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

Origin of report

Party:	*Republic of Indonesia*
Contact officer for report	
Name and title of contact officer:	*Ms. Masnellyarti Hilman* *Deputy Minister for Nature Conservation Enhancement and Environmental Destruction Control* *Ministry of Environment*
Mailing address:	*6th Floor, Building A* *Ministry of Environment of Indonesia* *D.I. Panjaitan Kav. 24, Jakarta 13410*
Telephone:	*+62 21 859 04923*
Fax:	*+62 21 859 04923*
E-mail:	*nellyhilman@yahoo.com* *kehati@menlh.go.id*
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting report:	*[signature provided in original document]*
Date of submission:	*10 October 2007*
Time period covered by this report:	*September 2003 – September 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:

Indonesia's first national report was prepared in consultation with relevant government institutions including Ministry of Agriculture, the Indonesian Institute of Sciences, the Ministry of Environment, National Agency for Food and Drug Control, and last but not least the Indonesian Biotechnology Information Centre (IndoBiC). The report attempt to reflect activities on the implementation of Cartagena Protocol in Indonesia after the entry into force of Protocol in September 2003.

The first draft of the report was written by the task-team using material taken from various relevant agriculture and biosafety regulations, reports, available data and information including the

domestic decisions concerning genetically engineered products provided by Ministry of Agriculture. Primary and secondary data had been analyzed to provide further details and further crosschecked with the literature. Finally, experts were consulted to fill gaps and contribute a further dimension of veracity and accuracy to the assessment.

Main regulation and information documents as a basis for the implementation of Cartagena Protocol in Indonesia including Government Regulation Number 21/2005 regarding Biosafety of Genetically Engineered Product; National Biosafety Framework of the Republic of Indonesia; and other official document from relevant ministry i.e domestic decisions by Biosafety Committee as result of their assessment for the certain product.

The draft national report was circulated for comment to a wide range of relevant institution. Several Consultation meetings with stakeholders were arranged to enrich the draft, followed by review by the team of experts to refine the final draft.

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):

In addition to having a mandate for fulfilling Cartagena Protocol, BCH of Indonesia plays an important role as a part of Biosafety Committee which organizes and provides information to the public. In the same time, BCH of Indonesia brings together public opinion and suggestion for further consideration to Biosafety Committee. Cartagena Protocol's mandate concerning obligatory information has been available in bahasa Indonesia although there are several indirect regulations regarding PRG has not been provided due to some technical problems. Its translation to English version is still in progress.

At the moment, improvement of overall performance of BCH is undertaking through funding scheme from UNEP-GEF project on Building Capacity of Biosafety Clearing House. The activities involve among others formation of Task Force and Sub Working Group, make available all necessary data and information, conduct public consultation, and provide English translation for all information requested by CBD secretary.

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- *Act No 16/92 : Quarantine for animals, fish and plants → To protect animal, fish and plants from foreign pest and diseases, and from invasive alien species* *Act No 5/94 : Ratifications of*	X- *Act No 6/67 : Animal husbandry and animal health → Animals to be reared commercially, biological materials for animals* *Act No 9/85 : The use and*	

	the Convention on Biological Diversity → Conservation, management and utilization of genetic resources *Act No 29/2000 : Plant Variety Protection → Intellectual property protection of new plant varieties* *Act No. 21/2004 : Ratification of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety* *GR No. 6/95 : Plant Protections → Pest Control using Natural Enemies* *GR No. 44/95 : Seeds for Crops → Imports/exports, breeding and release of new varieties* *GR No. 29/2000 : Animal Quarantine → To prevent foreign diseases entering Indonesian territory* *GR No. 28/2004 : Foodsafety, Quality and Nutrition*	*management of fish resources → Release of new fish varieties* *Act No 5/90 : Conservation of Genetic Resources → Conservation of flora and fauna* *Act No 12/92 : Systems for Plant Culture → Various aspects of agriculture including release of new varieties of agricultural crops* *Act No 44/99 : Forestry → Forest management with new forest varieties* *Act No 23/97 : Environment → Biological environment* *GR No. 78/92 : Animal pharmaceutical → If the production involves modern biotechnology* *GR No. 27/99 : Environmental Impact Analysis → Analysis of*	

	GR No. 21/2005 : Biosafety of Genetically Engineered Product → To prevent environment and human health from potential negative impact of GEPs	*the risk to the environment* *GR No. 15/2002 : Fish Quarantine → To prevent foreign fish pests and diseases entering Indonesian territory* *Decree of the Minister of Agriculture No 737/Kpts/TP.240/9 /98 Amendment of Decree No 902/Kpts/TP.240 /12/96 : Testing, evaluation and release of new plant varieties → Procedure for testing, evaluation and release of new plant varieties* *No 26/KPTS/OT.210 /1/1998 : Importation of fish fingerlings → Procedures for importation of fish fingerlings to be reared commercially in Indonesia*	
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- *Act No. 7/1996: Food → In term of foods derived from genetically*		

	modified organisms it is very clearly stated in article 13 that based on the precautionary approach the Government of Indonesia regulates that all GM-based Foods shall be assessed for food safety before their release into the market. *GR No. 28/2004 : Foodsafety, Quality and Nutrition*		
c) Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Articles 14.2, 20.3(b), and 24.1);			X- NA
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- NA
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- NA

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- *Decree of Ministry of Agriculture No. 107/Kpts/KB.430/ 2/ 2001 (for the period of 2001-2002) concerning Transgenic Cotton variety DP 5690 with commercial name NuCOTN 35B (Bollgard);* *Decree of Ministry of Agriculture No.102/Kpts/KB. 430/2/2003 (for the period of 2003-2004) concerning Transgenic Cotton variety DP 5690 with commercial name NuCOTN 35B (Bollgard)*		
j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);		X- *Proposal of biosafety assessment from:* *PT Romindo Primavetcom for biosafety and food safety assessment for GMO vaccine to control avian influenza in poultry.* *PT Surya Hidup Satwa for biosafety and food safety assessment for ZYMPEX P 5000 (animal*	

		feed) containing phytase enzyme which its production involves GMO microbes. *PT CEVA Health Indonesia for biosafety and food safety assessment for vector vaccines Mune FP-MG and Mune FP-MG + AE for poultry immunization to pox, micoplasmosis, and avian encephalomyalitis.*	
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- 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- NA
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- *Draft of foodsafety guideline*		
n) Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12.1);			X- NA
o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)			X- NA
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- NA

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- *Summary of RA for Transgenic Cotton Variety DP 5690 RR (or 1220 RRA 68022) with commercial name NuCOTN 35B (Bollgard);* *Summary of RA for Bt Transgenic Cotton Varieties Bt DP 90 B (alias 90 BE 60023) & PM 1560 B (alias 1560 BE 72022) (Event 531);* *Summary of RA for Round up Ready Transgenic Soybean Varieties Cristalina RR & Jatoba RR (Event GTS 40-3-2);* *Summary of RA for Round up Ready Transgenic Maize Varieties RR-1 & RR-2 (Event GA 21);* *Summary of RA for Bt Transgenic maize Varieties Bt Mon 810-1 & Bt Mon 810-2 (Event Mon 810);*	X- *Summary of RA for Ronozyme-P (Probiotic feed); Summary of RA for Finase-L and Finase-P;*	

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:

Before the ratification of the Cartagena Protocol, Indonesia had preventive measure dealed with Living Modified Organisms (LMOs), first in the form of The Decree of the Minister of Agriculture No 856 Kpts/Hk.330/9/1997 on the Provision of Biosafety of Genetically Engineered Agricultural Biotechnology Products which was later revised to accommodate food safety issue with the Joint Decree of Four Ministers (Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Forestry and Estate Crops, Minister of Health and State Minister for Food and Horticulture No 998.1/Kpts/OT.210/9/99, 790.a/Kpts- IX/19991145A/MENKES/ SKB/IX/1999, 015A/NmenegPHOR/09/1999) on Biosafety and Food Safety of Genetically Engineered Agricultural Products in 1999.

The government regulation No. 21 on Biosafety of Genetically Engineered Products (GEP) has been in place since 2005. This Government Regulation is required because the existing legislations do not sufficiently regulate everything on GEP as required in the Cartagena Protocol, and that a systematic and effective arrangement is needed. This government Regulation will serve as legal basis in providing biosafety, food safety and animal feed safety of GEP for the welfare of people based on principle of health and biological resource management, consumer protection and business certainty by putting religion, ethic, social, culture and esthetic into consideration.

The government regulation consist of ten (10) chapters with the important chapters on regulates the kinds and requirements of GEPs, research and development of GEPs, introduction of GEPs, assessment, release and utilization of GEPs, control and monitoring of GEPs, institution, and financial arrangements. The main requirement this government regulation is the regulatory bodies which consist of biosafety committee and biosafety technical team. The Biosafety Clearing House is a part of Biosafety Committee. The formation of Biosafety Committee will be established through Presidential Decree. The status of Presidential Decree is in the final draft (after discussion with the Secretariat Cabinet). The technical guidelines which will be implemented for research and development (R & D) are under development process. The technical guidelines for R & D consist of the guideline for confined field trial experiment of genetically engineered plant, the guideline for experiment of genetically engineered plant in the biosafety containment facility, and the guideline for experiment of genetically engineered organisms in the laboratory. In addition to those guidelines, we are also improving and updating the existing guidelines become the guidelines in line with the requirement of GR No21/2005. These guidelines consist of environment safety risk assessment of genetically engineered product (for plants, animal, fish and micro organism), food safety risk assessment, and feed safety risk assessment. The guidelines for food safety

risk assessment in the final draft.

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:	

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

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:

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)	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	
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:	
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:	

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 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.

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:	
Indonesia has not entered into 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

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	X
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	

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- *At this time, we are improving and updating the existing guidelines on risk assessment become the new guidelines in line with the requirement of the Protocol and our national regulation. These guidelines consist of environment safety risk assessment of genetically engineered product (for plants, animal, fish and microorganism), food safety risk assessment, and feed safety risk assessment. The guidelines for food safety risk assessment in the final draft.*

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	
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	
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)	X
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:	
Government regulation No. 21/2005 regarding Biosafety of genetically engineered product has authorized the obligation to conduct risk assessment including strategy for its risk management. However, prevention attempt nor regulation for unintentional transboundary movement has not been ruled out in the above government regulation. Guideline for implementation of risk assessment and detailed risk management supposedly submitted this time is still in progress. Preliminary guideline before the existence of the above government regulation no.21/2005 is being used as the basic draft with some additional issues that will be included i.e. the strategy to deal with unintentional transboundary movement of PRG. *Based on the existing regulation, the proponent applying for the introduction of a GEP has to submit a written application for the biosafety risk assessment (environment, food and/or feed safety assessment) to the NCA. After receiving the application, the above mentioned official requests the considerations on the technical aspects of environment, food and/or feed safety from the Biosafety Committee (BC). The BC examines the application for its completion, and if necessary corresponds with the proponent to complete the applications. After getting all of the complete information needed, the BC*	

requests the Biosafety Technical Team (BTT) to carry out an appropriate technical study (risk assessment and risk management). The BTT is obligated to submit a report on the result of the risk assessment and risk management study to the BC. Biosafety Clearing House publishes the summary of the risk assessment result for public consultation. On the basis of the report on the risk assessment and risk management results, the BC submits its suggestions, considerations or recommendations to the responsible minister who will issue the permit. In the case that the GEP has once been utilized in Indonesia, the BC will provide the responsible Minister its suggestions, consideration or recommendation about the case.

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:	
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

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:	
For handling, transport, packaging and identification we implement international regulation regarding movement of commodities in trade and also requirements as stipulated in the government regulation no. 21/2005. Every entity which wants to introduce a kind of Genetically Engineered Product (GEP) for the first time must ask permit from the related Minister responsible for a certain commodity. *The request to introduce a GEP has to be submitted together with documents indicating fulfillment of the environment safety, food safety and feed safety standards. The basic information as guide to fulfilling requirement of environmental safety shall include among others:* *a. Description and purpose of use;* *b. Change of genetics and phenotype expected to detect;* *c. Clear identity on taxonomy, physiology, and reproduction of GEP.* *d. Organism used as source of gene must clearly be stated.* *e. Genetically engineered method used shall comply with standard protocol that can be justified scientifically.*	

f. Molecular characteristic of GEP must be clearly stated

g. Gen expression transformed into GEP must be stable in subsequent generations.

h. Applied manner of destruction in case of irregularity.

In addition, proponent should also submit certificate of free trade in the country of origin, and document of containing risk assessment and risk management by institutions where the risk assessments has been done.

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:

BCH Indonesia website has been established and launched since 11 March 2003. The URL address is http://www.bchindonesia.org/. For the time being, we are improving and updating the Indonesia BCH website under UNEP-GEF Project on Building Capacity of BCH and will be further provided into bilingual (English and Bahasa).

The website contains :

1. *Introduction to BCH Indonesia (papers and presentations on BCH Indonesia) and Cartagena Protocol.*
2. *Laws and regulations*
3. *Mechanism of Releasing GEPs*
4. *Domestic decisions*
5. *Authority Building*
6. *Experts*
7. *Research and paper*
8. *Related link*

Cartagena Protocol's mandate concerning obligatory information has been available in bahasa Indonesia although there are several indirect regulations regarding PRG has not been provided due to some technical problems. Its translation to English version is still in progress.

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:	
Not applicable, not a party of export.	

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)	X

b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developing country Party	
44. If yes to question 43, how has such cooperation taken place:	
Dr. Inez H.S. Loedin (Biotechnology Regional Coordinator for ASEAN and the NFP for BCH) has been contributing as resource person to develop biosafety guideline (in Cambodia) and to socialize CPB in certain country.	
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:	
The members of BFSTT, senior scientists, journalists, and policy makers have been trained in	

biosafety and food safety, risk assessment, and risk communication by various donors. The training courses and workshops have been conducted in several countries as describe below :

a. *2003: one senior scientist from ICABIOGRAD was trained in Biosafety for one week in Australia funded by AUSAID*
b. *2004: two senior scientists from ICABIOGRAD was attended Workshop on Agricultural Biotechnology for ASEAN Countries in Beijing, China funded by MoA China*
c. *2005: six senior scientists including members of Biosafety and Food Safety Technical Team from different institutes and university such as ICABIOGRAD, Indonesian Estate Crops Research Institute, University of Gadjah Mada, and Indonesian Agency for Food and Drug Inspection were trained in Food safety for one week in TERI India funded by PBS/USAID*
d. *2005: one senior scientist from IVEGRI was trained in Biosafety for one week (July-August 2007) in Michigan State University, USA funded by PBS/USAID*
e. *2005: one senior scientist from ICABIOGRAD was attended Regional Training Workshop on Risk Assessment and Risk Management on GM Crops in Japan funded by FAO*
f. *2005-2006: about 20-30 research scientists including members of Biosafety and Food Safety Technical Team from different institutes and university were trained in risk communication for 3 days in Bogor, Indonesia funded by ISAAA and ABSPII/USAID.*
g. *2006: Bogor Agricultural University conduct an International Biosafety Course "Holistic Foundations for Assessment and Regulation of Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms" in collaboration with Genok (Norway) and TWN.*
h. *2006: one senior scientist from Bogor Agricultural University was trained in Biosafety for one week (July-August 2007) in Michigan State University, USA funded by ABSPII/USAID*
i. *2007: one senior staff of MoE and one senior scientist from Gadjah Mada University was attended Norway Canada Workshop on Risk Assessment for Emerging Applications of LMOs in Montreal, Canada funded by government of Norway and Canada.*
j. *2007: one senior scientist from ICABIOGRAD was trained in Biosafety for 45 days (July-August 2007) in Michigan State University, USA funded by PBS/USAID*
k. *2007: one senior staff of MoE was trained in International Biosafety Course "Holistic Foundations for Assessment and Regulation of Genetic Engineering and Genetically Modified Organisms" in University of Tromso, Norway funded by NORAD*

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	
b) yes – limited extent	X
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:	
The constraint in the implementation of Cartagena Protocol in the regulation in Indonesia regarding public participation is because public participation is a new concept in Indonesia, and the mechanisms have to be make as such in order not too costly and enough transparency for the stakeholders. To inform directly every stakeholders likely to be involved will be too costly and will be very difficult because biotechnology itself is a new science and to explain the benefit and possible risk to every people in Indonesia will be impossible. Therefore, the strategy will be the accessibility of information for the concern stakeholders, using electronic means such as website and publications in the newspaper. *In the government regulation on Biosafety of Genetically Engineered Product, the mechanism for public participation is done by announcing the draft of the recommendations of the BC through the*	

Biosafety Clearing House, brochures, and pamphlets of the related government's office. The public has 60 days to respond to the announcement. Then the BC has to answer the concerns.

Effective public education is also done through other efforts, e.g. by cooperating with organizations such as Universities, Research Institutes, Professional Organizations, through the development of modules for public education on biotechnology and biosafety. The materials developed can be in the form of written popular material such as brochures, pamphlets, booklets or teaching modules for high school and university. Program study of biotechnology and related subject such as bioethics has been established in various universities. It is expected that an increase in public knowledge will encourage and enable effective public participation.

There are some obstacles identified during implementation of public awareness and participation, namely:

- *different level of awareness and education of target groups;*
- *limited budget;*
- *characterization of Indonesia as archipelago country;*
- *determined appropriate media for public awareness and participation .*

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

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	
b) no	X

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:

Indonesia is the world's archipelagic country; it's situated between two continents i.e. Asia and Australia/Oceania. In view of the particular geographic situation of Indonesia, it is likely that genetically engineered products will be transported through the ocean or country jurisdictions 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

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	X
d) not a Party of import	

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	X
c) no	

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:

Socio economic has become a consideration for decision making. In the case of Bt cotton, government requested the importer to appoint independent institution to conduct socioeconomic studies. These studies have been conducted twice (2001 & 2002). But it is a not a part of risk assessment.

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:

In 2002 to 2004 Indonesia received a financial support from UNEP-GEF to develop a biosafety policy, institution, regulatory framework and a system for handling request to be in conformity with the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol. The financial support covers 5 (five) components: national project personnel component (National Project Personnel, consultants, administrative support, and travel), sub contract component (sub contract to governmental agencies and sub contract to private firms), training component, equipment and premises component (expendable equipment, non-expendable equipment, premises), and miscellaneous component (operation and maintenance equipment, reporting cost, sundry).

In the mean time, Indonesia is submitting a project proposal to get financial assistance from UNEP-GEF entitled "Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Indonesia". This project is very crucial for implementation of Cartagena Protocol in Indonesia because it is an extension of previous project explained earlier, i.e. "Development of the National Biosafety Framework for Indonesia". The proposal for "Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for Indonesia" is projected for 4 years implementation and submitted to UNEP-GEF for technical grant of total US$ 1,631,640 comprising of GEF component of US$ 922,440 and national fund of US$ 709,200.

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:

The National Competent Authorities are :

1. *The Minister of Environment responsible for the environmental safety of GEPs which will be released deliberately to the environment.*
2. *The Minister related to the commodities: Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Marine and Fishery and Ministry of Forestry are the authorities responsible for regulating GEP release to the field after been declared environmentally safe by the Minister of Environment.*
3. *The National Agency for Drug and Food Control responsible for GEPs intended to be use*

directly as food or to be processed.

4. *Minister of Agriculture for GEP intended to be used for feed and vaccine of animal husbandry and poultry; Minister of Marine and Fishery for GEP intended to be used for feed and vaccine of fish.*

The National Focal Point is the Deputy Minister on Nature Conservation Enhancement and Environmental Destruction Control, Ministry of 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: