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

Origin of report

Party:	Estonia
Contact officer for report	
Name and title of contact officer:	Liina Eek Senior Officer Ministry of the Environment Department of Nature Conservation
Mailing address:	Ministry of the Environment Narva mnt 7A 15172 Tallinn Estonia
Telephone:	+372-6262877
Fax:	+372-6262901
E-mail:	Liina.Eek@envir.ee
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting report:	Liina Eek Ministry of the Environment Department of Nature Conservation Estonia
Date of submission:	11.09.2007
Time period covered by this report:	16.02.2004 – 11.09.2007

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:

In Estonia, the Ministry of the Environment is the competent authority responsible for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The Ministry of the Environment is responsible for preparation of National Report on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol to the Executive Secretary.

Report was compiled, using publicly available information from BCH and Estonian Official Journal (journal where are published all adopted legal acts). Additional information was gained from consultations with the Ministry of Agriculture and Veterinary and Food Board.

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):

- Existing national legislation for the implementation of the Protocol has been submitted in 2005, but it needs updating as there have been several new legal acts adopted and also translated into English.

- Contacts for the competent national authorities (Articles 19.2 and 19.3) and national focal point (Articles 19.1 and 19.3) should be updated as BCH FP left from CA in August 2007 and no new FP has been nominated yet.

- Roster of experts – this roster was compiled in 2002 – 2003 and needs updating – CVs need updating, some persons do not deal with biosafety any longer, some persons should be added, etc. The problem is that there is no agreed process how to select those experts and who should adopt this list, what are the criteria for experts etc. This has been discussed in CP meetings, but as there is no agreement, no action has been taken as well.

Main problem is that there is only 1 person dealing with biosafety and GMO issues in Ministry of Environment and this person left job in July 2007, new person was hired in mid September 2007, but she is overloaded with other tasks.

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 (Article 20.3(a))	X	X- needs updating	
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	X- needs updating	
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- Decisions taken by the EU are to be provided by the European Commission.		
j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);			NA
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;			NA
l) Final decisions regarding the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing that are taken under domestic regulatory frameworks (Article 11.4) or in accordance with annex III (Article 11.6) (requirement of Article 20.3(d))	X- Decisions are made on the EU level and are to be provided by the European Commission.		
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:

As an EU Member State, Estonia complies with European Community law. The relevant law is EC Regulation 1946/2003, which went into effect in November 2003. This Regulation states the obligations of the EU with regard to exports of GMOs to third countries. EU Regulation 1829/2003 on genetically modified food and feed, and Regulation 1830/2003 concerning the traceability and labelling of genetically modified organisms and the traceability of food and feed products produced from genetically modified organisms and amending directive 2001/18/EC, both went into effect in April 2004.
Estonia has adopted the Act on the Release into the Environment of Genetically Modified Organisms, valid since 01.05.2004, which provides regulations in accordance with Directive 2001/18 of the European Council.
Additionally, there are several sctoral legal acts connected to biosafety, based on EU legal acts:
The Act on Contained Use of Genetically Modified Microorganisms (01.08.2002);
The Food Act, (last redaction 01.05.2004);
The Act on Seeds and Plant Propagation Material (last redaction since 01.05.2004);
The Food Act, (last redaction since 01.05.2004.)

For more details, see report of EC.

Estonia has not encountered any special obstacles while introducing legal, administrative and other measures. Administrative problem is usually understaffing of competent authorities and "brain flow" - trained personnell leave from job as they get better offers, governmental salaries are comparatively low and workload is huge and work very specific.

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	
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:	
Estonia has not been a Party of export of LMOs intended for release into the environment during the reporting period.	
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:	
Estonia has not taken any decisions on import or release. . See the report of EC.	

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.

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

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)	X
b) no	
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	X
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	
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:	
Not applicable. Estonia was not a country of export during the reporting period. 13. There is an ongoing project financed by UNEP/GEF Implementation of National Biosafety Framework in Estonia (2006 – 2009). There are foreseen several capacity building activities in this field.	
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:	
Estonia, as a part of the EC, has adopted the community framework for GMOs for FFP. For more details, see the report of EU.	

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:	
The EC has not made use of the simplified procedure for imports of LMOs as specified in Article 13.	

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- EC regulatory framework adopted
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:	
Estonia has not entered into any bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements as per Article 14(1), except for adopting the existing legislative framework of the EC.	

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	X
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)	(X)
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:	
24. As an EU Member State, Estonia complies with European Community law and frameworks. The EC has put in place a comprehensive system of risk assessment and risk management dealing with releases into the environment or placing on the market of GMOs, whether imported into or developed within the EC. However, Estonia lacks any experience in risk management as we do not have any GMO applications yet. Once we start growing GMOs we might face problems that staff of survaillance bodies are not trained well enough to follow monitoring plans. Also responsibilities of surveillance bodies are not clearly defined, so there might be overlapping obligations and also gaps. This question is being analyzed in the framework of UNEP/GEF NBF Implementation Project and is supposed to be ready by the end of 2007. 25. System is in place on paper, but it might not work in reality. There is no experience and competent authorities are not well enough aware of their obligations in this regard. There are no special emergency measures foreseen for unintentional LMO transboundary movement nor we have any functional contacts with neighbours (ie Russian Federation as there is no real border inside of EU anyway). In summary – Estonia does not have any expereience in real life, a comprehensive system is in place on paper, but it might eventually not work in reality.	

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:	
Not applicable.	

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	X
b) not yet, but under development	
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:
As an EU Member State, Estonia complies with European Community law and frameworks. The EC has developed a comprehensive legal framework on GMOs, which also addresses the issues of handling, transport, packaging and identification requirement covered by Article 18. For more details, see report of EU. 33. In Estonia there is no special legislation regulating labelling of GM higher plants destined for contained use. Main problem in implementing art 18 is sharing of responsibilities of different institutions in Estonia (Ministry of Environment and its Environmental Inspectorate, Ministry of Agriculture and its Plant Production Inspetrorate and Veterinary and Food Board, and Customs). Also, it is foreseen to revise current system of accompanying documentation of shipments and its checking system. Foreseen to be completed under UNEP/GEF NBF Implementation Project.

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:
Estonia has designated the Ministry of the Environment as the competent authority for its national focal point for the BCH. The process of creating a national BCH node and making it interoperable with the central portal and EU BCH is ongoing. UNEP-GEF Project for Building Capacity For Effective Participation in the BCH started in September 2007 and is supposed to end in December 2007.

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:	
EU legislation and respective Estonian legislative acts on GMOs contain confidentiality provisions that apply equally to domestic and foreign producers of GMOs. For more information, see EU report.	
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:	
Not applicable, not a Party of export during the reporting period.	

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)	X
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developed country Party	
42. If yes to question 41, how has such cooperation taken place:	
See details from EU report.	
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)	X
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developing country Party	
44. If yes to question 43, how has such cooperation taken place:	
Estonia is currently a beneficiary from UNEP-GEF project for Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This project is coordinated by Tallinn Technical University and Estonian Ministry of the Environment and is meant for implementation of Cartagena Protocol.	

Additionally, UNEP-GEF Project for Building Capacity For Effective Participation in the BCH started in September 2007 and is supposed to end in December 2007. An intra-EC twinning project for creating measures for co-existence of GM, conventional and organic agriculture between Estonia, Germany and Austria (main beneficiary the Ministry of Agriculture) was launched in 2006 and finished in 2007, resulting in drafting the intended measures.	
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- Several capacity building activities launched under UNEP/GEF NBF Implementation project.
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:
Estonia is currently a beneficiary from UNEP-GEF project for Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This project is coordinated by Tallinn Technical University and Estonian Ministry of the Environment. UNEP-GEF Project for Building Capacity For Effective Participation in the BCH started in September 2007 and is supposed to end in December 2007. An intra-EC twinning project for creating measures for co-existence of GM, conventional and organic agriculture between Estonia, Germany and Austria (main beneficiary the Ministry of Agriculture) was launched in 2006 and finished in 2007, resulting in drafting the intended measures.

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	X
b) yes – limited extent	
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	X
b) yes – limited extent	
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	
b) yes – limited extent	X
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:
Estonian legislation on GMOs complies with European Community law, which promotes public awareness and participation as an integral part of its regulatory framework. Estonia is Party to the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters. In decision making, different stakeholders are involved in consultative process, as the Minister of Environment consults with Estonian Gene Technology Commission before any decisions regarding deliberate release and the 17 members of the Commission include government officers, academic scientists, consumer protection, environmental NGOs. As required by EU legislation, applications are available for everyone for commenting. Gene Technology Committee has an obligation to answer to all comments and explain if they take comments into account or not. All decisions are published and public. There have been limited information made available about BCH so far, but it will be done during 2007 in the frameworkd of UNEP/GEF BCH Porject (there will be special training and also special guidelines will be published). No real problems have been encountered while implementing this article.

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:
For details see EU report.

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:
Estonia has harmonized its legislation with the legislation of the European Union. The measures are regulated by the Act on the Release into the Environment of Genetically Modified Organisms and the Food Act. Penalties for unauthorised release into the environment or other infringements of the Act, violation of the requirements for labelling have been established.

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:
XThe European Commission has issued a Recommendation on 23 July 2003 on guidelines for the development of national strategies and best practices to ensure the coexistence of genetically modified crops with conventional and organic farming. According to this recommendation and with the help of Twinning project, draft guidelines have been worked out in 2006 – 2007 for co-existence of GMOs and conventional crops. Those have not yet been adopted by the Parliament, though.

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	X

c) both	
d) neither	

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:
UNEP-GEF PROJECT for implementation of NBF and BCH Project. Phare twinning project for establishing measures of co-existence. See details at 48.

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:
No further comments.

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:

No difficulties encountered