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

Origin of report

Party:	The Netherlands
Contact officer for report	
Name and title of contact officer:	Ruben Dekker Policy Officer on Biotechnology Directorate for Chemicals, Waste, Radiation Protection Radiation Protection, Nuclear and Biosafety Division
Mailing address:	Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment P.O. Box 30945 (ipc 645) 2500 GX The Hague The Netherlands
Telephone:	+31 (0)70 3394639
Fax:	+31 (0)70 3391316
E-mail:	Ruben.dekker@minvrom.nl
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting report:	Ms. A. van Limborgh LL M Head of Radiation Protection, Nuclear and Biosafety Division
Date of submission:	1st Oktober 2007
Time period covered by this report:	11 september 2003 – 1st Oktober 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:

A draft report was circulated to other ministries and agencies involved in biotechnology policy-making, inspection and control agencies, technical advisory agencies and a number of stakeholders including environmental ngo's and industry representatives. Their comments were taken into account when finalising the report.

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):
All available information has been provided to the BCH

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		
b) National laws, regulations and guidelines applicable to the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.5);	X		
c) Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Articles 14.2, 20.3(b), and 24.1);			X
d) Contact details for competent national authorities (Articles 19.2 and 19.3), national focal points (Articles 19.1 and 19.3), and emergency contacts (Article 17.2 and 17.3(e));	X		
e) In cases of multiple competent national authorities, responsibilities for each (Articles 19.2 and 19.3);			X
f) Reports submitted by the Parties on the operation of the Protocol (Article 20.3(e));	X		
g) Occurrence of unintentional transboundary movements that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17.1);			X

Type of information	*Information exists and is being provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information exists but is not yet provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information does not exist /not applicable*
h) Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25.3);	X		
i) Final decisions regarding the importation or release of LMOs (i.e. approval or prohibition, any conditions, requests for further information, extensions granted, reasons for decision) (Articles 10.3 and 20.3(d));	X		
j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);			X
k) Final decisions regarding the domestic use of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.1);	X		
l) Final decisions regarding the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing that are taken under domestic regulatory frameworks (Article 11.4) or in accordance with annex III (Article 11.6) (requirement of Article 20.3(d))	X		
m) Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.6)			X
n) Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12.1);	X		
o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)			X
p) Cases where intentional transboundary movement may take place at the same time as the movement is notified to the Party of import (Article 13.1);			X
q) Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information regarding products thereof (Article 20.3(c)).	X		

Article 2 – General provisions

3. Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for implementation of the Protocol? (Article 2.1)	
a) full domestic regulatory framework in place (please give details below)	X
b) some measures introduced (please give details below)	
c) no measures yet taken	
4. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 2, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Most of the legislation for LMOs as applicable in the Netherlands originates from EU legislation. The most important legislative instruments for LMOs are directives 2001/18/EC and 1998/81/EC and regulations EC/1829/2003, EC/1830/2003 and EC/1946/2003. For details on this EU legislation on LMOs, please see the report of the European Community. In EU law, EU regulations are directly applicable in all member states. As such, a member state is only responsible for the penalisation of infringements of the regulation. In the Netherlands infringement of the regulations on LMOs are considered an economic offense, with penalties ranging from fines to inprisonment. EU directives have to be transposed in the national legislation of member states. In the Netherlands, the EU directives on LMOs have been implemented in the Genetically Modified Organisms Act. This Act contains rules for contained use, introduction into the environment of LMOs and introduction into the environment of LMO-FFP's. Only LMOs that have received a market authorisation under 1829/2003 are not covered by the GMO Act. A courtesy translation of this Act is available through the BCH.	

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	X
b) no	
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	

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

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	X
d) not applicable – not a Party of export	
9. 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	
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:	
Not applicable.	
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:	
Please note that most of the requirements and procedures described in Articles 7 to 10 and 12 of the Biosafety Protocol are covered by the European procedure for market approval of GMO's. For a detailed description of the procedure for authorisation for market release in the EU, please see the report of the European Community. Once an authorisation under directive 2001/18/EC has been granted at the European level, the member state that received the original application must make a final decision. The Netherlands has done so on two occasions since 11/9/2003. Both final decisions have been made available through 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.

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

b) no	
c) not relevant	X
14. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 11.4?	
a) yes	X
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	
15. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	
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:	
Please see the report by the EC for a thorough description of the experiences with LMO-FFP import to the EU. Many of these imports enter the EU through the Netherlands. However, implementation of Article 11 of the Protocol is part of the European procedure for market authorisation.	

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:	
Not applicable	

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:	

Articles 15 and 16 – Risk assessment and risk management

21. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, were risk assessments carried out for all decisions taken under Article 10? (Article 15.2)	
a) yes	
b) no (please clarify below)	
c) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
22. If yes to question 21, did you require the exporter to carry out the risk assessment?	
a) yes – in all cases	
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
23. If you took a decision under Article 10 during the reporting period, did you require the notifier to bear the cost of the risk assessment? (Article 15.3)	
a) yes – in all cases	
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
24. Has your country established and maintained appropriate mechanisms, measures and strategies to regulate, manage and control risks identified in the risk assessment provisions of the Protocol? (Article 16.1)	
a) yes – fully established	X
b) not yet, but under development or partially established (please give further details below)	
c) no	
25. Has your country adopted appropriate measures to prevent unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms? (Article 16.3)	
a) yes – fully adopted	X
b) not yet, but under development or partially adopted (please give further details below)	
c) no	
26. Does your country endeavour to ensure that any living modified organism, whether imported or locally developed, undergoes an appropriate period of observation commensurate with its life-cycle or generation time before it is put to its intended use? (Article 16.4)	
a) yes – in all cases	X
b) yes – in some cases (please give further details below)	

c) no (please give further details below)	X
d) not applicable (please give further details below)	
27. Has your country cooperated with others for the purposes specified in Article 16.5?	
a) yes (please give further details below)	X
b) no (please give further details below)	
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:	
No decisions were taken under Article 10, since the EU and the Netherlands use their domestic regulatory framework for decision making on LMOs. Co-operation with other Parties on the subject of Risk Assessment consists of discussions amongst EU member states on LMOs as well as discussions in the context of the OECD (with Parties and non-Parties). Furthermore, the Netherlands has actively participated in exchange of information on Risk Assessment in the context of the Protocol through participation in the AHTEG on risk assessment in Rome (2005), the Norway-Canada workshop (2007) and in the the African regional workshop on Risk Assessment (2007).	

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:	

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:	
Please see the report for the European Community for a detailed description of EU rules that are relevant for the implementation of Article 18.	

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:
All information is provided to the BCH as required. However, much of the information is only available in Dutch. This could prove to be an obstacle for other countries to access the information.

Article 21 – Confidential information

37. Does your country have procedures to protect confidential information received under the Protocol and that protect the confidentiality of such information in a manner no less favourable than its treatment of confidential information in connection with domestically produced living modified organisms? (Article 21.3)	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
38. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, did you permit any notifier to identify information submitted under the procedures of the Protocol or required by the Party of import as part of the advance informed agreement procedure that was to be treated as confidential? (Article 21.1)	
a) yes	X
If yes, please give number of cases	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of import / no such requests received	
39. If you answered yes to the previous question, please provide information on your experience including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:	
Under EU and Dutch law for LMOs, notifiers have the right to identify information contained in the application which they wish to be kept confidential. The Competent authority of the Netherlands then decides whether this request can be granted. In any case, the notifier has to submit all information that is necessary to evaluate the validity of the risk assessment in a publicly available document. According to EU law (directive 2001/18), the following information may not be kept confidential: • General description of the GMO or GMOs, name and address of the notifier, purpose of the release, location of release and intended uses; • Methods and plans for monitoring of the GMO or GMOs and for emergency response; • Environmental risk assessment.	
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	

Article 22 – Capacity-building

41. If a developed country Party, during this reporting period has your country cooperated in the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety for the purposes of the effective implementation of the Protocol in developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and in Parties with economies in transition?	
a) yes (please give details below)	X
b) no	

c) not applicable – not a developed country Party	

42. If yes to question 41, how has such cooperation taken place:

The Netherlands has made financial support available for the Southern Africa Biosafety and Environment Programme between 2005 and 2007. This programme aimed to initiate the Regional Agricultural and Environmental Initiatives Network (RAEIN).

Furthermore, the Netherlands has made funds available for the organisation of the African Regional Workshop on Capacity Building and Risk Assessment on LMOs, which was held in August of 2007. A biosafety expert from the Netherlands held a presentation at the workshop, with a view to exchanging experiences and best practices with regard to risk assessment.

Besides the financial support that the Netherlands provides through the UNEP-GEF, the Netherlands has also made expertise available for several projects in the context of UNEP-GEF. Experts from the Netherlands participated in workshops on subjects such as biosafety risk assessment and enforcement in i.a. Slovenia, Croatia, Kenya and Namibia.

During the reporting period, the Netherlands initiated several bilateral initiatives with Eastern European Countries, including Slovenia, Romania and Bulgaria, aimed at aiding these countries in installing a National Biosafety Framework, including enforcement of this framework.

43. If a developing country Party, or Party with an economy in transition, during this reporting period has your country contributed to the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety for the purposes of the effective implementation of the Protocol in another developing country Party or Party with an economy in transition?

a) yes (please give details below)	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developing country Party	X

44. If yes to question 43, how has such cooperation taken place:

45. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training in the proper and safe management of biotechnology to the extent that it is required for biosafety?

a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	
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	X

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)	

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	X
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)	
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	X
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:	

Article 23 – Public awareness and participation

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

b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
53. Has your country informed its public about the means of public access to the Biosafety Clearing-House? (Article 23.3)	
a) yes – fully	
b) yes – limited extent	X
c) no	

54. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 23, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:

EU law on LMOs contains several references and requirements in the context of public awareness and participation. Please see the EC report for details. In the Netherlands, the General Administrative Law Act contains further provisions for public awareness and participation.

All decisions taken on gmo's in the Netherlands, including contained use, introduction into the environment and market release, can be accessed through a publicly available database. The web-page on biotechnology of the ministry of environment (www.vrom.nl/biotechnologie) contains amongst others a link to this database as well as general information on and a link to the Biosafety Clearing House.

Depending on the type of decision, decisions and draft decisions made by the competent authorities are open for comments and objections from the general public for a certain period of time (generally 6 weeks). Individuals or organisations that are not satisfied by the response by the competent authorities to their comments or objections generally have the possibility to appeal to the decision in court. In recent years, many court cases on introduction into the environment have been handled in the Netherlands, initiated by both organisations and individuals.

Beside the legal opportunities for public participation described above, the government of the Netherlands puts effort into involving the general public in policy making on gmo's and biotechnology. Such efforts have in recent years included discussion groups on certain specific topics (such as genetic modification of animals) and civil participation projects linked to important policy documents. Also, several organisations exist in the Netherlands that are funded wholely or partially by the government and whose aim is (inter alia) to facilitate public dicussions on biotechnology. Two examples are the Rathenau instituut (www.rathenau.nl) and the centre for society and genomics (www.society-genomics.nl).

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	X
b) no	

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:

No transboundary movements to non-parties took place (export).

Transboundary movement from non-parties took place, however, the Netherlands and the EC applies its domestic legislative framework to all imports of LMOs, whether these originate from parties or non-parties to the Protocol. for further details, please refer to the EC report.

Article 25 – Illegal transboundary movements

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

57. Has your country adopted appropriate domestic measures to prevent and penalize, as appropriate, transboundary movements of living modified organisms carried out in contravention of its domestic measures? (Article 25.1)	
a) yes	X
b) no	
58. Have there been any illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms into your country during the reporting period?	
a) yes	X
b) no	
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:	
The prevention and penalization of transboundary movements of LMOs in contravention of domestic measures is covered by penalization of violations of the regulations in place for LMOs. See also question 4. In 2006, an illegal transboundary movement of LMOs was encountered in the Netherlands. The incident involved genetically modified *Danio rerio* (also known as "Glofish"), which had been imported without complying with the rules for gmo's in the Netherlands. Since the incident concerned a limited amount of fish, which were contained in heated aquaria and which could not survive in the Dutch environment, it was not considered likely that there would be an adverse affect on biodiversity. The incident was pursued by the Dutch environmental inspection agency. The fish were collected from the importer and terminated. A full report was made available to the European Commission and competent authorities of other member states. This report is also available through the BCH.	

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	X
c) no	
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 aspects are not taken into account directly when coming to a decision on import of LMOs. However, a number of policy decisions also apply to LMOs that are (to be) imported. Thus a number of aspects are taken into account indirectly. The clearest example would be that in the Netherlands, rules have been established on how to acchieve co-existence between farmers of LMOs and conventional and biological farmers. Although these rules have no direct effect on decisions on imports, they do describe the conditions under which the imports may take place.

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	X
b) yes – received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions	
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:
The Netherlands has on several occasions during the reporting period made funds available to facilitate developing countries to participate in meetings in the context of the Biosafety Protocol, through the CBD Voluntary Trust Fund which exists for this purpose.

Other information

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

Comments on reporting format

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