Origin of report

Party	Arab Republic of Egypt
Contact officer for report	
Name and title of contact officer:	Dr. Osama Muhammad al-Tayyib, Scientific Advisor, Environmental Affairs Agency
Mailing address:	Center for Microbiological Technology, College of Pharmacology, University of Cairo, 51 Kasr El-Eini Street, Cairo, Post Code 11562
Telephone:	++(2)0106077374
Fax:	++(202) 362 0122
E-mail:	omtayeb@link.net
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting report:	Dr. Mustafa Fowda
Date of submission:	

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 report has been prepared by the Nature Protection Section of the Environmental Affairs Agency of the Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs, by reference to the activities of the Section, its local and international correspondence on this issue, and in full consultation with the following authorities:

1. The Ministerial Committee for Drafting of the Biosafety Law, represented by experts from all concerned governmental and non-governmental sectors, which consulted more than thirty relevant governmental and non-governmental authorities.
2. The Ministry of Health and Population and its agencies
3. The Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, the Center for Agricultural Research and the Committee for Bio-security
4. The Ministry of Foreign Trade and Industry
5. The Foreign Ministry
6. The Ministry of Higher Education and of State for Scientific Research
7. The Supreme Council for Universities
8. The Academy of Scientific Research and Technology
9. The Confederation of Industries
10. The Chamber of Commerce
11. The Biosafety Clearing House of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

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 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):
Despite specification of the competent national authority, no information has been prepared for the BCH by Egypt, due to: (a) The need for capacity building, which has not yet been addressed by the United Nations Environment Programme and Global Environment Facility Unit. (b)The Unit has not provided the funding required for building the capacity to apply the Protocol; a scheme advanced by Egypt in 2001 to this effect has not yet been approved. (c) The national law regulating biosafety in Egypt has to date not been promulgated (although it has been drafted) due to domestic reasons and because of the absence of the necessary funding for application, as per item (b) above. (d) To date, no official applications have been submitted to the competent national authority in Egypt for the transboundary movement of genetically engineered products. No information has been received about unintended movement and no applications have been submitted to it for the local use of such products.

Information required to be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House:

(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)*)*

(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);

(c) Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Articles 14.2, 20.3(b), and 24.1);

(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));

(e) In cases of multiple competent national authorities, responsibilities for each (Articles 19.2 and 19.3);

(f) Reports submitted by the Parties on the operation of the Protocol (Article 20.3(e));

(g) Occurrence of unintentional transboundary movements that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17.1);

(h) Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25.3);

(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));

(j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);

(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);

(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))

(m) Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.6)

(n) Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12.1);

(o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)

(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); and

(q) Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information regarding products thereof (Article 20.3(c)).

Article 2 – General provisions

2. 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)	
b) some measures introduced (please give details below)	x
c) no measures yet taken	
3. 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:	
Through the work of the Ministerial Committee for the Drafting of the National Law for the Handling of Genetic Products, the final draft of the proposed law regulating the handling of genetically engineered products in Egypt conforms to the measures specified by the Protocol. It was referred to the Legislation Department of the Ministry of Justice for review from the legislative aspect in preparation for submission to the People's Assembly (through the Council of Ministers) for promulgation. All this was achieved solely by national efforts, with no support from the Global Environment Facility, despite the presentation of a scheme for this purpose that has been the subject of negotiation since 2001. The bill was prevented from being put before the People's Assembly during the concluding session by the submission of a number of sovereignty bills of the utmost national importance relating to amendment of the constitution, recently approved by referendum.	

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

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

4. 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	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of export	x
5. 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) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of export	x
6. 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
7. 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:	
The Arab Republic of Egypt was not a Party of export of living modified organisms intended for release into the environment during the reporting period.	
8. 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:	
The Arab Republic of Egypt received no applications for the importation of living modified organisms intended for release into the environment during the reporting period.	

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

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.

9. 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) no	
c) not applicable (please give details below)	
10. 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	
11. 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
12. 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:	
The Arab Republic of Egypt was not a Party of export of living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed or for processing during the reporting period.	
13. 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:	
The Arab Republic of Egypt received no applications for the importation of genetically modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed or for processing during the reporting period.	

In 2001, Egypt advanced a scheme for technical and financial support for applying the terms of the Protocol, including Articles 9 – 11, to the United Nations Environment Programme and Global Environment Facility Unit; this has been under consideration by the Unit since that time.

The draft, which has been finalized, of the national law for biosafety in the handling of genetically engineered products stipulates that the applicant for the use of these products shall be legally bound by the accuracy of the information submitted to the competent national authority.

Article 13 – Simplified procedure

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

14. If your country has used the simplified procedure during the reporting period, please describe your experiences in implementing Article 13, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
The simplified procedure was not used during the reporting period as no relevant applications were submitted to the competent national authority.

Article 14 – Bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements and arrangements

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

15. If your country has entered into bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements, describe your experiences in implementing Article 14 during the reporting period, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
The Arab Republic of Egypt has entered into no bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements concerning the implementation of Article 14 of the Protocol.

Articles 15 and 16 – Risk assessment and risk management

16. 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	x
17. If yes, 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	x
18. 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	x No applications submitted during the reporting period.
19. 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	x
b) no	
20. Has your country adopted appropriate measures to prevent unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms? (Article 16.3)	
a) yes	x
b) no	
21. 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)	

22. 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

23. 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:

Questions 16, 17, 19, 20, 21

The draft national law for regulation of the handling of genetically engineered products includes instruments regulating:

1. The method of risk assessment in cases which the Higher National Committee for Biosafety of the competent national authority decides must be carried out after preliminary examination of the submitted application for handling – the method of cost accounting – the method and authority for carrying out these studies – the charging of the applicant with depositing the cost of this with the competent national authority – the reference laboratories authorized to participate therein – the scope(s) of these studies, the method of their presentation and their role in the taking of a decision about the handling – the method of appealing the decision.
2. The method of managing the probable risks that are consistent with the application and of restoring matters to the condition they were in prior to handling.
3. The methods of monitoring the handling and determining the competent authority or authorities to do this during the period of validity of the handling license, in accordance with the nature of the product and the location or locations of its release.
4. The possibility of amending or withdrawing the license should new information emerge that alters the probable influence of the licensed product on biological diversity and the environment, notifying the licensee of the details of and reasons for the decision and the method of appeal.
5. The regulation of the transit of genetically engineered products through Egyptian territory.
6. The procedures for dealing with the unintended movement of genetically engineered products.

The instruments referred to have not yet been put into operation in view of the fact that the law has not been promulgated to date and the fact that no licensing applications have been submitted to the competent national authority. However, these procedures shall be applied in their capacity as elements in the Protocol (which Egypt has ratified and has thereby become national law), should the competent national authority receive relevant applications.

Article 17 – Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures

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

24. 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) partially (please clarify below)	
c) no (please clarify below) d) not applicable (please give further details below)	x

25. 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:
No occurrences of this sort have come to the knowledge of the competent national authority during the reporting period.

Article 18 – Handling, transport, packaging and identification

26. 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)	
b) no	
c) not applicable (please clarify below)	x
27. 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	
b) no c) not applicable (please give further details below)	x
28. 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) no	x
29. 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	
b) no	x
30. 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 18, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
The draft national law for the regulation of the handling of genetically engineered products stipulates: 1. The methods of packaging, transporting and handling the licensed product 2. The methods of placing uniquely distinguishing identification tags on the licensed product such that its genetically engineered organism content is clearly apparent, and setting up a focal point for further information. It shall be inadmissible to bypass this by claiming ignorance that the cargo contains genetically engineered elements, given the possibility of discovering them in the laboratory and the possibility of the producer's / exporter's	

knowledge of these elements. No exemption shall be made for commodities "which are not intended for release into the environment" unless they are designed for use in isolation from the environment.
3. The placing of tags to identify genetically engineered organisms and the setting up of a focal point for further information; the method of secure treatment to prevent release into the environment during transportation, storage, handling and use, in the case of products designed for use in isolation from the environment.

To date, these measures have not been put into operation because the law has not been promulgated and in view of the fact that no licensing applications have been submitted to the competent national authority. However, these procedures shall be applied in their capacity as elements in the Protocol (which Egypt has ratified and has thereby become national law), should the competent national authority receive relevant applications.

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.

31. 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:
The Article has not been put into effect because of the need for capacity building.

Article 21 – Confidential information

32. 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	
b) no	X – see comments at question 56
33. 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	X – see comments at question 56

34. If you answered yes to the previous question, please provide information on your experience including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:
35. 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:
The country is neither a producer nor an exporter of the relevant products. (also see comments at question 56)

Article 22 – Capacity-building

36. 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
37. If yes, how has such cooperation taken place:	
38. 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)	
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	x
b) 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	
39. 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)	
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	x
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	

40. 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)	
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	x
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	

41. 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:

In 2001, the Arab Republic of Egypt submitted an experimental, practical scheme to the United Nations Environment Programme and Global Environment Facility Unit which included a number of capacity building elements, including:

1. Assistance in formulating a national law and its executive provisions in preparation for Egypt's ratification of the Protocol.
2. Assistance in building an administrative framework to apply the law, reference laboratories to analyze samples and monitor release into the environment, risk assessment and management and the training of workers to apply the law and its executive provisions.
3. Building the necessary national capacity to participate in the efforts of the Protocol Secretariat in the sphere of the Biosafety Clearing House, including the training of the necessary cadres.
4. Assistance in spreading awareness and public participation in application of the law.

It is noted that Egypt was one of 16 states that in 1998 / 1999 participated in the Unit's trial project for the setting up of a national biosafety framework; the framework, which included the draft of a proposed law, was set up. The success of the Egyptian trial met with approval from the international conference convened in Cairo by the Unit to assess the performance of the sixteen participating states. The final report on Egypt's trial project made reference to the importance of following up the project with another, to apply those of its results that may be useful in the capacity building of a number of states whose situation is similar to that of Egypt's.

Negotiations over the setting up of the project continued in the period from 2001 to 2005. Egypt responded to successive requests from the Unit to change the project structure, resulting in the form of the project being changed seven times; the last of these was as the result of a visit by a Unit specialist to Cairo in 2004. The project, however, remains under consideration. As a result of this hesitation (which resulted in delaying Egypt's ratification of the Protocol) and the lack of a clear decision being taken on capacity building, or the proffering of excuses, the drafting of the national law and its executive provisions was delayed more than once. On the basis of a political decision, the law was drafted by national efforts with no assistance from the United Nations Environment Programme and Global Environment Facility Unit – in the expectation that such assistance would shortly materialize, although to date it has not done so.

There is no doubt that the lack of provision of international assistance for capacity building in the field of biosafety in Egypt has had negative effects which we shall strive to overcome within the limitations of available national capabilities.

Article 23 – Public awareness and participation

42. 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	
43. If yes, do you cooperate with other States and international bodies?	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	x
44. 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	
c) no	x
45. 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	
46. 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	
c) no	x
47. 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:	
Questions 45, 46 The proposed national law stipulates the necessity of consulting public opinion before a decision is taken concerning the licensing of the handling of genetically engineered products, when necessary. Also, there is still considerable media interest in the issue. Since 1999, the competent national authority has continued to clarify the facts surrounding the issue and participate in spreading public awareness by organizing open meetings to which specialists and representatives of the media are invited to discuss specific matters, as well as by participating in general and scientific conferences dealing with the issues of biosafety.	

Article 24 – Non-Parties

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

48. 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:
Authorities from states that are non-Party to the Protocol have not submitted applications to the competent national authority.

Article 25 – Illegal transboundary movements

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

49. 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	
b) no	x
50. 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:	
In view of the particular geographic situation of the Arab Republic of Egypt, it is likely that genetically engineered products will be transported through the Suez Canal without informing the competent national authority. However, no cases of unlawful transboundary movement of such products have come to the knowledge of the competent national authority.	

Article 26 – Socio-economic considerations

51. 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
52. 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
53. 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:	
The proposed draft national law has taken into consideration the fact that the Arab Republic of Egypt is a Party to the Protocol by stipulating the necessity for social and economic considerations to be taken into account when a decision is taken concerning the licensing of the handling of a genetically engineered product. It is worth mentioning that this consideration is particularly important to the public when dealing with the issue of biosafety in the media.	

Article 28 – Financial mechanism and resources

54. 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
55. 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:	
Please refer to the answer to Question no. 41.	

Other information

56. 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:
RE Questions 32, 33, 34, 35 The draft national law for the regulation of the handling of genetically engineered products stipulates that what Article 21 of the Protocol states and regulates regarding "confidential information" shall be respected and applied. It likewise stipulates complete equality between locally produced products and those imported from abroad. - - - - - - The draft national law for the regulation of genetically engineered products stipulates the exclusion of the area of handling in research and experiments in isolation from the environment, which is to be left to another, separate law. It is limited to handling that results from intentional release into the environment.

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:

None