



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBI/REC/1/3
6 May 2016

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

First meeting

Montreal, Canada, 2-6 May 2016

Agenda item 6

RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED BY THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON IMPLEMENTATION

1/3. Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Protocol

The Subsidiary Body on Implementation

1. *Welcomes* the input of the Compliance Committee and the contribution of the Liaison Group on Capacity-Building to 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;¹

2. *Takes note* of the comparative analysis of third national reports against the baseline of the status of implementation and the summary of the emerging trends;²

3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to, as appropriate, prepare and make available as an information document, a more in-depth analysis examining potential correlations, if any, among indicators, such as a correlation between countries that have operational regulatory frameworks in place and those that have taken decisions on living modified organisms;

4. *Recommends* that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its eighth meeting adopt a decision along the following lines:

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

1. *Welcomes* the work of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in undertaking 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;

2. *Notes with concern* the lower rate of submission of the third national reports in comparison with the previous reporting cycle, and *urges* the Parties that have not yet submitted their third national report to do so as soon as possible;

¹ UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/4, annexes I and II.

² UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/4/Add.1.

3. *Notes* the absence of clear linkages between some of the outcomes and indicators in the current Strategic Plan, and *agrees* to reflect such linkages in the follow-up to the present Strategic Plan;

4. *Notes also* that, in the follow-up to the current Strategic Plan, indicators should be simplified, streamlined and made easily measurable with a view to ensuring that progress towards achieving operational objectives can be easily tracked and quantified;

5. *Notes further* the slow progress in: (a) the development of modalities for cooperation and guidance in identifying living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health; (b) capacity-building for risk assessment and risk management; (c) socioeconomic considerations; and (d) capacity-building to take appropriate measures in cases of unintentional release of living modified organisms;

6. *Notes with concern* that, to date, only approximately half of the Parties have fully put in place legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol, and *urges* Parties that have not yet fully done so to put in place their national biosafety frameworks, in particular biosafety legislation, as a matter of priority;

7. *Urges* Parties, for the remaining period of the Strategic Plan, to consider prioritizing the operational objectives relating to the development of biosafety legislation, risk assessment, detection and identification of living modified organisms, and public awareness, education and training in view of their critical importance in facilitating the implementation of the Protocol;

8. *Also urges* Parties to undertake targeted capacity-building activities on biosafety and to share relevant experiences and lessons learned from these activities through the Biosafety Clearing-House in order to facilitate further development and implementation of the Protocol;

9. *Encourages* Parties to make use of Biosafety Clearing-House to share experiences on national processes and best practices related to socioeconomic considerations in decision-making related to living modified organisms, as appropriate, and in accordance with national legislation;

10. *Encourages* those Parties that have not yet done so to become Party to the Nagoya–Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress as soon as possible;

11. *Encourages* Parties to continue to enhance capacity for public awareness, education and participation regarding the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms, including for indigenous and local communities, and to integrate training, public awareness, education and participation into national initiatives for communication, education and public awareness, initiatives for the Sustainable Development Goals, initiatives for climate change [mitigation and] adaptation and other environmental initiatives;

12. *Recommends* that the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the financial mechanism with respect to support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, invite the Global Environment Facility to continue to assist eligible Parties that have not yet done so to put in place a national biosafety framework and to make funding available to this end;

13. *Notes* that a lack of awareness and political support for biosafety issues contributes to limited access to and uptake of funding for biosafety, and *urges* Parties to enhance efforts to raise awareness of key biosafety-related issues among policy- and decision makers;

14. *Urges* Parties to strengthen national consultative mechanisms among relevant government institutions regarding the programming of national Global Environment Facility allocations with a view to ensuring appropriate funding for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol;

15. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To undertake regional and subregional workshops and other relevant activities, subject to the availability of resources, in order to enhance the capacity of Parties to promote the integration of biosafety considerations into national biodiversity strategies and action plans, national development plans and national strategies to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals;

(b) To carry out further capacity-building activities, subject to the availability of resources, on risk assessment, risk management, detection and identification of living modified organisms, liability and redress, and, as appropriate, socioeconomic, cultural and related health considerations, including the possible impact of living modified organisms on indigenous and local communities;

(c) To propose questions for the fourth national reporting format that provide further clarity or explanation and eliminate redundancy observed in the questions used for the third national report with a view to ensuring that complete and accurate information is captured while striving to maintain continuity with past reporting formats;

(d) To further enhance cooperation and collaboration in biosafety with relevant organizations;

(e) To take into account items (a) and (b) above in implementing the short-term action plan (2017-2020) to enhance and support capacity-building for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
