafety Bureau meetings	20.0	25.0	45.0
C.	COP/MOP	200.0	250.0	450.0
D.	Consultants/subcontracts	20.0	20.0	40.0
E.	Travel on official business	50.0	50.0	100.0
F.	Liaison Group meetings on Capacity-Building	30.0	30.0	60.0
G.	Biosafety Clearing House advisory meetings	55.0	-	55.0
H.	Compliance committee meeting	45.0	45.0	90.0
I.	AHTEG- Risk Assessment	-	-	-
J.	General operating expenses	252.4	255.6	508.0
K.	Temporary assistance/Overtime	5.0	5.0	10.0
L.	Translation of BCH website	25.0	25.0	50.0
M.	AHTEG on Socio-economic considerations	-	-	-
Sub-total (I)		2,577.6	2,622.3	5,199.9
II	Programme support charge 13%	335.1	340.9	676.0
III	Working capital reserve	9.4		9.4
GRAND TOTAL (I + II + III)		2,922.1	2,963.1	5,885.2
Less contribution from host country		189.5	193.3	382.9
TOTAL		2,732.6	2,769.8	5,502.4
Less savings from previous years		200.0	200.0	400.0
NET TOTAL (amount to be shared by Parties)		2,532.6	2,569.8	5,102.4

* Includes 15% costs for 1P-5, 1 P-4; 3 P-3 and 2 G-S staff funded mainly by the Convention.

* Includes 50% costs for 1 P-4 staff funded by the Convention.

Table 2. Biosafety Protocol staffing requirements from the core budget (BG Trust Fund) for the biennium 2013-2014

	2013	2014
I. Professional category		
D-1	1	1
P-4 ⁴	2.5	2.5
P-3	3	3
P-2	1	1
Total professional category	7.5	7.5
II. Total General Service category	5	5
TOTAL (A + B)	12.5	12.5

⁴ Includes 50% costs for 1 P-4 staff funded by the Convention

Table 3

**Resource requirements from the Special Voluntary Trust Fund (BH) for
Additional Voluntary Contributions in Support of Approved Activities of
the Cartagena Protocol for the biennium 2013-2014
(Thousands of United States dollars)**

I Description*	2013-2014
Meetings/Workshops	
Agenda item 5: Biosafety Clearing-House	55,000
Agenda item 13: Article 17 (Unintentional) – Regional workshop	120,000
Agenda item 14: Risk assessment and risk management expert meeting	50,000
Agenda item 16: Socio-economic considerations expert meeting	50,000
Agenda item 9: Coordination meetings	60,000
Ongoing Strategic Plan activities	160,000
Consultants	
Agenda item 5: Activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House	10,000
Agenda item 9: Roster of biosafety experts	200,000
Agenda item 18: Methodological approach to assessment and review	20,000
Travel of Staff	
Agenda item 7: Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives	30,000
Agenda item 16: Socio-economic considerations	10,000
Publications/Printing costs	
Agenda item 13: Article 17(unintentional)	60,000
On-going Strategic Plan activities	300,000
Equipment	
Agenda item 5: Biosafety Clearing-House	10,000
Activities	
Agenda item 5: Translation of the Biosafety Clearing-House	20,000
Agenda item 14: Risk assessment and risk management (translation)	100,000
Sub-total I	1,255,000
II Programme support costs (13%)	163,150
Total Costs (I + II)	1,418,150

* COP-MOP/6 agenda items

Table 4

Resource requirements from the Special Voluntary Trust Fund (BI) for Facilitating Participation of Parties in the Protocol for the biennium 2013-2014

(Thousands of United States dollars)

	Description	2013	2014
I.	<i>Meetings</i>		
	Meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol		600.0
	Subtotal I		600.0
II.	Programme support charges (13%)		78.0
	Total Cost (I + II)		678.0

Table 5. Contributions to the Trust Fund for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the biennium 2013-2014

Party	UN scale of assessments 2012 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2013 US\$	UN scale of assessments 2012 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions as per 1 Jan. 2014 US\$	Total contributions 2013-2014 US\$
Albania	0.010	0.014	357	0.010	0.014	362	719
Algeria	0.128	0.180	4,570	0.128	0.180	4,637	9,208
Angola	0.010	0.010	253	0.010	0.010	257	510
Antigua and Barbuda	0.002	0.003	71	0.002	0.003	72	144
Armenia	0.005	0.007	179	0.005	0.007	181	360
Austria	0.851	1.200	30,385	0.851	1.200	30,832	61,216
Azerbaijan	0.015	0.021	536	0.015	0.021	543	1,079
Bahamas	0.018	0.025	643	0.018	0.025	652	1,295
Bahrain	0.039	0.055	1,392	0.039	0.055	1,413	2,805
Bangladesh	0.010	0.010	253	0.010	0.010	257	510
Barbados	0.008	0.011	286	0.008	0.011	290	575
Belarus	0.042	0.059	1,500	0.042	0.059	1,522	3,021
Belgium	1.075	1.516	38,382	1.075	1.516	38,947	77,330
Belize	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Benin	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Bhutan	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Bolivia	0.007	0.010	250	0.007	0.010	254	504
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.014	0.020	500	0.014	0.020	507	1,007
Botswana	0.018	0.025	643	0.018	0.025	652	1,295
Brazil	1.611	2.271	57,520	1.611	2.271	58,367	115,887
Bulgaria	0.038	0.054	1,357	0.038	0.054	1,377	2,734
Burkina Faso	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Burundi	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Cambodia	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Cameroon	0.011	0.016	393	0.011	0.016	399	791
Cape Verde	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Central African Republic	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Chad	0.002	0.003	71	0.002	0.003	72	144
China	3.189	4.496	113,862	3.189	4.496	115,538	229,400
Colombia	0.144	0.203	5,141	0.144	0.203	5,217	10,359
Comoros	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Congo	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Costa Rica	0.034	0.048	1,214	0.034	0.048	1,232	2,446
Croatia	0.097	0.137	3,463	0.097	0.137	3,514	6,978
Cuba	0.071	0.100	2,535	0.071	0.100	2,572	5,107
Cyprus	0.046	0.065	1,642	0.046	0.065	1,667	3,309
Czech Republic	0.349	0.492	12,461	0.349	0.492	12,644	25,105
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.007	0.010	250	0.007	0.010	254	504

Party	UN scale of assessments 2012 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2013 US\$	UN scale of assessments 2012 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions as per 1 Jan. 2014 US\$	Total contributions 2013-2014 US\$
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Denmark	0.736	1.038	26,279	0.736	1.038	26,665	52,944
Djibouti	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Dominica	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Dominican Republic	0.042	0.059	1,500	0.042	0.059	1,522	3,021
Ecuador	0.040	0.056	1,428	0.040	0.056	1,449	2,877
Egypt	0.094	0.133	3,356	0.094	0.133	3,406	6,762
El Salvador	0.019	0.027	678	0.019	0.027	688	1,367
Eritrea	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Estonia	0.040	0.056	1,428	0.040	0.056	1,449	2,877
Ethiopia	0.008	0.010	253	0.008	0.010	257	510
European Union	2.500	2.500	63,314	2.500	2.500	64,246	127,560
Fiji	0.004	0.006	143	0.004	0.006	145	288
Finland	0.566	0.798	20,209	0.566	0.798	20,506	40,715
France	6.123	8.632	218,619	6.123	8.632	221,836	440,456
Gabon	0.014	0.020	500	0.014	0.020	507	1,007
Gambia	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Georgia	0.006	0.008	214	0.006	0.008	217	432
Germany	8.018	11.304	286,280	8.018	11.304	290,492	576,772
Ghana	0.006	0.008	214	0.006	0.008	217	432
Greece	0.691	0.974	24,672	0.691	0.974	25,035	49,707
Grenada	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Guatemala	0.028	0.039	1,000	0.028	0.039	1,014	2,014
Guinea	0.002	0.003	71	0.002	0.003	72	144
Guinea-Bissau	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Guyana	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Honduras	0.008	0.011	286	0.008	0.011	290	575
Hungary	0.291	0.410	10,390	0.291	0.410	10,543	20,933
India	0.534	0.753	19,066	0.534	0.753	19,347	38,413
Indonesia	0.238	0.336	8,498	0.238	0.336	8,623	17,120
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.233	0.328	8,319	0.233	0.328	8,442	16,761
Ireland	0.498	0.702	17,781	0.498	0.702	18,043	35,823
Italy	4.999	7.048	178,487	4.999	7.048	181,114	359,601
Jamaica	0.014	0.020	500	0.014	0.020	507	1,007
Japan	12.530	17.665	447,379	12.530	17.665	453,962	901,341
Jordan	0.014	0.020	500	0.014	0.020	507	1,007
Kazakhstan	0.076	0.107	2,714	0.076	0.107	2,753	5,467
Kenya	0.012	0.017	428	0.012	0.017	435	863
Kiribati	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Kyrgyzstan	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72

Party	UN scale of assessments 2012 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2013 US\$	UN scale of assessments 2012 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions as per 1 Jan. 2014 US\$	Total contributions 2013-2014 US\$
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Latvia	0.038	0.054	1,357	0.038	0.054	1,377	2,734
Lesotho	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Liberia	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Libya	0.129	0.182	4,606	0.129	0.182	4,674	9,280
Lithuania	0.065	0.092	2,321	0.065	0.092	2,355	4,676
Luxembourg	0.090	0.127	3,213	0.090	0.127	3,261	6,474
Madagascar	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Malawi	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Malaysia	0.253	0.357	9,033	0.253	0.357	9,166	18,199
Maldives	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Mali	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Malta	0.017	0.024	607	0.017	0.024	616	1,223
Marshall Islands	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Mauritania	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Mauritius	0.011	0.016	393	0.011	0.016	399	791
Mexico	2.356	3.322	84,120	2.356	3.322	85,358	169,478
Mongolia	0.002	0.003	71	0.002	0.003	72	144
Montenegro	0.004	0.006	143	0.004	0.006	145	288
Morocco	0.058	0.082	2,071	0.058	0.082	2,101	4,172
Mozambique	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Myanmar	0.006	0.008	214	0.006	0.008	217	432
Namibia	0.008	0.011	286	0.008	0.011	290	575
Nauru	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Netherlands	1.855	2.615	66,232	1.855	2.615	67,207	133,439
New Zealand	0.273	0.385	9,747	0.273	0.385	9,891	19,638
Nicaragua	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Niger	0.002	0.003	71	0.002	0.003	72	144
Nigeria	0.078	0.110	2,785	0.078	0.110	2,826	5,611
Niue	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Norway	0.871	1.228	31,099	0.871	1.228	31,556	62,655
Oman	0.086	0.121	3,071	0.086	0.121	3,116	6,186
Pakistan	0.082	0.116	2,928	0.082	0.116	2,971	5,899
Palau	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Panama	0.022	0.031	786	0.022	0.031	797	1,583
Papua New Guinea	0.002	0.003	71	0.002	0.003	72	144
Paraguay	0.007	0.010	250	0.007	0.010	254	504
Peru	0.090	0.127	3,213	0.090	0.127	3,261	6,474
Philippines	0.090	0.127	3,213	0.090	0.127	3,261	6,474
Poland	0.828	1.167	29,563	0.828	1.167	29,998	59,562
Portugal	0.511	0.720	18,245	0.511	0.720	18,514	36,759

Party	UN scale of assessments 2012 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2013 US\$	UN scale of assessments 2012 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions as per 1 Jan. 2014 US\$	Total contributions 2013-2014 US\$
Qatar	0.135	0.190	4,820	0.135	0.190	4,891	9,711
Republic of Korea	2.260	3.186	80,692	2.260	3.186	81,880	162,572
Republic of Moldova	0.002	0.003	71	0.002	0.003	72	144
Romania	0.177	0.250	6,320	0.177	0.250	6,413	12,732
Rwanda	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Saint Lucia	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Samoa	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Saudi Arabia	0.830	1.170	29,635	0.830	1.170	30,071	59,706
Senegal	0.006	0.008	214	0.006	0.008	217	432
Serbia	0.037	0.052	1,321	0.037	0.052	1,341	2,662
Seychelles	0.002	0.003	71	0.002	0.003	72	144
Slovakia	0.142	0.200	5,070	0.142	0.200	5,145	10,215
Slovenia	0.103	0.145	3,678	0.103	0.145	3,732	7,409
Solomon Islands	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Somalia	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
South Africa	0.385	0.543	13,746	0.385	0.543	13,949	27,695
Spain	3.177	4.479	113,434	3.177	4.479	115,103	228,536
Sri Lanka	0.019	0.027	678	0.019	0.027	688	1,367
Sudan	0.010	0.010	253	0.010	0.010	257	510
Suriname	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Swaziland	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
Sweden	1.064	1.500	37,990	1.064	1.500	38,549	76,538
Switzerland	1.130	1.593	40,346	1.130	1.593	40,940	81,286
Syrian Arab Republic	0.025	0.035	893	0.025	0.035	906	1,798
Tajikistan	0.002	0.003	71	0.002	0.003	72	144
Thailand	0.209	0.295	7,462	0.209	0.295	7,572	15,034
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.007	0.010	250	0.007	0.010	254	504
Togo	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Tonga	0.001	0.001	36	0.001	0.001	36	72
Trinidad and Tobago	0.044	0.062	1,571	0.044	0.062	1,594	3,165
Tunisia	0.030	0.042	1,071	0.030	0.042	1,087	2,158
Turkey	0.617	0.870	22,030	0.617	0.870	22,354	44,384
Turkmenistan	0.026	0.037	928	0.026	0.037	942	1,870
Uganda	0.006	0.008	214	0.006	0.008	217	432
Ukraine	0.087	0.123	3,106	0.087	0.123	3,152	6,258
United Kingdom	6.604	9.310	235,793	6.604	9.310	239,263	475,056

Party	UN scale of assessments 2012 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions per 1 Jan. 2013 US\$	UN scale of assessments 2012 (per cent)	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01 % (per cent)	Contributions as per 1 Jan. 2014 US\$	Total contributions 2013-2014 US\$
United Republic of Tanzania	0.008	0.010	253	0.008	0.010	257	510
Uruguay	0.027	0.038	964	0.027	0.038	978	1,942
Venezuela	0.314	0.443	11,211	0.314	0.443	11,376	22,587
Viet Nam	0.033	0.047	1,178	0.033	0.047	1,196	2,374
Yemen	0.010	0.010	253	0.010	0.010	257	510
Zambia	0.004	0.006	143	0.004	0.006	145	288
Zimbabwe	0.003	0.004	107	0.003	0.004	109	216
TOTAL	71.671	100.000	2,532,558	71.671	100.000	2,569,825	5,102,383

Table 6. Biosafety Protocol - Contingency resource requirements from the core budget (BG Trust Fund) for the period 2013-2015

Expenditures		2013	2014	2015	<i>TOTAL</i>
		(US\$ thousands)	(US\$ thousands)	(US\$ thousands)	(US\$ thousands)
A.	Staff costs*	1,875.2	1,916.7	1,959.3	5,751.2
B.	Biosafety Bureau meetings	20.0	20.0	25.0	65.0
C.	COP/MOP	100.0	200.0	150.0	450.0
D.	Consultants/subcontracts	20.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
E.	Travel on official business	50.0	50.0	50.0	150.0
F.	Liaison Group meetings on Capacity-Building	30.0	30.0	30.0	90.0
G.	Biosafety Clearing House advisory meetings	55.0	-	55.0	110.0
H.	Compliance committee meeting	45.0	45.0	45.0	135.0
I.	AHTEG- Risk Assessment	-	-	-	-
J.	General operating expenses	252.4	255.6	255.6	763.7
K.	Temporary assistance/Overtime	5.0	5.0	5.0	15.0
L.	Translation of BCH website	25.0	25.0	25.0	75.0
M.	AHTEG on Socio-economic considerations	-	-	-	-
Sub-total (I)		2,477.7	2,567.3	2,620.0	7,665.0
II	Programme support charge 13%	322.1	333.8	340.6	996.4
III	Working capital reserve	148.7			148.7
GRAND TOTAL (I + II + III)		2,948.4	2,901.1	2,960.6	8,810.1
<i>Less contribution from host country</i>		189.5	193.3	197.2	580.0
TOTAL		2,758.9	2,707.7	2,763.4	8,230.0
<i>Less savings from previous years</i>		200.0	200.0		400.0
NET TOTAL (amount to be shared by Parties)		2,558.9	2,507.7	2,763.4	7,830.0

* Includes 15% costs for 1P-5, 1 P-4; 3 P-3 and 2 G-S staff funded mainly by the Convention.

* Includes 50% costs for 1 P-4 staff funded by the Convention.

** Assessed contributions to be based on the applicable UN scale of assessments for 2015.

Table 7. Biosafety Protocol - Contingency staffing requirements from the core budget (BG Trust Fund) for the period 2013-2015

	2013	2014	2015
A			
Professional category			
D-1	1	1	1
P-4	2.5	2.5	2.5
P-3	3	3	3
P-2	1	1	1
Total Professional category	7.5	7.5	7.5
B.			
Total General Service category	5	5	5
TOTAL (A + B)	12.5	12.5	12.5

BS-VI/8. Handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms (Article 18)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling its decisions BS-I/6, BS-III/8, BS-IV/8 and BS-V/9,

Noting the ongoing cooperation between the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and international organizations whose work is relevant to the handling, transport, packaging and identification of living modified organisms further to decision BS-II/6,

1. *Urges* Parties to expedite the implementation of their biosafety regulatory frameworks and make available to the Biosafety Clearing-House any laws, regulations and guidelines for the implementation of the Protocol and any changes to their regulatory requirements related to the identification and documentation of living modified organisms destined for contained use or living modified organisms for intentional introduction into the environment;

2. *Requests* Parties and *encourages* other Governments to continue to implement the requirements of paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of Article 18 of the Protocol and related decisions through the use of a commercial invoice or other documents required or utilized by existing documentation systems, or documentation required by domestic regulatory and/or administrative frameworks;

3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to include a specific question in the report form for the third national reports inquiring whether Parties require identification information to be provided in existing types of documentation or in a stand-alone document or both;

4. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, and relevant international organizations to cooperate with and support developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to build capacity to implement the detection and identification requirements of paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of Article 18 of the Protocol and related decisions, including by facilitating the transfer of technology;

5. *Encourages* the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development to renew efforts to develop unique identification systems for living modified micro-organisms and animals, further to paragraph 3 of section C of decision BS-I/6;

6. *Encourages* Parties and *invites* other Governments to support, in meetings of the Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization, the request of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for observer status in the Committee;

7. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to:

(a) Continue collaborating with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations on the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health;

(b) Further examine the potential gaps and inconsistencies identified in the study commissioned under paragraph 1 (d) of decision BS-V/9 (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/INF/24) and provide recommendations, as appropriate, to the seventh meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

BS-VI/9. *Subsidiary Bodies (Article 30)*

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling its decision BS-IV/13,

Taking note of the experience gained and lessons learned in handling scientific and technical issues through the establishment of ad hoc technical expert groups and online discussion forums such as the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Second Assessment and Review of the Protocol,

Decides:

- (a) That, at this stage, there is no need to establish an open-ended subsidiary body for scientific and technical advice under the Protocol;
- (b) To continue establishing, as needed and subject to the availability of funds, ad hoc technical expert groups with specific mandates to provide advice on one or more scientific and technical issues;
- (c) To take into account the experience gained and lessons learned from previous ad hoc technical expert groups in establishing similar expert groups in the future, including the convening, as appropriate, open-ended online expert forums prior to any face-to-face meetings of future ad hoc technical expert groups;
- (d) To consider the need to establish an open-ended subsidiary body for scientific and technical advice under the Protocol at its eighth meeting in conjunction with the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020.

BS-VI/10. Notification requirements (Article 8)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling its recommendation to Parties, contained in paragraph 2 of decision BS-II/8, to consider the elements referred to therein in implementing Article 8 of the Protocol,

Recalling also its decision BS-IV/18 to further review this item at the present meeting of the Parties to the Protocol based on national implementation experiences that may be communicated through the second national reports,

Recognizing that, based on the analysis of information in the second national reports, a number of Parties still need to take appropriate legal and administrative measures with a view to implementing the notification requirements specified in Article 8 of the Protocol,

Recalling paragraph 3 of decision BS-V/2 regarding the LMO quick-link tool available in the Biosafety Clearing-House, which is intended to facilitate easy access to information on specific living modified organisms,

1. *Requests* Parties to address any gaps that may exist in their domestic implementation of the notification requirements under Article 8 of the Protocol, including in the context of their general obligation to take the necessary and appropriate legal, administrative and other measures to implement their obligations under the Protocol, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 2 of the Protocol;

2. *Decides* that possible further review of this item should only take place if there is a documented need, indicated by Parties through national reports or other submissions, including to the Biosafety Clearing-House, that demonstrate challenges in implementing obligations under Article 8, taking also into account experiences of acknowledging receipt of notification in the context of Article 9;

3. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to consider using the LMO quick-link tool by their relevant national authorities where reference is made to a living modified organism;

4. *Encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to share, through the Biosafety Clearing-House, experiences and best practices on the implementation of notification requirements under Article 8 of the Protocol.

BS-VI/11. Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling its decision BS-V/11, which, among other things, called upon Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to sign the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress and subsequently deposit instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession,

Welcoming the 51 Parties to the Protocol that had signed the Supplementary Protocol by the closing date of 6 March 2012 and the three Parties that have deposited their instruments of ratification to date,

Noting with appreciation the generous financial contribution made by the Government of Japan, which has enabled the Secretariat to undertake the work it has accomplished in the past two years to introduce and promote the Supplementary Protocol with a view to expediting its early entry into force and its implementation,

1. *Calls upon* Parties to the Protocol that have not yet done so to initiate and expedite their internal processes leading to ratification, approval or acceptance of or accession to the Supplementary Protocol;
2. *Calls upon* States that are Parties to the Convention but that are not Parties to the Protocol to ratify, accept, approve or accede to the Protocol, as appropriate, without further delay, so that they can also become Parties to the Supplementary Protocol;
3. *Notes* the outcome of the interregional workshop on capacity needs for the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol and *invites* Parties to identify their capacity-building needs and establish national priorities in order to be able to effectively implement and apply the provisions of the Supplementary Protocol;
4. *Invites* Parties and relevant organizations to make financial resources available with a view to supporting awareness-raising, experience-sharing and capacity-building activities in order to expedite the early entry into force and implementation of the Supplementary Protocol;
5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue encouraging organizations such as the United Nations Environment Programme and the International Union for Conservation of Nature to work towards the development of an explanatory guide on the Supplementary Protocol.

BS-VI/12. Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling its decisions BS-IV/11 and BS-V/12 on risk assessment and risk management,

I. Further guidance on specific aspects of risk assessment

1. *Takes note* of the conclusions and recommendations of the open-ended online forum and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on Risk Assessment and Risk Management and *commends* the progress made on the resulting Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms, clearly understanding that:

(a) The Guidance is not prescriptive and does not impose any obligations on Parties;

(b) The Guidance will be tested nationally and regionally for further improvement in actual cases of risk assessment and in the context of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

2. *Encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, as appropriate, to translate the Guidance into national languages and to make such translated versions available through the Biosafety Clearing-House for wide dissemination, in order to facilitate the testing of the Guidance at national, regional and subregional levels;

3. *Also encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations, through their risk assessors and other experts who are actively involved in risk assessment, to test the Guidance in actual cases of risk assessment and share their experiences through the Biosafety Clearing-House and the open-ended online forum;

4. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to provide financial and technical assistance to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to undertake, as appropriate, the testing activities referred to in paragraph 3 above;

5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to:

(a) Develop appropriate tools to structure and focus the testing of the Guidance;

(b) Gather and analyse, in a transparent manner, feedback provided as a result of testing on the practicality, usefulness and utility of the Guidance, (i) with respect to consistency with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; and (ii) taking into account past and present experiences with living modified organisms; and

(c) Provide a report on possible improvements to the Guidance for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its seventh meeting;

6. *Establishes* the following mechanism for regularly updating the list of background documents to the Guidance in a transparent manner:

(a) On an annual basis, the Executive Secretary will invite Parties, non-Parties, relevant organizations and all Biosafety Clearing-House users, to propose relevant background materials that can be linked to specific sections of the Guidance;

(b) In the absence of any AHTEG on risk assessment and risk management, a regionally balanced group of fifteen experts in risk assessment (three experts per region) will be nominated by the Parties and selected by the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to work online to examine the relevance of the proposed background documents. The members of the Group will work on an ongoing basis, renewable every four years;

(c) The Group will nominate a chair from among its members to lead deliberations transparently in approving, updating, rearranging or rejecting the proposed background materials in a justified manner;

(d) Documents on the list will be re-validated by the Group every five years or as appropriate. Documents not re-validated after this time period will, initially, be flagged for one year as “possibly outdated” and will subsequently be deleted from the list of background materials after an additional year;

(e) The Group will submit a report of its activities to each meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol;

7. *Decides* to extend the open-ended online forum, bring to a close the current AHTEG and establish a new AHTEG, that will serve until the seventh meeting of the Parties, in accordance with the terms of reference annexed hereto;

8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to:

(a) With a view to achieving a balance of current and new members, select experts for the new AHTEG, in consultation with the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, in accordance with paragraph 18 of the consolidated *modus operandi* of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity (decision VIII/10, annex III);

(b) Invite other Governments and relevant international organizations to participate in the open-ended online forum;

(c) Ensure that the participation of experts nominated by other Governments and relevant organizations to the open-ended online forum and AHTEG is in accordance with rules 6 and 7 of the rules of procedure for meetings of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol;

(d) Ensure that all online discussions of the open-ended online forum are moderated to enhance their efficiency; and

(e) Undertake temporary measures for updating the list of background documents in the time it takes to establish the membership of the new AHTEG;

II. *Capacity-building in risk assessment and risk management*

Acknowledging the revised training manual on risk assessment of living modified organisms and the concept of an e-training tool based on the revised training manual,

Welcoming the reports of the subregional workshops on capacity-building and exchange of experiences on risk assessment held in the Caribbean, Latin American and African (Anglophone countries) subregions and *taking note* of the recommendations from the workshops,

Taking note of the recommendations of the open-ended online forum and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on Risk Assessment and Risk Management regarding capacity-building in risk assessment and risk management,

9. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of funds, to:

(a) Convene, at the earliest convenient date, the remaining training courses on risk assessment for the African (Francophone countries) and the Central and Eastern Europe subregions to enable the countries concerned to gain hands-on experience in the preparation and evaluation of risk assessment reports in accordance with the relevant articles and annex III of the Protocol;

(b) Cooperate with the open-ended online forum and AHTEG to develop a package that aligns the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms (e.g. the Roadmap) with the training manual “Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms” in a coherent and complementary manner, with the clear understanding that the Guidance is still being tested;

(c) Follow up on training by gathering additional feedback from Parties on the practicality, usefulness and utility of the Guidance and training manual through online discussions or other means, as appropriate; and

(d) Conduct workshops on risk assessment and risk management at international, regional and/or subregional levels, using the package to carry out training courses for risk assessors, taking into consideration real case studies in risk assessment and how to apply the Guidance in the context of the decision-making process under the procedures of the Protocol;

10. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and international organizations to provide financial and technical assistance to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to implement the above capacity-building activities, as appropriate;

III. Identification of living modified organisms or specific traits that (i) may have or (ii) are not likely to have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health

11. *Invites* Parties and encourages other Governments and relevant organizations to provide the Executive Secretary with scientific information that may assist in the identification of living modified organisms or specific traits that may have or that are not likely to have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health;

12. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to create sections in the Biosafety Clearing-House where such information could be submitted and easily retrieved;

IV. Status of implementation of risk assessment and risk management provisions

13. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to conduct an online survey on the status of the implementation of operational objectives 1.3, 1.4 and 2.2 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020, where data is missing and cannot be retrieved through existing sources of information available to the Secretariat, with a view to establishing baselines for, and collecting data on, the indicators concerned.

Annex

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE OPEN-ENDED ONLINE FORUM AND AD HOC TECHNICAL EXPERT GROUP ON RISK ASSESSMENT AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Methodology

1. The open-ended online forum and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management shall work primarily online on the following issues in the given order of priority:

(a) Provide input, *inter alia*, to assist the Executive Secretary in his task to structure and focus the process of testing the guidance, and in the analysis of the results gathered from the testing;

(b) Coordinate, in collaboration with the Secretariat, the development of a package that aligns the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms (e.g. the Roadmap) with the training manual “Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms” in a coherent and complementary manner, for further consideration of the Parties, with the clear understanding that the Guidance is still being tested;

(c) Consider the development of guidance on new topics of risk assessment and risk management, selected on the basis of the Parties’ needs and their experiences and knowledge concerning risk assessment.

2. Subject to the availability of funds, the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management shall meet once face-to-face prior to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

Expected outcomes

3. The open-ended online forum and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management shall work together with a view to developing and achieving the following:

(a) Moderated online discussions relating to the testing of the practicality, usefulness and utility of the Guidance;

(b) A package that aligns the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms (e.g. the Roadmap) with the training manual “Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms” in a coherent and complementary manner; and

(c) A recommendation on how to proceed with respect to the development of further guidance on specific topics of risk assessment, selected on the basis of the priorities and needs indicated by the Parties with the view of moving toward the operational objectives 1.3. and 1.4 of the Strategic Plan and its outcomes.

Reporting

4. The open-ended online forum and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management shall submit their final reports detailing the activities, outcomes and recommendations for consideration by the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

5. The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management shall also operate the mechanism set out in paragraph 6 of decision BS-VI/12 for the regular updating of the background documents to the Guidance and submit a report on its activities related to updating the background documents to the Guidance to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

BS-VI/13. Socio-economic considerations

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Welcoming the conclusions and suggestions for next steps from the Workshop on Capacity-building for Research and Information Exchange on Socio-economic Impacts of Living Modified Organisms held from 14 to 16 November 2011 in New Delhi,

Noting that, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 26 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, Parties may take into account, consistent with their international obligations, socio-economic considerations arising from the impact of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, especially with regard to the value of biological diversity to indigenous and local communities, in reaching a decision on import under the Protocol or under their domestic measures to implement the Protocol,

Recognizing the need expressed by several Parties for further guidance when choosing to implement paragraph 1 of Article 26 of the Protocol,

Recalling operational objective 1.7 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the Period 2011–2020 and section IV of decision BS-V/3,

1. *Encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to continue to:
 - (a) Conduct research on the socio-economic impact of living modified organisms with a view to filling knowledge gaps and identifying specific socio-economic issues, including those with positive impacts;
 - (b) Share and exchange, through the Biosafety Clearing-House, information on their research, research methods and experiences in taking the socio-economic impact of living modified organisms into account;
 - (c) Engage local institutions of higher education with a view to building domestic capacity in socio-economic analysis of the impact of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity;
2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, in order to develop a global overview, keeping in mind national and regional specificities and policies along with other commitments, to compile, take stock of and review information on socio-economic considerations arising from the impact of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, especially with regard to the value of biological diversity to indigenous and local communities, on the basis of:
 - (a) Existing institutional frameworks, legislation and policies with provisions on socio-economic considerations;
 - (b) Capacity-building activities related to biosafety and socio-economic considerations;
 - (c) Existing expertise and experience;
 - (d) Other policy initiatives concerning social and economic impact assessments;
3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to convene online discussion groups and regional online real-time conferences to facilitate and synthesize the exchange of views, information and

experiences on socio-economic considerations among Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and indigenous and local communities in the context of paragraph 1 of Article 26;

4. *Decides* to establish an ad hoc technical expert group, subject to the availability of funds, to:

(a) Draw upon the outcomes of paragraphs 2 and 3 above in order to develop conceptual clarity in the context of paragraph 1 of Article 26;

(b) Carry out its work according to the terms of reference annexed hereto; and

(c) Submit its report for consideration by the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety with a view to enabling the meeting to deliberate and decide upon appropriate further steps towards fulfilling operational objective 1.7 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the Period 2011-2020 and its outcomes, in a manner that provides flexibility to take into account the situations in different countries;

5. *Encourages* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to make funds available to the Executive Secretary to organize a meeting of the ad hoc technical expert group.

Annex

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

The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-Economic Considerations shall:

(a) Be composed of eight experts per region, selected on the basis of nominations by Parties. In case of insufficient resources, there should be a minimum of five experts per region while maintaining regional balance. In addition, at least five but no more than ten participants in total representing non-Parties, United Nations organizations and specialized agencies, relevant organizations and indigenous and local communities shall be invited to participate as observers;

(b) Examine the outcomes of the activities requested in paragraphs 2 and 3 of decision BS-VI/13 in order to develop conceptual clarity on socio-economic considerations arising from the impact of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, especially with regard to the value of biological diversity to indigenous and local communities.

BS-VI/14. Monitoring and reporting (Article 33)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Welcoming the financial support of the Global Environment Facility for eligible Parties to prepare and submit their national reports and *recognizing* the contribution of that support to the high rate of submission of these reports;

Noting that 14 Parties have not yet submitted their second national reports and that five of those Parties have never fulfilled their reporting obligations under Article 33 of the Protocol,

Recognizing that there are some discrepancies between the information contained in the second national reports and the information made available by Parties through the Biosafety Clearing-House,

Taking into account the recommendations of the Compliance Committee contained in document UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/16,

1. *Welcomes* the high rate of submissions of second national reports by Parties and *takes note* of the analysis of responses prepared by the Executive Secretary;

2. *Reminds* Parties of their obligation to submit national reports, in accordance with Article 33 of the Protocol;

3. *Urges* the 14 Parties that have not yet submitted their national reports to do so at the earliest opportunity by fully completing the report form for the second national report, as contained in the annex to decision BS-V/14;

4. *Also urges* those Parties that have not yet responded fully to all mandatory questions in the second national report to cooperate with the Secretariat in order to complete their second national reports as soon as possible;

5. *Reminds* Parties of paragraph 2 of decision BS-V/14, which requests Parties submitting their national report for the first time to use the reporting format for the second national report, and *decides* that all Parties should complete this form before using any simplified reporting format that may be adopted in the future;

6. *Further reminds* Parties of their obligation to make available to the Biosafety Clearing-House the information required under paragraph 3 of Article 20 of the Protocol;

7. *Encourages* Parties to facilitate the preparation and submission of their national reports by exploring and utilizing, as appropriate: (i) the technical and other resources available in existing bilateral, subregional and regional arrangements; and (ii) the roster of biosafety experts;

8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to assess, on the basis of the second national reports, the discrepancies and/or gaps in information made available by Parties through the Biosafety Clearing-House, and to assist Parties to submit, through the Biosafety Clearing-House and without further delay, the updated information contained in their reports;

9. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to update the reporting format, taking into account the experience gained from analysing the second national reports, the recommendations of the Compliance Committee and the feedback received from Parties; and

/...

10. *Further requests* the Executive Secretary to submit the revised format, adjusted in accordance with paragraph 8 of decision BS-V/14, to the seventh meeting of the Parties to the Protocol for its consideration.

BS-VI/15. Second assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 35)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling its decision BS-V/15,

Taking note of the report of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Second Assessment and Review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety contained in document UNEP/BS/COP-MOP/6/17 and the recommendations set out in annex I thereto,

Stressing the need to undertake activities to enable the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to initiate the processes for the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and for the mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020,

1. *Notes* the information provided in the second national reports and the analysis undertaken on the status of implementation of core elements of the Protocol (UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/6/17/Add.1);

2. *Decides* that the data and information contained in the analysis shall form the baseline for measuring progress in implementing the Protocol, in particular the subsequent evaluation of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the mid-term evaluation of the implementation of the Strategic Plan;

3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to:

(a) Undertake a dedicated survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan that could not be obtained from the second national reports or through other existing mechanisms;

(b) Review the information gathered through the survey referred to in subparagraph (a) above and make the results available to the Parties before their seventh meeting;

4. *Further requests* the Executive Secretary to:

(a) Commission a consultant, subject to the availability of funds, to develop a sound methodological approach for the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol, focusing primarily on the effectiveness of its institutional processes, annexes, procedures and mechanisms;

(b) Provide Parties with the opportunity to submit views on the methodological approach developed under subparagraph (a) above;

(c) Review the methodological approach referred to in subparagraph 4(a) above, in the light of views received under subparagraph (b) above, and submit a proposal for consideration by the seventh meeting of the Parties to the Protocol;

5. *Decides* that, in the process of preparing for the third assessment and review of the Protocol, the experiences of the Parties in complying with the Protocol, including submission of national reports, shall be taken into account, along with the input of, *inter alia*, the Compliance Committee;

6. *Requests* the Compliance Committee, in the light of the conclusions and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the Second Assessment and Review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, to evaluate the status of implementation of the Protocol as a contribution to the third evaluation of effectiveness in meeting the objectives of the Protocol, in accordance with Article 35 of the Protocol.

BS-VI/16. Unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms (Article 17)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling Article 17 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling also operational objective 1.8 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020, adopted as annex I to decision BS-V/16, and the programme of work for the present meeting adopted in annex II to the same decision,

Noting the existence of decisions, rules and guidelines relevant to the issue of unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms,

Also noting that the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms is not prescriptive and does not impose any obligations on Parties,

1. *Encourages* Parties to use, as guidance, or apply, as appropriate, the following in their efforts to implement the measures specified in Article 17 of the Protocol and, in particular, to determine and take appropriate response measures, including emergency measures, in the event of an occurrence that leads or may lead to unintentional transboundary movement of a living modified organism that is likely to cause significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health:

(a) Decisions that have been or may be taken in the context of identifying living modified organisms under Article 18 of the Protocol, in particular those relating to the detection of living modified organisms;

(b) The Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms developed by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment and Risk Management with input from the Open-Ended Online Expert Forum;

2. *Urges* Parties and *invites* other Governments and relevant organizations which have not yet done so to:

(a) Make available to the Biosafety Clearing-House the relevant details of their point of contact for the purposes of receiving notifications under Article 17 of the Protocol;

(b) Establish and maintain appropriate measures to prevent unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms; and

(c) Establish a mechanism for emergency measures in case of unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms that are likely to have significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health;

3. *Invites* Parties and other Governments to cooperate in building the capacity, transferring the technology and exchanging information necessary to detect and respond to occurrences resulting in a release that could lead to unintentional transboundary movement of a living modified organism that is likely to have significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health;

4. *Requests* Parties and *invites* other Governments and relevant organizations to provide views and information to the Executive Secretary, six months prior to the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, on any challenges and experiences relating to the implementation of Article 17 of the Protocol and on the scope and elements of possible guidance or tools that may facilitate appropriate responses by Parties to unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms;

5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to prepare a synthesis of the views referred to in paragraph 4 above for consideration by the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.
