THE INTERIM NATIONAL REPORT ON 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 on Nature Conservation Enhancement and Environmental Destruction Control Ministry of Environment of Indonesia
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:	[original signed]
Date of submission:	12 September 2005

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:

This report was prepared through several steps:

1. interpreting the meaning of every question
2. preparation of a preliminary draft by a task force
3. verifying the preliminary draft with relevant stakeholders
4. finalizing the report based on stakeholders inputs and information extracted from research results of transgenic products in Indonesia.

Most stakeholders involved are those who are experienced and familiar with work on transgenic issues in Indonesia. They came from various institutions including the Ministry of Agriculture, the Indonesian Institute of Sciences, the Ministry of Environment, and last but not least the Indonesian Biosafety Clearing House (BCH).

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):

Information required to be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House	obstacles or impediments encountered regarding provision of that information
(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))	Indonesia has a system in place regarding legislation, regulation and guidelines as a basis for supporting the implementation of the Protocol. Most of these documents are posted in the national BCH in Indonesian. To facilitate data exchange with other CNAs requires their translation from the Indonesian into English as one of the UN languages besides establishing an exchange mechanism.
(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);	With the exception of the technical guidelines for food safety, all regulations are available in Indonesian. Again, the majpr obstacle is their translation into English.
(c) Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Articles 14.2, 20.3(b), and 24.1);	Indonesia does not have any bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements or arrangements in place.
(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));	All these information has been submitted to the BCH portal during the MOP 2.
(e) In cases of multiple competent national authorities, responsibilities for each (Articles 19.2 and 19.3);	All these information has been submitted to the BCH. The obstacle is the flow of new information between CNAs
(f) Reports submitted by the Parties on the operation of the Protocol (Article 20.3(e));	None
(g) Occurrence of unintentional transboundary movements that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17.1);	There are mechanisms in place, but up to now there is no case reported.

(h) Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25.3);	There is no reporting mechanism
(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));	There are mechanism in place
(j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);	There are mechanism in place
(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);	There are mechanism in place, but has not yet been implemented due to limited human resources and capacity
(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))	There are mechanisms in the government regulation No. 21/2005 and some cases had been reported
(m) Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.6)	Draft of technical guidelines for food safety assessment has not been signed yet.
(n) Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12.1);	There is mechanism in place but no review has ever been conducted. So far there has not been any changing of decision.
(o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)	There are mechanisms in place but so far no reported case
(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	There is no case
(q) Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information regarding products thereof (Article 20.3(c)).	There are mechanisms in place and report of some cases are available in BCH

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)	X
b) some measures introduced (please give details below)	
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:	
We have a government regulation No. 21 on Biosafety of Genetically Engineered Products (GEP) which 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. To make it operational, technical guidelines are needed. The existing technical guidelines of the 1999 Joint Decree of Four Ministers (Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Forestry & Estate Crops, Minister of Health, and Minister of Food & Horticulture) could be used, but they need to be improved and updated to be in tune with government regulation No. 21.	

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	X
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	

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

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:
-
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:
We imported seven transgenic (genetically modified) plants (Bt cotton, HT cotton, Bt/HT cotton, Bt corn, HT corn, another HT corn, and HT soybean) for the purposes of risk assessment for environment safety. We approved Bt cotton for limited release from 2001-2003 in 7-9 districts in South Sulawesi. HT= herbicide tolerance. Risk assessments were carried out before the entry of the force of the protocol; therefore, it was not prepared in the common format as required by the BCH.

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:	
-	

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:
We conducted risk assessment of two enzymes products (Ronozymes P and Finase) for feed (pro biotic) derived from transgenic (genetically modified) microorganisms. Risk assessments were carried out before the entry of the force of the protocol, but the information have not been posted in the BCH homepage.

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:
There were two enzymes products (Ronozymes and Finase) derived from genetically modified micro-organisms have been evaluated and stated as safe for environment by the Biosafety and Food Safety Committee (BFSC). The enzymes are used for feed as probiotic. The proponent submitted the written application to the DG of Animal Husbandry and Livestock. For risk assessment, the DG delivered the application to the Biosafety and Food Safety Committee and the Biosafety and Food Safety Technical Team (BFSTT). In Indonesia, the BFSTT members are senior scientists, and comprise of five group: Animal, Fish, Food, Micro-organisms, and Plant. Risk assessment of the two enzymes products were conducted by the BFSTT animal and micro-organism group. The obstacle: the available questioner for the proponent to fill in, is not really applicable to the products, because it was designed for GE product to be introduced to the environment.

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:
No experience

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	x
b) no (please clarify below)	
c) not a Party of import	

17. If yes, did you require the exporter to carry out the risk assessment?	
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	
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	X
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	
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:	
Based on the existing regulation, the proponent applying for the introduction of a GEP has to submit a written application for the biosafety and/or food safety assessment to the NCA. After receiving the application, the abovementioned official requests the considerations on the technical aspects of biosafety and/or food 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 asks 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. 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

The obstacles :

- It has not been decided yet which institution will be responsible for budgeting the mechanism.
- there was no indication about timeframe and public notice for participation

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)	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:
The mechanism has been established. but up to now there is no release of LMOs that has a potential to cause unintentional transboundary movement.

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)	x
b) no	
c) not applicable (please clarify below)	

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	x
b) no	
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	x
b) no	
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	X
b) no	
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:	
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. Obstacles : - Socialisation of the Cartagena Protocol and the new government regulation No. 21/2005 to related stakeholders has not been conducted yet	

Article 19 – Competent national authorities and national focal points

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

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: Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Forestry, Minister of Marine and Fishery 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. The Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for GEPs intended to be used directly as feed.

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

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:

For the time being, only Indonesian version is currently available for browsing. English version is still under construction. BCH Indonesia website has been established and launched on the internet since 11 March 2003. The URL address is http://www.bchindonesia.org/.

The website contains :

1. Introduction to BCH Indonesia (papers and presentations on BCH Indonesia).
2. Regulations (regulations directly related to biosafety)
3. Guidelines for Biosafety and Food Safety Assessments of GEAPs.
4. Domestic decisions (released GEAP in Indonesia, Bt cotton from Monsanto)
5. Contact address of BCH Indonesia (for public and related institutions).
6. Roster of experts (experts related to biosafety of GEAPs in Indonesia).
7. Discussion forum (for public opinion and news from BCH Indonesia).
8. Related scientific papers (published papers in peer-reviewed journals).
9. Links

The obstacles are :

- Belated/delayed action of CNAs to prepare risk assessment summary in BCH format

- A form of public notice for participation is available in the regulation (by posting the application summary and risk assessment 1 m. prior to decision); however, to reach more stakeholders other means in addition to internet based is needed.
- CNAs should actively submit the decision documents to national BCH team (not the other way around) – within the time frame stipulated in the protocol.

A fulltimer with enough knowledge on BCH management and IT is needed to cope with the increasing amount of information to be posted in the BCH web-site.

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	x
b) no	
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	X
If yes, please give number of cases	Seven products
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of import	
34. If you answered yes to the previous question, please provide information on your experience including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:	
In the Joint Decree of Four Ministers which was used prior to the issue of government regulation 21, there are clausules on the protection of confidential information on commercial information, intellectual property right and others not related to biosafety.	
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:	
Not applicable, not a party of export.	

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)	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	
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)	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	
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)	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	
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:	
The members of BFSTT and senior scientists have been trained in biosafety and food safety Risk assessment, and risk communication by various donors (e.g. ISNAR, FAO, and USAID through PBS and ABSPII). The training courses have been conducted in several countries such as Canada, India, Italy, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, and USA. ASEAN Secretariat and ILSI conducted Workshop on Safety and Risk Assessment of Agriculture Related GMOs on August 31-September 2, 2004 in Jakarta. The participants from Indonesia were the member of BFSTT and senior scientists from various institutions such as universities and research institutes. Obstacles: Some members of technical teams have the opportunity to follow biosafety training in/outside the countries. Only part of them got the real benefit from the training because either they are technical team members or decision makers related to BCH.	

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	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
43. If yes, do you cooperate with other States and international bodies?	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	x with ILSI, FAO, IFPRI and ASEAN
c) no	
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	X
c) no	

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	X
c) no	

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:

The mechanisms 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. It is expected that an increase in public knowledge will encourage and enable effective public participation.

Obstacles :

1. Internet access as one of effective communication means, is not yet available to the public at large. Its use is still limited to certain segment of the society
2. There is no clear definition with respect to representatives of the different profession/stakeholders.

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:

Not applicable

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	x
b) no	
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:	
Domestic release and distribution of GEP are regulated by the existing laws such as the Law on Systems for Plant Cultivation No. 12/1992 and the Law on Fishery No.31/2004 on fishery.	

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	x
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import	
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:	
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. But it is a not a part of risk assessment.	

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	X
c) both	
d) neither	

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:
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).

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:

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:
