FIRST REGULAR NATIONAL REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Origin of report

Party:	**Belarus**
Contact officer for report	
Name and title of contact officer:	**Ms. Natalya Minchenko** Head of Specialized Inspection of State Control for Wildlife and Protected Areas Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection
Mailing address:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Kollektornaya Str., 10 Minsk, 220048 Belarus
Telephone:	+375 17 200 53 34
Fax:	+375 17 200 53 34 +375 17 200 55 83
E-mail:	n_minchenko@tut.by, zapovednik@minpriroda.by
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting report:	
Date of submission:	10.10.2008
Time period covered by this report:	2002 - 2007

Please provide summary information on the process by which this report has been prepared, including information on the types of stakeholders who have been actively involved in its preparation and on material which was used as a basis for the report:

The present report is prepared by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection with the input of the National Coordination Center on Biosafety.

The ad hoc authorized officers from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection and the National Coordination Center on Biosafety have been involved in its preparation.

Obligations for provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House

1. Several articles of the Protocol require that information be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House (see the list below). For your Government, if there are cases where relevant information exists but has not been provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH), describe any obstacles or impediments encountered regarding provision of that information (note: To answer this question, please check the BCH to determine the current status of your country's information submissions relative to the list of required information below. If you do not have access to the BCH, contact the Secretariat for a summary):

Institution responsible for contacts with the Biosafety Clearing-House was established in 1998 by the Cabinet of Ministers' Resolution № 963 of June 19, 1998 is National Coordination Center. Its main objectives are:

Collecting, analyzing and classifying information about legislation and biosafety research, field tests of living modified organisms, LMO export/import, commercial use and GMO-containing products in Belarus as well as specified information on biosafety from the databases of international information networks, as well as establishing the national biosafety database;

Providing ministries concerned and other national government authorities, mass media with information on biosafety;

Information-sharing with the biosafety focal points of other countries and international organizations;

Arranging for expertise relating to the safety of living modified organisms and GMO-containing products, which are intended for use on the territory of Belarus;

providing advisory services to ministries and other national government bodies to develop draft legislative acts regarding LMO import/export and safe use and GMO-containing products, guidelines for the assessment and prevention of risks to the environment and human health, safety regulations for genetic engineering laboratories;

providing advisory services to ministries and other national government bodies to prepare proposals for bilateral and regional agreements, and develop international agreements on safety matters.

The Cabinet of Ministers designated government bodies responsible for liaison with the CBD Secretariat with its Resolution № 734 of June 5, 2002 "On Measures for Implementing the Provisions of the Cartagena Safety Protocol to the Convention on Biological Diversity".

The Procedure and conditions for access to the specified information were approved with the Cabinet of Ministers' Resolution № 734 of June 5, 2002 "On the Approval of the Procedure and Conditions for Access to the GMO Database".

At present the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food as well as the Ministry of Health submit information to the National Focal Point for Biosafety on an annual basis

All the information in Russian and partially in English is made available on the website of the National Coordination Center on Biosafety (http://biosafety.org.by/)

2. Please provide an overview of information that is required to be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House:

Type of information	*Information exists and is being provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information exists but is not yet provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information does not exist /not applicable*
a) Existing national legislation, regulations and guidelines for implementing the Protocol, as well as information required by Parties for the advance informed agreement procedure		X	

(Article 20.3(a))			
b) National laws, regulations and guidelines applicable to the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.5);		X	
c) Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Articles 14.2, 20.3(b), and 24.1);			X
d) Contact details for competent national authorities (Articles 19.2 and 19.3), national focal points (Articles 19.1 and 19.3), and emergency contacts (Article 17.2 and 17.3(e));	X		
e) In cases of multiple competent national authorities, responsibilities for each (Articles 19.2 and 19.3);	X		
f) Reports submitted by the Parties on the operation of the Protocol (Article 20.3(e));			X
g) Occurrence of unintentional transboundary movements that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17.1);			X
Type of information	*Information exists and is being provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information exists but is not yet provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information does not exist /not applicable*
h) Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25.3);			X
i) Final decisions regarding the importation or release of LMOs (i.e. approval or prohibition, any conditions, requests for further information, extensions granted, reasons for decision) (Articles 10.3 and 20.3(d));			X
j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);	X		
k) Final decisions regarding the domestic use of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.1);			X
l) Final decisions regarding the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing that are taken under domestic	X		

regulatory frameworks (Article 11.4) or in accordance with annex III (Article 11.6) (requirement of Article 20.3(d))			
m) Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.6)			X
n) Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12.1);			X
o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)			X
p) Cases where intentional transboundary movement may take place at the same time as the movement is notified to the Party of import (Article 13.1);			X
q) Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information regarding products thereof (Article 20.3(c)).	X		

Article 2 – General provisions

3. Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for implementation of the Protocol? (Article 2.1)	
a) full domestic regulatory framework in place (please give details below)	X
b) some measures introduced (please give details below)	
c) no measures yet taken	

4. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 2, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:

The Republic of Belarus joined the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in 2002 (Belarusian Law № 97-З of May 6, 2002 «On the Accession of the Republic of Belarus to the Cartagena Biosafety Protocol to the Convention on Biological Diversity»)

The national government bodies responsible for implementing the Cartagena Protocol (the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and the Ministry of Health) were designated by the Cabinet of Ministers with its Resolution № 734 of June 5, 2002 "On Measures for Implementing the Provisions of the Cartagena Biosafety Protocol to the Convention on Biological Diversity"; the National Coordination Center on Biosafety was appointed a responsible body for liaison with the CBD Secretariat regarding safety matters.

The Belarusian National Law of January 9, 2006 (№ 96-З) which determines the legal and administrative framework for ensuring genetic engineering activities in the Republic of Belarus was adopted at the beginning of 2006.

In particular, the Law specifies:

- basic principles for ensuring genetic engineering activities;
- objects and entities of relationships in the area of genetic engineering activities;

- measures for ensuring genetic engineering activities;
- Ad hoc authorized government bodies in the area of genetic engineering activities;
- powers of the President, the Cabinet of Ministers and ad hoc authorized government bodies of the Republic of Belarus;
- responsibilities of the actors, carrying out genetic engineering activities;
- risk levels of genetic engineering activities;
- safety requirements to genetic engineering activities in the closed system;
- safety requirements to LMOs intended for release into the environment for testing;
- safety requirements to GMOs intended for use for commercial purposes;
- safety requirements to GMOs intended for transportation;
- safety requirements to GMOs intended for import/export and transit;
- safety requirements to neutralizing GMOs.

In addition, the Law focuses on issues regarding:

- State GMO safety expertise;
- dataware in the area of safety of genetic engineering activities;
- citizens and public associations' rights to access to information on the safety of genetic engineering activities;
- requirements to information on the LMO safety in the course of their transportation and storage;
- registration of living modified organisms developed, imported/exported and being in transit on the territory of Belarus as well as State statistics on LMO safety;
- State monitoring of genetic engineering activities;
- departmental, production and public monitoring of genetic engineering activities;

A number of regulations were adopted by the ad hoc authorized government bodies in the area of genetic engineering activities within the development of the Law «On the Safety of Genetic Engineering Activities».

Articles 7 to 10 and 12: The advance informed agreement procedure

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

5. Were you a Party of import during this reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
6. Were you a Party of export during this reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
7. Is there a legal requirement for the accuracy of information provided by exporters 1/ under the jurisdiction of your country? (Article 8.2)	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	

1/ The use of terms in the questions follows the meanings accorded to them under Article 3 of the Protocol.

d) not applicable – not a Party of export	
8. If you were a Party of export during this reporting period, did you request any Party of import to review a decision it had made under Article 10 on the grounds specified in Article 12.2?	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
d) not applicable – not a Party of export	X
9. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 9.2(c).	
a) yes	
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	X
10. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for release into the environment during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Articles 7 to 10 and 12, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
During the reporting period the Republic of Belarus was not a Party of export of LMOs intended for release into the environment	
11. If your country has taken decisions on import of LMOs intended for release into the environment during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Articles 7 to 10 and 12, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
During the reporting period the Republic of Belarus did not take any decisions on LMO imports intended for release into the environment	

Article 11 – Procedure for living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

12. Is there a legal requirement for the accuracy of information provided by the applicant with respect to the domestic use of a living modified organism that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing? (Article 11.2)	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
d) not applicable (please give details below)	
13. Has your country indicated its needs for financial and technical assistance and capacity-building in respect of living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing? (Article 11.9)	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) no	X
c) not relevant	

14. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 11.4?	
a) yes	
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	X
15. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
During the reporting period the Republic of Belarus was not a Party of export of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing	
16. If your country has been a Party of import of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
During the reporting period the Republic of Belarus was not a Party of import of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing	

Article 13 – Simplified procedure

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

17. Have you applied the simplified procedure during the reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
18. If your country has used the simplified procedure during the reporting period, or if you have been unable to do so for some reason, please describe your experiences in implementing Article 13, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
During the reporting period the Republic of Belarus did not use the simplified procedure for transboundary movements of GMOs	

Article 14 – Bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements and arrangements

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

19. Has your country entered into any bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
20. If your country has entered into bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements, or if you have been unable to do so for some reason, describe your experiences in implementing Article 14 during the reporting period, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
During the reporting period the Republic of Belarus did not enter into bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements regarding to transboundary movements of GMOs	

Articles 15 and 16 – Risk assessment and risk management

21. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, were risk assessments carried out for all decisions taken under Article 10? (Article 15.2)

a) yes	
b) no (please clarify below)	
c) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
22. If yes to question 21, did you require the exporter to carry out the risk assessment?	
a) yes – in all cases	
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
23. If you took a decision under Article 10 during the reporting period, did you require the notifier to bear the cost of the risk assessment? (Article 15.3)	
a) yes – in all cases	
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
24. Has your country established and maintained appropriate mechanisms, measures and strategies to regulate, manage and control risks identified in the risk assessment provisions of the Protocol? (Article 16.1)	
a) yes – fully established	
b) not yet, but under development or partially established (please give further details below)	X
c) no	
25. Has your country adopted appropriate measures to prevent unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms? (Article 16.3)	
a) yes – fully adopted	X
b) not yet, but under development or partially adopted (please give further details below)	
c) no	
26. Does your country endeavour to ensure that any living modified organism, whether imported or locally developed, undergoes an appropriate period of observation commensurate with its life-cycle or generation time before it is put to its intended use? (Article 16.4)	
a) yes – in all cases	X
b) yes – in some cases (please give further details below)	
c) no (please give further details below)	
d) not applicable (please give further details below)	

27. Has your country cooperated with others for the purposes specified in Article 16.5?	
a) yes (please give further details below)	
b) no (please give further details below)	X

28. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Articles 15 and 16, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:

The regulation on the risk assessment of possible adverse effects of living modified organisms on the environment was approved by Resolution №55 of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of August 29, 2006. The risk assessment mechanism is in compliance with the UNEP principles of safety measures in Biotechnology.

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection specified safety requirements to pilot fields and other bodies designated for test operation of nonpathogenic LMOs in the course of their first release into the environment in its Resolution № 56 of August 29, 2006.

Regulation № 076-086 on the procedure for risk assessment of possible LMO effects on human health was approved by the State Chief Health Officer on August 25, 2006.

The Regulation on safety requirements to closed systems during genetic engineering operations of the second, third and fourth risk levels, the Regulation on the accreditation of closed systems for conducting genetic engineering operations of the second, third and fourth risk levels, the Regulation on safety requirements to transportation of conditionally pathogenic and pathogenic living modified organisms as well as the Regulation on the procedure for the State legal entities' registration of conditionally pathogenic and pathogenic living modified organisms developed, imported/exported and moved in and out were approved by the Health Ministry of the Republic of Belarus with its Resolution № 65 of August 25, 2006 «On some Matters of Genetic Engineering Safety».
With its Resolution № 1160 of September 8, 2006 the Cabinet of Ministers approved the Regulation on State Expertise in the area of safety of genetically modified organisms and the suggested terms of contracts concluded for its implementation as well as the Regulation on the procedure for permitting for nonpathogenic living modified organisms intended for release into the environment for test operation.

Article 17 – Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

29. During the reporting period, if there were any occurrences under your jurisdiction that led, or could have led, to an unintentional transboundary movement of a living modified organism that had, or could have had, significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health in such States, did you immediately consult the affected or potentially affected States for the purposes specified in Article 17.4?	
a) yes – all relevant States immediately	
b) yes – partially consulted, or consultations were delayed (please clarify below)	
c) no – did not consult immediately (please clarify below)	
d) not applicable (no such occurrences)	X

30. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences in implementing Article 17, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:

During the reporting period there were no occurrences that led, or could have led, to an unintentional

transboundary movement of living modified organisms in the Republic of Belarus

Article 18 – Handling, transport, packaging and identification

31. Has your country taken measures to require that living modified organisms that are subject to transboundary movement within the scope of the Protocol are handled, packaged and transported under conditions of safety, taking into account relevant international rules and standards? (Article 18.1)	
a) yes (please give details below)	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
d) not applicable (please clarify below)	
32. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms for direct use as food or feed, or for processing, clearly identifies that they 'may contain' living modified organisms and are not intended for intentional introduction into the environment, as well as a contact point for information? (Article 18.2(a))	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
33. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are destined for contained use clearly identifies them as living modified organisms and specifies any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information, including the name and address of the individual and institution to whom the living modified organisms are consigned? (Article 18.2(b))	
a) yes	
b) not yet, but under development	X
c) no	
34. Has your country adopted measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment of the Party of import and any other living modified organisms within the scope of the Protocol, clearly identifies them as living modified organisms; specifies the identity and relevant traits and/or characteristics, any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information and, as appropriate, the name and address of the importer and exporter; and contains a declaration that the movement is in conformity with the requirements of this Protocol applicable to the exporter? (Article 18.2(c))	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
35. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as a description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 18, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Requirements to transportation, labeling and identification of GMOs being subject to intentional transboundary movement are specified in Article 18 of the National Law «On the Safety of Genetic	

Engineering Activities»

Article 19 – Competent national authorities and national focal points

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

Article 20 – Information-sharing and the Biosafety Clearing-House

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

36. In addition to the response to question 1, please describe any further details regarding your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 20, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
With its Resolution № 734 on «Measures for Implementing the Provisions of the Cartagena Biosafety Protocol to the Convention on Biological Diversity» of June 5, 2002 the Cabinet of Ministers designated the National Coordination Center on Biosafety as an authorized body for liaison with the CBD Secretariat on biosafety matters. The Cabinet of Ministers' Resolution № 1222 on the Procedure and Conditions for Access to Information from the Information Database on Genetically Modified Organisms approved the procedure and conditions for ensuring specified information.

Article 21 – Confidential information

37. Does your country have procedures to protect confidential information received under the Protocol and that protect the confidentiality of such information in a manner no less favourable than its treatment of confidential information in connection with domestically produced living modified organisms? (Article 21.3)	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
38. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, did you permit any notifier to identify information submitted under the procedures of the Protocol or required by the Party of import as part of the advance informed agreement procedure that was to be treated as confidential? (Article 21.1)	
a) yes	
If yes, please give number of cases	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of import / no such requests received	X
39. If you answered yes to the previous question, please provide information on your experience including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:	
40. If you were a Party of export during this reporting period, please describe any impediments or difficulties encountered by you, or by exporters under your jurisdiction if information is available, in the implementation of the requirements of Article 21:	

Article 22 – Capacity-building

41. If a developed country Party, during this reporting period has your country cooperated in the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety for the purposes of the effective implementation of the Protocol in developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and in Parties with economies in transition?	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developed country Party	X
42. If yes to question 41, how has such cooperation taken place:	
43. If a developing country Party, or Party with an economy in transition, during this reporting period has your country contributed to the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety for the purposes of the effective implementation of the Protocol in another developing country Party or Party with an economy in transition?	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) no	X
c) not applicable – not a developing country Party	
44. If yes to question 43, how has such cooperation taken place:	
45. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training in the proper and safe management of biotechnology to the extent that it is required for biosafety?	
a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	X
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	
46. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training in the use of risk assessment and risk management for biosafety?	
a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	X
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	

47. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training for enhancement of technological and institutional capacities in biosafety?	
a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	X
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	
48. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 22, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Within the 2002-2004 period the Republic of Belarus was involved in implementing the UNEP-GEF project «The development of the national Biosafety Framework for the Republic of Belarus» Within the 2006-2007 period the Republic of Belarus participated in the UNEP project «Capacity-building for effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House»	

Article 23 – Public awareness and participation

49. Does your country promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms in relation to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health? (Article 23.1(a))	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	X
c) no	
50. If yes, do you cooperate with other States and international bodies?	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	X
c) no	
51. Does your country endeavour to ensure that public awareness and education encompass access to information on living modified organisms identified in accordance with the Protocol that may be imported? (Article 23.1(b))	
a) yes – fully	
b) yes – limited extent	X
c) no	
52. Does your country, in accordance with its respective laws and regulations, consult the public in the decision-making process regarding living modified organisms and make the results of such decisions available to the public? (Article 23.2)	
a) yes – fully	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	

53. Has your country informed its public about the means of public access to the Biosafety Clearing-House? (Article 23.3)	
a) yes – fully	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
54. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 23, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Information on the beginning and results of expertise relating to the safety of genetically modified organisms is displayed on the web-site of the National Coordination Center on Biosafety. Experts who assess GMO-related risks shall take into account the Public's responses. Round tables dedicated to issues relating to GMO production and use are held with the representatives of mass media and non-governmental organizations on an occasional basis.	

Article 24 – Non-Parties

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House**.**

55. Have there been any transboundary movements of living modified organisms between your country and a non-Party during the reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
56. If there have been transboundary movements of living modified organisms between your country and a non-Party, please provide information on your experience, including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:	

Article 25 – Illegal transboundary movements

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

57. Has your country adopted appropriate domestic measures to prevent and penalize, as appropriate, transboundary movements of living modified organisms carried out in contravention of its domestic measures? (Article 25.1)	
a) yes	X
b) no	
58. Have there been any illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms into your country during the reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
59. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences in implementing Article 25, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Penalties for illegal transboundary movements of goods including LMOs are provided for by the Code of	

the Republic of Belarus «On Administrative Offences» (Article 14.4).

Article 26 – Socio-economic considerations

60. If during this reporting period your country has taken a decision on import, did it take into account 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? (Article 26.1)	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import	X
61. Has your country cooperated with other Parties on research and information exchange on any socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms, especially on indigenous and local communities? (Article 26.2)	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	X
62. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 26, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
During the reporting period our Country did not take any decisions on LMO import.	

Article 28 – Financial mechanism and resources

63. Please indicate if, during the reporting period, your Government made financial resources available to other Parties or received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions, for the purposes of implementation of the Protocol.	
a) yes – made financial resources available to other Parties	
b) yes – received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions	
c) both	
d) neither	X
64. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
During the reporting period our Country did not receive financial resources from other Parties and did not make financial resources available to other Parties for the purposes of application of the Protocol.	

Other information

65. Please use this box to provide any other information related to articles of the Protocol, questions in the reporting format, or other issues related to national implementation of the Protocol:

Comments on reporting format

The wording of these questions is based on the Articles of the Protocol. Please provide information on any difficulties that you have encountered in interpreting the wording of these questions:
