



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/CP/MOP/10/12
20 October 2023

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION
ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE
MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA
PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Tenth meeting – Part II and resumed part II
Montreal, Canada, 7–19 December 2022
Nairobi, 19 and 20 October 2023

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY ON THE SECOND PART OF ITS TENTH MEETING

Summary

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety held the second part of its tenth meeting in Montreal, Canada, from 7 to 19 December 2022, and in Nairobi, on 19 and 20 October 2023. It adopted 14 decisions, which are provided in section I, while the account of the proceedings of the meeting is contained in section II.

Contents

	Page
I. Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety*	3
CP-10/2. Compliance.....	3
CP-10/3. Implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.....	4
CP-10/4. Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress	13
CP-10/5. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (Article 20).....	27
CP-10/6. Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources (Article 28)	29
CP-10/7. Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 35) and final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020.....	31
CP-10/8. Review of effectiveness of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols	35
CP-10/9. Monitoring and reporting (Article 33).....	37
CP-10/10. Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16).....	39
CP-10/11. Detection and identification of living modified organisms	42
CP-10/12. Socio-economic considerations (Article 26)	44
CP-10/13. Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.....	45
CP-10/14. Budget for the integrated programme of work of the Secretariat	47
II. Account of proceedings.....	53

* For decision CP-10/1, see CBD/CP/MOP/10/4, sect.I.

I. DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL*

CP-10/2. Compliance

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

1. *Reminds* Parties of rule II, paragraph 4, of the procedures and mechanisms on compliance, and urges them to ensure that members are elected to the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety on the understanding that they will serve a full four-year term;
2. *Also reminds* Parties of their obligation to designate a national focal point for the Cartagena Protocol, and one or more competent national authorities, and to notify the Secretariat accordingly, as per Article 19 of the Protocol;
3. *Further reminds* Parties of their obligation to designate a national focal point for the Biosafety Clearing-House, in line with decision BS-I/3 and decision II/7 of the Conference of the Parties;
4. *Reminds* Parties of their obligation to make available in the Biosafety Clearing-House the relevant details setting out their point of contact for the purposes of receiving notifications under Article 17 of the Protocol, and urges them to do so as soon as possible;
5. *Urges* Parties and invites other Governments to provide voluntary funds in support of the four Parties¹ that have developed compliance action plans, as well as any additional Parties that develop and implement compliance action plans at the request of the Committee;
6. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:
 - (a) To develop an online survey on the national limitations and challenges in fulfilling (i) the obligation to take the necessary legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol, and (ii) the obligation to submit a national report in a timely manner;
 - (b) To invite all Parties to complete the survey;
 - (c) To compile the findings and submit these for consideration by the Committee at its eighteenth meeting.

* Decision CP-10/1 (Budget for the integrated programme of work of the Secretariat) was adopted on 15 October 2021, during the first part of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and is therefore included in the corresponding report ([CBD/CP/MOP/10/4](#)).

¹ Barbados, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco and Oman.

CP-10/3. Implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recognizing the usefulness of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020¹ to support national implementation,

Recalling decision CP-9/7, in which it decided to develop an implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety that is anchored in and complementary to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework,

Recalling also decision CP-9/3, in which it acknowledged the need for a specific action plan for capacity-building for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol that is aligned with the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and complementary to the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020,

Welcoming the contribution to the development of the implementation plan by the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and the review by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting,

Acknowledging the relevance of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,² as interlinked but separate plans, to the achievement of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity,

Recognizing the need to periodically set priorities to plan for and programme work to be undertaken within the time period of the implementation plan,

Noting decision CP-10/6 on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources,

1. *Adopts* the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as contained in the annex to the present decision;

2. *Welcomes* the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework adopted in decision 15/4;

3. *Recognizes* the complementarity of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and that the Implementation Plan can contribute to the achievement of the goals and targets relevant to biosafety in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, especially for Parties to the Convention that are also Parties to the Cartagena Protocol;

4. *Urges* Parties and invites other Governments to review and align, as appropriate, their national action plans and programmes relevant to the implementation of the Protocol, including their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, with the Implementation Plan;

5. *Decides* that the baseline for the Implementation Plan shall comprise information gathered in the fourth reporting cycle;³

6. *Also decides* to conduct a midterm evaluation of the Implementation Plan in conjunction with the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol;

7. *Requests* the Executive Secretary (a) to include in the reporting format for the fifth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety questions designed to elicit information on the indicators of the Implementation Plan and (b) to analyse and synthesize that information to facilitate the midterm evaluation in conjunction with the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness

¹ Decision [BS-V/16](#).

² Decision CP-10/4.

³ CBD/SBI/3/3/Add.1.

of the Cartagena Protocol, and to make this information available to the Liaison Group and, as appropriate, the Compliance Committee;

8. *Requests* the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Compliance Committee, as appropriate, working in a complementary and non-duplicative manner, to contribute to the midterm evaluation of the Implementation Plan, and to submit their conclusions for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation;

9. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, at a meeting to be held before the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, to consider the information provided, and the conclusions reached by the Liaison Group and the Compliance Committee, and to submit its findings and recommendations to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its twelfth meeting with a view to facilitating the midterm evaluation of the Implementation Plan.

Annex

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

I. PURPOSE OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

1. The Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (hereinafter “Implementation Plan”) has been developed as a framework of broad desirable achievements and accomplishments to help guide Parties in their implementation of the Protocol and measure progress in this regard for the period up to 2030.

2. The Implementation Plan is complemented by the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety⁴ with the purpose of facilitating the development and strengthening of the capacities of Parties to implement the Protocol, including by facilitating the engagement of partners, including donors, and by promoting regional and international cooperation and coordination. The Capacity-building Action Plan covers the same period as the Implementation Plan, up to 2030.

3. The Implementation Plan is directed primarily at Parties. Nonetheless, it is recognized that non-Parties, stakeholders from different sectors, organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities, and donors can support the implementation of the Protocol.

II. LINKAGE WITH THE KUNMING-MONTREAL GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK AND THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

4. The Implementation Plan is anchored in and complementary to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, as its goals, objectives and outcomes contribute to achieving the Framework’s 2050 vision — “By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people” — and its mission — “To take urgent action to halt and reverse biodiversity loss to put nature on a path to recovery for the benefit of people and planet by conserving and sustainably using biodiversity and ensuring the fair and equitable sharing of benefits from the use of genetic resources, while providing the necessary means of implementation”. The Implementation Plan is intended to facilitate the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and is addressed to Parties to the Cartagena Protocol. The Implementation Plan can also support and guide Parties in meeting goals and targets relevant to biosafety within the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

5. The Implementation Plan can also help to support Parties to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, including for example Goals 2 (to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and provide sustainable agriculture) and 3 (ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages).

⁴ Decision CP-10/4.

III. STRUCTURE OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

6. A table containing the goals, objectives, indicators and outcomes of the Implementation Plan is presented in the appendix below.

7. The Implementation Plan outlines goals representing broad desirable achievements by Parties. The goals of the Implementation Plan are organized according to “areas for implementation” and “enabling environment”. The “areas for implementation” consist of goals concerning key elements for the implementation of the Protocol. The “enabling environment” comprises cross-cutting goals related to providing support for implementation, i.e. capacity-building, resource mobilization, cooperation, and public awareness, education and participation. The goals under the “enabling environment” represent cross-cutting achievements that benefit a variety of implementation-related goals and can be read in conjunction with the goals related to “areas for implementation”. Each goal includes corresponding objectives, outcomes and indicators.

8. The objectives describe key accomplishments to achieve the goal to which they relate. The objectives are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of accomplishments that may be relevant for the goal. The objectives follow the provisions in the Protocol, including both obligations and other provisions, and guidance provided through decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. Most goals include multiple objectives.

9. The indicators are designed to measure progress towards the objectives. The indicators are intended to be simple, measurable and relevant to the associated objective.

10. The outcomes describe the effect of achieving the goal.

11. The Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress was adopted by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol in 2010 (decision BS-V/11). The Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020, also adopted in 2010, included elements on liability and redress and the Supplementary Protocol. The Supplementary Protocol entered into force on 5 March 2018.

12. A component on the Supplementary Protocol has been included in the appendix below. The inclusion of a component on the Supplementary Protocol is intended to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and to contribute to the effective implementation of the Supplementary Protocol, while recognizing that they are separate legal instruments and that obligations arising from these instruments only bind the Parties to the respective instrument.

IV. EVALUATION AND REVIEW

13. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol shall undertake a midterm evaluation and may decide to undertake a final evaluation of the Implementation Plan. These evaluations may draw on information provided by Parties in their national reports and information in the Biosafety Clearing-House, among others. This information may be used to assess the extent to which the objectives of the Implementation Plan are being accomplished.

14. The results of the fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020 will be used to establish a baseline for measuring progress in achieving the goals of the Implementation Plan.

V. PRIORITIES AND PROGRAMMING

15. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol may periodically set priorities to plan for and programme work to be undertaken within the time period of the Implementation Plan. This could include identifying milestones that lead to the achievement of the goals of the Implementation Plan.

16. In deciding on priorities and programming, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol may wish to take into consideration developments and advancements

in the field of biosafety and biotechnology. In this regard, the Implementation Plan has taken the approach that where organisms developed through new technologies constitute “living modified organisms” as defined in the Protocol, these organisms are addressed in the Plan.

VI. RESOURCES

17. The successful implementation of the Protocol depends to a large extent on having access to adequate human, technical and financial resources and effective cooperation, in accordance with Articles 22 and 28 of the Protocol. The Implementation Plan aims at supporting Parties in this regard, including in particular under the goals related to creating an enabling environment.

VII. ROLE OF THE SECRETARIAT

18. While the Implementation Plan is directed primarily at Parties, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity will support the Parties in their efforts to implement the Protocol, following the guidance of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and in accordance with Article 31 of the Cartagena Protocol and Article 24 of the Convention on Biological Diversity. This support includes managing and maintaining the Biosafety Clearing-House as well as undertaking activities, including capacity-building activities, as requested by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

Appendix

Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety			
Goals <i>(Desirable achievements)</i>	Objectives <i>(What must be accomplished to achieve the goal)</i>	Indicators <i>(Measuring progress towards objectives)</i>	Outcomes <i>(The effect of achieving the goal)</i>
A. Areas for implementation			
A.1. Parties have in place functional national biosafety frameworks	A.1.1. Parties have adopted and implemented legal, administrative and other measures to fulfil their obligations under the Protocol; A.1.2. Parties have designated competent national authorities and national focal points for the Protocol and emergency measures (Article 17) contact points; A.1.3. Competent national authorities have adequately trained staff to carry out their tasks.	(a) Percentage of Parties that have measures in place to implement the provisions of the Protocol; (b) Percentage of Parties that have designated a national focal point, competent national authorities for the Protocol and an emergency measures (Article 17) contact point and have notified the Secretariat accordingly; (c) Percentage of Parties that have qualified staff to operationalize their national biosafety frameworks.	Functional national biosafety frameworks enable competent authorities, national focal points and Article 17 contact points of all Parties to effectively and efficiently fulfil their obligations under the Protocol
A.2. Parties have improved the availability and exchange of relevant information through the	A.2.1. Parties provide accurate and complete mandatory information in the BCH in accordance with their obligations under the Protocol;	(a) Percentage of Parties making mandatory information available to the BCH; (b) Percentage of Parties that publish any non-mandatory biosafety-related information through the BCH;	BCH facilitates the availability and exchange of biosafety-related information and enables Parties to take informed decisions

Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety			
Goals	Objectives	Indicators	Outcomes
Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)	A.2.2. Parties publish any non-mandatory biosafety-related information through the BCH.	(c) Number of active users of and visits to the BCH; (d) Percentage of decisions in the BCH with associated reports on risk assessment.	
A.3. Full information on the implementation of the Protocol is made available by Parties in a timely manner	A.3.1. Parties submit complete national reports within the established deadline.	(a) Percentage of Parties that have submitted a complete national report within the established deadline; (b) Percentage of eligible Parties that have accessed Global Environment Facility funding for the preparation of their national report in a timely manner.	Accurate and timely information on the implementation of the Protocol enables the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to set priorities and identify where support is needed
A.4. Parties are in compliance with the requirements of the Protocol	A.4.1. Parties comply with their obligations under the Protocol; A.4.2. Parties resolve issues of non-compliance identified by the Compliance Committee.	(a) Percentage of Parties that comply with their obligations under the Protocol; (b) Percentage of Parties that have resolved non-compliance issues identified by the Compliance Committee.	Effective compliance mechanism facilitates implementation of the Protocol
A.5. Parties carry out scientifically sound risk assessments of living modified organisms (LMOs), and manage and control identified risks to prevent adverse effects of LMOs on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health	A.5.1. Parties apply scientifically sound and appropriate procedures for risk assessment and risk management of LMOs, in accordance with Annex III to the Protocol; A.5.2. Parties develop (as necessary), have access to and use appropriate resource materials for carrying out scientifically sound risk assessment and risk management.	(a) Percentage of Parties that undertake risk assessment for decision-making on LMOs, where required under the Protocol; (b) Percentage of Parties that have access to and use relevant risk assessment and risk management resource materials; (c) Percentage of Parties carrying out risk assessments, considering other available scientific evidence, referred to in Article 15; (d) Percentage of Parties that have measures in place to identify LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and adopt risk mitigation measures.	Parties identify, assess and appropriately manage and control risks of LMOs to biodiversity, taking also into account risks to human health
A.6. Parties prevent and address illegal	A.6.1. Parties have adopted appropriate measures to prevent and address illegal and	(a) Percentage of Parties that have measures in place to prevent and address	Illegal and unintentional transboundary

Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety			
Goals	Objectives	Indicators	Outcomes
and unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs	unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs.	illegal and unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs.	movements of LMOs are prevented or minimized
A.7. Parties have measures in place to fulfil the handling, transport, packaging and identification requirements of LMOs under Article 18 of the Protocol	A.7.1. Parties have adopted the necessary measures to require that LMOs subject to transboundary movement are handled, packaged and transported under conditions of safety, taking into consideration relevant international rules and standards, as appropriate; A.7.2. Parties have measures in place to fulfil the documentation requirements for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing, LMOs destined for contained use, LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment, and other LMOs.	(a) Percentage of Parties that have taken necessary measures to require that LMOs subject to transboundary movement are handled, packaged and transported under conditions of safety, taking into consideration relevant international rules and standards, as appropriate; (b) Percentage of Parties that have put in place documentation requirements for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing; (c) Percentage of Parties that have put in place documentation requirements for LMOs destined for contained use; (d) Percentage of Parties that have put in place documentation requirements for LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment and other LMOs.	Through appropriate handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs, Parties are able to safely manage intentional transboundary movements of LMOs
A.8. Parties are able to detect and identify LMOs	A.8.1. Parties have access to the necessary technical infrastructure and expertise for the detection and identification of LMOs; A.8.2. Parties have access to and use appropriate resource materials for the detection and identification of LMOs; A.8.3. Parties have access to and use the necessary information to detect and identify LMOs, including detection methods and certified reference materials.	(a) Percentage of LMOs in the BCH for which detection methods are available; (b) Percentage of Parties that have access to and use resource materials and detection methods to detect and identify LMOs; (c) Percentage of Parties that have access to and use certified reference materials necessary to detect and identify LMOs; (d) Percentage of Parties that have access to the technical infrastructure needed to detect and identify LMOs.	By detecting and identifying LMOs, Parties are able to respond to unintentional and illegal transboundary movements and to implement the handling, transport, packaging and identification requirements in accordance with the Protocol
A.9. Parties that choose to do so take into account socioeconomic considerations when making decisions on the import of LMOs	A.9.1. Parties that choose to do so take socioeconomic considerations into account in decision-making in accordance with Article 26; A.9.2. Parties that choose to take into account socioeconomic considerations in accordance	(a) Percentage of Parties that take into account socioeconomic considerations in decision-making in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol; (b) Percentage of Parties that access and use resource materials for taking socioeconomic considerations into account;	Parties that choose to do so take into account socioeconomic considerations in decision-making on imports of LMOs and cooperate on research and information

Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety			
Goals	Objectives	Indicators	Outcomes
and cooperate on research and information exchange in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol	with Article 26 have access to and are able to use resource materials; A.9.3. Parties that choose to do so cooperate on research and information exchange on any socioeconomic impacts of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, especially on indigenous peoples and local communities, in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol.	(c) Percentage of Parties that cooperate on research and information exchange on any socioeconomic impacts of LMOs on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, especially on indigenous peoples and local communities, in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol.	exchange in accordance with Article 26
A.10. Parties to the Cartagena Protocol become Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress and have in place measures to fulfil their obligations under the Supplementary Protocol	A.10.1. Increased number of Parties to the Supplementary Protocol; A.10.2. Parties to the Supplementary Protocol have adopted and implemented appropriate measures to give effect to the provisions of the Supplementary Protocol; A.10.3 Parties to the Supplementary Protocol report on the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol.	(a) Percentage of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that have become Parties to the Supplementary Protocol; (b) Percentage of Parties to the Supplementary Protocol that have the necessary measures in place to implement the provisions of the Supplementary Protocol; (c) Percentage of Parties to the Supplementary Protocol reporting on the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol.	Increased number of ratifications of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress advances the development of national rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage resulting from LMOs originating in a transboundary movement
B. Enabling environment			
B.1. Parties engage in capacity-building activities	B.1.1. Parties have identified and prioritized their capacity-building needs; B.1.2. Parties undertake capacity-building activities, as set out in the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety; B.1.3. Parties use capacity-building materials, including online resources; B.1.4. Parties cooperate to strengthen capacities for the implementation of the Protocol.	(a) Percentage of Parties that have identified and prioritized their capacity-building needs; (b) Percentage of Parties undertaking capacity-building activities; (c) Percentage of Parties with capacity-building needs that use capacity-building materials, including online resources; (d) Percentage of Parties that cooperate to strengthen capacities for the implementation of the Protocol.	Parties have the necessary capacity for the implementation of the Protocol

Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety			
Goals	Objectives	Indicators	Outcomes
B.2. Parties mobilize adequate resources from all sources to support implementation of the Protocol in accordance with Article 28 of the Protocol	<p>B.2.1. Adequate resources are allocated to biosafety through national budgets;</p> <p>B.2.2. Parties allocate a share of national biodiversity STAR allocations to biosafety activities;</p> <p>B.2.3. Parties mobilize resources from other sources.</p>	<p>(a) Percentage of Parties that have adequate resources for biosafety from national budgets;</p> <p>(b) Percentage of eligible Parties that use national STAR allocations for biosafety activities;</p> <p>(c) Percentage of Parties having accessed additional resources.</p>	Full implementation of the Protocol is enabled by adequate resources
B.3. Parties promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation on the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs, in accordance with Article 23 of the Protocol	<p>B.3.1. Parties have developed mechanisms to promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation in biosafety;</p> <p>B.3.2. Parties have access to resource materials for promoting and facilitating public awareness, education and participation in biosafety;</p> <p>B.3.3. Parties consult the public in making decisions on LMOs, in accordance with their respective laws and regulations, and make the results of decisions available to the public;</p> <p>B.3.4. Parties inform the public about the means of public access to the BCH.</p>	<p>(a) Percentage of Parties accessing resource materials for facilitating and promoting public awareness, education and participation in biosafety;</p> <p>(b) Percentage of Parties mainstreaming biosafety in relevant educational and training programmes;</p> <p>(c) Percentage of Parties having in place a mechanism facilitating and promoting public participation in decision-making regarding LMOs;</p> <p>(d) Percentage of Parties informing the public about means for participation in decision-making;</p> <p>(e) Percentage of Parties having consulted the public in the decision-making process in accordance with their respective laws and regulations;</p> <p>(f) Percentage of Parties making the results of decisions available to the public;</p> <p>(g) Percentage of Parties that have informed the public about the means of public access to the BCH.</p>	Through public awareness, education and participation, Parties ensure that the public is appropriately informed about the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs and involved in decision-making on the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs
B.4. Parties enhance cooperation and coordination on biosafety issues at the national, regional and international levels	<p>B.4.1. Parties cooperate to support implementation of the Protocol, including through the exchange of scientific, technical and institutional knowledge;</p> <p>B.4.2. Parties have put in place effective mechanisms to involve indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant stakeholders from different</p>	<p>(a) Percentage of Parties cooperating in exchanging scientific, technical and institutional knowledge;</p> <p>(b) Percentage of Parties engaging in bilateral, regional or multilateral activities for the implementation of the Protocol;</p> <p>(c) Percentage of Parties that have mechanisms for involving indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant stakeholders from different</p>	Through cooperation at the national, regional and international levels, and participation of stakeholders, Parties' implementation of the Protocol is more effective

Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety			
Goals	Objectives	Indicators	Outcomes
	sectors in the implementation of the Protocol; B.4.3. Parties facilitate sectoral and cross-sectoral coordination and cooperation at the national level to mainstream biosafety.	sectors in the implementation of the Protocol; (d) Percentage of Parties that have integrated biosafety in national sectoral and cross-sectoral strategies, action plans, programmes, policies or legislation.	

CP-10/4. Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recognizing the usefulness of the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,¹

Recalling decision CP-9/7, in which it decided to develop an implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety that is anchored in and complementary to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework,

Recalling also decision CP-9/3, in which it acknowledged the need for a specific action plan for capacity-building for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and its Supplementary Protocol that is aligned with the implementation plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and complementary to the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building beyond 2020,

Welcoming the contribution to the development of a capacity-building action plan by the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and the review by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its third meeting,

Acknowledging the relevance of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety² and the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, as interlinked but separate plans, to the achievement of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity,

Recognizing the need to periodically set priorities to plan for and programme work to be undertaken within the time period of the Capacity-building Action Plan,

Noting decision CP-10/6 on matters related to the financial mechanism and resources,

1. *Adopts* the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, as contained in the annex to the present decision;
2. *Welcomes* the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development adopted in decision 15/8 of the Conference of the Parties;
3. *Recognizes* the complementarity of the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety with the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development adopted in decision 15/8 of the Conference of the Parties;
4. *Urges* Parties and invites other Governments to review and align, as appropriate, their national action plans and programmes relevant to the implementation of the Protocol, including their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, with the Capacity-building Action Plan;
5. *Decides* that the baseline for the Capacity-building Action Plan shall comprise information gathered in the fourth reporting cycle;³
6. *Also decides* to conduct a midterm evaluation of the Capacity-building Action Plan in conjunction with the midterm evaluation of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;
7. *Encourages* Parties, through their competent national authorities, to identify relevant actors to support the implementation of the Capacity-building Action Plan, as appropriate, noting the importance of avoiding and managing conflicts of interest, in accordance with national legislation.

¹ Decision [BS-VI/3](#), annex I.

² Decision CP-10/3, annex.

³ CBD/SBI/3/3/Add.1.

*Annex***CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTION PLAN FOR THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY****I. PURPOSE OF THE CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTION PLAN**

1. The purpose of the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (hereinafter “Capacity-building Action Plan”) is to facilitate the development and strengthening of the capacities of Parties to implement the Protocol by (a) identifying key areas for capacity-building related to the different goals of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety⁴ (hereinafter “Implementation Plan”); (b) facilitating the engagement of partners, including donors; (c) fostering a coherent and coordinated approach to capacity-building for the implementation of the Protocol; and (d) promoting regional and international cooperation and coordination. The Capacity-building Action Plan covers the same period as the Implementation Plan, up to 2030.

2. Parties, non-Parties and stakeholders from different sectors, organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities and donors can support the undertaking of capacity-building activities, including those outlined in the Capacity-building Action Plan.

II. LINKAGE WITH THE KUNMING-MONTREAL GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK, THE LONG-TERM STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT, AND THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

3. The Capacity-building Action Plan has been developed in alignment with the Implementation Plan, as requested in decision CP-9/3, outlining examples of capacity-building activities for each goal of the Implementation Plan. The Capacity-building Action Plan is complementary to the Implementation Plan as the capacity-building activities can support the achievement of the goals and outcomes of the Implementation Plan. In addition, in order to ensure alignment and avoid possible duplication, goal B.1 of the Implementation Plan addresses capacity-building in general and refers to the specific capacity-building activities outlined throughout the Capacity-building Action Plan.

4. The Capacity-building Action Plan is complementary to the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development.⁵ The general principles, approaches and strategies for enhancing capacity-building, which are elaborated in the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development, shall be taken into consideration when planning capacity-building activities based on the Capacity-building Action Plan.

5. The Capacity-building Action Plan can also help to support Parties to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, including for example Goals 2 (to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and provide sustainable agriculture) and 3 (ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages).

III. STRUCTURE OF THE CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTION PLAN

6. A table containing the goals, key areas for capacity-building and examples of capacity-building activities, indicators and outcomes of the Capacity-building Action Plan is presented in the appendix below.

7. The Capacity-building Action Plan is aligned with the goals of the Implementation Plan. The goals represent broad desirable achievements by Parties. For each goal, key areas for capacity-building, examples of capacity-building activities, indicators and outcomes are provided.

8. The *key areas for capacity-building* relate to each goal of the Implementation Plan. The key areas for capacity-building are aligned with the objectives of the Implementation Plan and include areas for which capacity-building activities are suggested.

⁴ Decision CP-10/3, annex.

⁵ Annex I to decision 15/8 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention.

9. The Capacity-building Action Plan also provides a list of examples of *capacity-building activities*, which were developed taking into consideration the capacity-building activities of continuing relevance included in, among others, the Framework and Action Plan for Capacity-Building for the Effective Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol for Biosafety adopted in 2012, and the programme of work on public awareness, education and participation. The capacity-building activities are meant to support the successful implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. Activities may contribute to one or several outcomes.

10. The key areas and capacity-building activities outlined in the Capacity-building Action Plan are not meant to be prescriptive or exhaustive. The key areas for capacity-building are meant as indicative areas in which capacities may be needed, and on which capacity-building interventions may focus, depending on national circumstances and needs. The capacity-building activities are examples and not an exhaustive list since each country should adapt the activities to their reality and needs. Additionally, lessons learned in previous capacity-building activities can support the identification of the most suitable activities to be developed in each country. It is recognized that national and regional needs and circumstances should ultimately determine the design and delivery of capacity-building activities, taking also into consideration the strategic guidance provided in the long-term strategic framework for capacity-building and development, as appropriate.

11. The Capacity-building Action Plan also provides a set of indicators designed to measure the success of the activities and/or the contribution of the activities to the outcome. They are intended to be simple, measurable and relevant to the outcome. Each indicator refers to an activity and/or the outcome.

12. Information on capacity-building activities undertaken or capacity-building resources or materials developed in the context of the Capacity-building Action Plan should be shared through the Biosafety Clearing-House.

Capacity-building providers and target audiences

13. The capacity-building activities can be carried out at various levels, including at the national, regional and global levels.

14. The implementation of capacity-building activities may involve a range of actors. The identification of actors in this respect depends largely on national circumstances, needs and priorities. The actors may include, among others, relevant national authorities and institutions, customs and border officials, other Governments, academia, research institutions, networks of laboratories, indigenous peoples and local communities, non-governmental organizations, the public and other relevant stakeholders, the Global Environment Facility and other international funding organizations, private sector, including banks, corporations and investors, United Nations agencies, and the Secretariat.

15. Similarly, a range of target audiences may benefit from specific capacity-building activities, depending on national circumstances, needs and priorities. These audiences could include policymakers, administrative authorities, laboratory technicians and customs officers, among others.

16. When designing capacity-building interventions within the areas for capacity-building or based on the examples of activities outlined in the Capacity-building Action Plan, actors and target audiences should be identified. As set out in the goals under the “enabling environment” of the Implementation Plan and the Capacity-building Action Plan, cooperation and collaboration as well as the provision of adequate resources are prerequisites for undertaking capacity-building activities in support of the implementation of the Protocol.

17. The Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress was adopted by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol in 2010 (decision BS-V/11). The Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020, also adopted in 2010, included elements on liability and redress and the Supplementary Protocol. The Supplementary Protocol entered into force on 5 March 2018.

18. A component on the Supplementary Protocol has been included in the appendix below. The inclusion of a component on the Supplementary Protocol is intended to support capacity-building for the

implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and to contribute to the effective implementation of the Supplementary Protocol, while recognizing that they are separate legal instruments and that obligations arising from these instruments only bind the Parties to the respective instrument.

IV. EVALUATION AND REVIEW

19. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol shall undertake a midterm evaluation and may decide to undertake a final evaluation of the Implementation Plan and the Capacity-building Action Plan. These evaluations may draw on information provided by Parties in their national reports, information on capacity-building activities, and information in the Biosafety Clearing-House, among others. This information may be used to assess the extent to which the objectives of the Implementation Plan are being accomplished, including through capacity-building activities.

20. The results of the fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020⁶ will be used to establish a baseline for measuring progress in achieving the goals of the Implementation Plan and the Capacity-building Action Plan.

V. PRIORITIES AND PROGRAMMING

21. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol may periodically set priorities to plan for and programme work to be undertaken within the time period of the Capacity-building Action Plan. This might lead to the need for adjustments to the Capacity-building Action Plan.

22. In deciding on priorities and programming, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol may wish to take into consideration developments and advancements in the field of biosafety and biotechnology. In this regard, the Capacity-building Action Plan has taken the approach that, where organisms developed through new technologies constitute “living modified organisms” as defined in the Protocol, these organisms are addressed in the Plan.

VI. RESOURCES

23. The successful implementation of the Protocol depends to a large extent on having access to adequate human, technical and financial resources and effective cooperation in accordance with Articles 22 and 28 of the Protocol. The Capacity-building Action Plan aims at supporting Parties in this regard, including in particular under the goals related to creating an enabling environment.

VII. ROLE OF THE SECRETARIAT

24. While the Capacity-building Action Plan is directed at Parties and other stakeholders, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity will support the Parties in their efforts, following the guidance of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and in accordance with Article 31 of the Cartagena Protocol and Article 24 of the Convention on Biological Diversity. This support includes managing and maintaining the Biosafety Clearing-House as well as undertaking activities, including capacity-building activities, as requested by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

⁶ See decision CP-10/7.

Appendix

Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety				
Goals <i>(Desirable achievements)</i>	Key areas for capacity-building <i>(Key areas where capacities may be needed)</i>	Capacity-building activities <i>(Examples of suggested capacity-building activities within the key areas for capacity-building)</i>	Indicators <i>(Measures whether activity took place)</i>	Outcomes <i>(The effect of successfully completed activities)</i>
A. Areas for implementation				
A.1. Parties have in place functional national biosafety frameworks	(1) Development and implementation of legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol; (2) Strengthening capacities of competent national authorities.	(i) Provide training on the development and implementation of legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol; (ii) Train personnel of competent national authorities on administering their national biosafety regulatory system.	(a) Percentage of Parties with training needs on the development and implementation of legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol that successfully executed training activities; (b) Percentage of Parties that have sufficient and trained staff to administer the national biosafety system.	Functional national biosafety frameworks enable competent authorities, national focal points and Article 17 contact points of all Parties to effectively and efficiently fulfil their obligations under the Protocol
A.2. Parties have improved the availability and exchange of relevant information through the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)	(1) Publishing information in the BCH; (2) Accessing and using information in the BCH.	(i) Develop, update and maintain interactive support tools, following the migration of the BCH to the new platform; (ii) Provide training on the use of the BCH.	(a) Percentage of interactive support tools that are updated to the features of the new BCH platform; (b) Number of users that make use of the training material on the use of the BCH; (c) Percentage of Parties that have pertinent and updated information in the BCH.	BCH facilitates the availability and exchange of biosafety-related information and enables Parties to take informed decisions BCH is used as the reference information platform for biosafety-related information

Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety				
Goals	Key areas for capacity-building	Capacity-building activities	Indicators	Outcomes
A.3. Full information on the implementation of the Protocol is made available by Parties in a timely manner	(1) Establishing and strengthening national coordination systems to gather biosafety information; (2) Preparing a national report.	(i) Provide training on information gathering and data management to relevant national authorities for national reporting; (ii) Develop tools to assist Parties in preparing and submitting their national reports; (iii) Support cooperation among Parties to assist Parties with inadequate resources in the preparation and submission of their national reports.	(a) Percentage of Parties that identify their training needs on national reporting and develop training to relevant national authorities; (b) Percentage of Parties with needs for assistance that, with the use of assistance tools, prepared and submitted their reports in a timely manner; (c) Percentage of Parties requiring support, benefiting from cooperative activities to assist them in preparing and submitting their national report.	Accurate and timely information on the implementation of the Protocol enables the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to set priorities and identify where support is needed.
A.4. Parties are in compliance with the requirements of the Protocol	(1) Address non-compliance issues identified by the Compliance Committee.	(i) Provide technical and adequate financial support for Parties concerned to carry out activities set out in compliance action plans, to address identified issues of non-compliance.	(a) Percentage of non-compliant Parties whose successfully executed compliance action plan resulted in full compliance.	Effective compliance mechanism facilitates implementation of the Protocol
A.5. Parties carry out scientifically sound risk assessments of living modified organisms (LMOs), and manage and	(1) Conducting and reviewing scientifically sound risk assessments; (2) Regulating, managing and controlling identified risks; (3) Access to infrastructure and	(i) Develop or update, as necessary, and disseminate training materials on risk assessment and risk management; (ii) Provide training on conducting and reviewing risk assessments, including use of resource documents and	(a) Percentage of Parties that developed or updated their training material, as needed, on scientifically sound risk assessment and risk management; (b) Percentage of Parties that provide training on conducting	Parties identify, assess and appropriately manage and control risks of LMOs to biodiversity, taking also into account risks to human health Increased involvement of academia and specialized

Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety				
Goals	Key areas for capacity-building	Capacity-building activities	Indicators	Outcomes
control identified risks to prevent adverse effects of LMOs on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity taking also into account risks to human health	technical expertise for risk assessment and risk management; (4) Access to scientific data relevant for risk assessment and risk management; (5) Parties have qualified staff to undertake case-by-case risk assessment and risk management.	gathering and analysis of scientific information; (iii) Facilitate access to adequate infrastructure and expertise for risk assessment and risk management; (iv) Provide training to conduct scientific research, review and acquire data on biodiversity for specific ecological areas relevant to risk assessment and risk management; (v) Establish relations with academia and/or specific research entities to develop specific educational programmes on risk assessment and risk management.	and reviewing risk assessment and risk management; (c) Number of experts by Parties that are able to conduct or review case-by-case risk assessment and risk management; (d) Percentage of Parties that have access to adequate infrastructure and expertise for assessing and managing risks; (e) Percentage of Parties that provide training to conduct scientific research, review and data acquisition relevant to risk assessment and risk management; (f) Percentage of Parties with established relations with academia and/or specific research entities for the development of specific educational programmes on risk assessment and risk management.	research institutes strengthens scientific support for risk assessment and risk management
A.6. Parties prevent and address illegal and unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs	(1) Establishment of functional national systems for detection, notification and appropriate responses to unintentional transboundary movements, in	(i) Provide training on LMO documentation, sampling, detection and identification to relevant stakeholders; (ii) Provide training on domestic measures to prevent and address illegal transboundary movement in accordance with Article 25 of the Protocol;	(a) Percentages of Parties that provide training on LMO documentation, sampling, detection and identification to relevant stakeholders; (b) Number of cases of unintentional or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs reported;	Illegal and unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs prevented or minimized

Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety				
Goals	Key areas for capacity-building	Capacity-building activities	Indicators	Outcomes
	accordance with Article 17 of the Protocol; (2) Establishment of functional domestic measures to prevent and address illegal transboundary movement in accordance with Article 25 of the Protocol.	(iii) Conduct training on monitoring of illegal transboundary movement of LMOs.	(c) Percentage of Parties that provide training with functional domestic measures to prevent and manage unintentional and illegal transboundary movement of LMOs; (d) Percentage of Parties that provide training on monitoring of illegal transboundary movement of LMOs.	
A.7. Parties have measures in place to fulfil the handling, transport, packaging and identification requirements of LMOs under Article 18 of the Protocol	(1) Establishment of functional national systems for handling, transport, packaging and identification, including in relation to documentation.	(i) Provide training to relevant competent national authorities on handling, transport, packaging, and identification of LMOs.	(a) Percentage of Parties with personnel enabled in verification of documents accompanying LMOs shipments; (b) Percentage of Parties that have been trained on handling, transport and packaging and identification of LMOs.	Through appropriate handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs, Parties are able to safely manage intentional transboundary movements of LMOs
A.8. Parties are able to detect and identify LMOs	(1) Development, as necessary, and access to resource materials, procedures and information for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs; (2) Strengthening sampling, detection and identification capacities	(i) Conduct training on methodologies and protocols for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs; (ii) Facilitate access to and establish infrastructure for detection and identification of LMOs, including accredited laboratories, certified reference materials and consumables;	(a) Percentage of Parties trained on methods and protocols for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs; (b) Percentage of Parties with access to infrastructure for sampling, detection and identification of LMOs;	By detecting and identifying LMOs, Parties are able to respond to unintentional and illegal transboundary movements and to implement the handling, transport, packaging and identification requirements in accordance with the Protocol

Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety				
Goals	Key areas for capacity-building	Capacity-building activities	Indicators	Outcomes
	<p>of officials and laboratory staff;</p> <p>(3) Access to technical infrastructure for detection and identification, including certified reference materials;</p> <p>(4) Strengthening collaboration, including through networks of laboratories.</p>	<p>(iii) Establish, strengthen and maintain networks of laboratories for LMO detection and identification.</p>	<p>(c) Percentages of Parties that have established accredited laboratories;</p> <p>(d) Percentage of Parties that are members of networks of laboratories for LMO detection and identification.</p>	<p>By sharing information and quality assurance programmes in laboratory networks, accurate, robust and reliable analytical results and efficient procedures are promoted.</p>
<p>A.9. Parties that choose to do so take into account socioeconomic considerations when making decisions on the import of LMOs and cooperate on research and information exchange in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol</p>	<p>(1) Strengthening capacities for taking into account socioeconomic considerations in accordance with Article 26;</p> <p>(2) Development and access to resource materials on socioeconomic considerations.</p>	<p>(i) Provide training to relevant national authorities on taking into account socioeconomic considerations in accordance with Article 26;</p> <p>(ii) Develop, as necessary, update and disseminate training materials on socioeconomic considerations;</p> <p>(iii) Share experiences with and approaches for taking into account socioeconomic considerations;</p> <p>(iv) Establish research and information exchange cooperation on any socioeconomic considerations arising from the impacts of LMOs on the conservation and</p>	<p>(a) Percentage of competent national authorities in Parties that have access to adequate training for taking into account socioeconomic considerations, especially with regard to the value of biodiversity to indigenous peoples and local communities;</p> <p>(b) Number of developed, updated and disseminated training materials on socioeconomic considerations;</p> <p>(c) Percentage of Parties that share their experiences with and approaches for taking into account socioeconomic considerations;</p> <p>(d) Percentage of Parties that established collaborations with academia that have the experience</p>	<p>Parties that choose to do so take into account socioeconomic considerations in accordance with Article 26 in decision-making on imports of LMOs</p> <p>Parties share experiences in conducting socioeconomic considerations</p>

Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety				
Goals	Key areas for capacity-building	Capacity-building activities	Indicators	Outcomes
		sustainable use of biodiversity, especially on indigenous peoples and local communities, with academia, other stakeholders and indigenous peoples and local communities.	needed in socioeconomic evaluations and with indigenous peoples and local communities.	
A.10. Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that become Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress have in place measures to fulfil their obligations under the Supplementary Protocol	<p>(1) Supporting Parties to the Cartagena Protocol in ratifying the Supplementary Protocol;</p> <p>For Parties to the Supplementary Protocol:</p> <p>(2) Development of national legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Supplementary Protocol;</p> <p>(3) Development and access to resource materials, experiences and lessons learned regarding implementation of the Supplementary Protocol;</p> <p>(4) Strengthening capacities of competent authorities of Parties to the Supplementary</p>	<p>(i) Provide training in awareness raising of the Supplementary Protocol to support ratification and implementation;</p> <p>For Parties to the Supplementary Protocol:</p> <p>(ii) Provide training on the analysis of laws, policies and institutional frameworks to determine how they address the requirements of the Supplementary Protocol;</p> <p>(iii) Provide training on the development or amendment of domestic legal and administrative frameworks to implement the Supplementary Protocol;</p> <p>(iv) Develop resource materials to assist competent authorities in discharging their responsibilities under the Supplementary Protocol;</p>	<p>(a) Percentage of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that have received training for the ratification of the Supplementary Protocol;</p> <p>(b) Percentage of Parties with personnel trained in the analysis of laws, policies and institutional frameworks in relation to the requirements of the Supplementary Protocol;</p> <p>(c) Percentage of Parties that have trained personnel for developing or amending domestic legal and administrative frameworks to implement the Supplementary Protocol;</p> <p>(d) Percentage of Parties that use resource materials regarding the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol;</p> <p>(e) Percentage of Parties whose competent authorities and other relevant stakeholders have been trained to evaluate damage,</p>	<p>Increased number of ratifications of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress advances the development of national rules and procedures on liability and redress for damage resulting from LMOs originating in a transboundary movement</p>

Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety				
Goals	Key areas for capacity-building	Capacity-building activities	Indicators	Outcomes
	Protocol to discharge their functions; (5) Development or identification of baselines of the status of biodiversity.	(v) Provide training on evaluating damage, establishing causal links, and determining appropriate response measures to competent authorities and other relevant stakeholders; (vi) Compile and share information on experiences and lessons learned in the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol.	establish causal links and determine appropriate response measures; (f) Percentage of Parties that compile and share information on experiences and lessons learned in the implementation of the Supplementary Protocol.	
B. Enabling environment				
B.1. Parties engage in capacity-building activities	(1) Self-assessment of capacity-building needs and priorities; (2) Provision of support for capacity-building activities; (3) Access to capacity-building materials; (4) Cooperation in capacity-building activities.	(i) Carry out a self-assessment of capacity-building needs and priorities; (ii) Provide technical, financial or other support for capacity-building activities, including those outlined in the present Capacity-building Action Plan; (iii) Develop and disseminate, capacity-building materials and outcomes of activities, including in local languages; (iv) Cooperate at the national, bilateral, regional and multilateral levels with partners from relevant sectors and	(a) Percentage of Parties that have carried out a self-assessment of capacity-building needs and priorities; (b) Percentage of Parties that receive technical, financial or other support for capacity-building activities; (c) Percentage of Parties that provide technical, financial or other support for capacity-building activities; (d) Percentage of Parties having developed and disseminated capacity-building materials and outcomes of activities, including in local languages;	Parties have the necessary capacity for the implementation of the Protocol Parties have identified their needs for capacity-building and recognize and put in place the appropriate actions to solve them

Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety				
Goals	Key areas for capacity-building	Capacity-building activities	Indicators	Outcomes
		stakeholders in carrying out capacity-building activities.	(e) Percentage of Parties that establish partnerships at the national, bilateral, regional and multilateral levels with partners from relevant sectors and stakeholders in carrying out capacity-building activities.	
B.2. Parties mobilize adequate resources from all sources to support implementation of the Protocol in accordance with Article 28 of the Protocol	(1) Establishment of a national budget allocation mechanism for biosafety; (2) Coordination with authorities, funding agencies and donors at the national level; (3) Access to additional resources through cooperation with other Parties and donors, including the private sector, and through international cooperation programmes.	(i) Provide training or raise awareness on the establishment and development of mechanisms to leverage adequate resources from national budgets to carry out activities necessary for the implementation of the Protocol; (ii) Establish/strengthen coordination at the national level among competent authorities, funding agencies and other donors; (iii) Establish/strengthen cooperation among donor Parties and other donors, developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to ensure the full implementation of the Protocol.	(a) Percentage of Parties that allocated resources from national budgets to carry out activities necessary for the implementation of the Protocol; (b) Percentage of Parties that strengthened coordination between competent authorities, funding agencies and other donors; (c) Percentage of Parties that strengthened cooperation among donor Parties and other donors, developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to ensure the full implementation of the Protocol; (d) Percentage of Parties having contributed resources to other Parties to strengthen their capacity for the implementation of the Protocol.	Full implementation of the Protocol is enabled by adequate resources Public and private resources are mobilized and provide regular and sustained support for the actions needed

Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety				
Goals	Key areas for capacity-building	Capacity-building activities	Indicators	Outcomes
B.3. Parties promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation on the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs, in accordance with Article 23 of the Protocol	<p>(1) Establishment of national systems for promoting public awareness, education and participation;</p> <p>(2) Development and dissemination of resource and training materials on public awareness, education and participation;</p> <p>(3) Provision of education on biosafety;</p> <p>(4) Strengthening mechanisms for participation in decision-making;</p> <p>(5) Development of public awareness programmes.</p>	<p>(i) Develop and disseminate capacity-building materials on public awareness, education and participation;</p> <p>(ii) Develop or update biosafety education programmes and strengthen institutional capacities;</p> <p>(iii) Integrate biosafety in relevant educational programmes;</p> <p>(iv) Establish academic exchange and fellowship programmes, including on modern biotechnology and biosafety research;</p> <p>(v) Provide training on participation in decision-making, in accordance with national laws and regulations, including on the establishment of mechanisms to inform the public about modalities for participation;</p> <p>(vi) Provide training on the development and implementation of biosafety public awareness programmes;</p> <p>(vii) Provide training on biosafety communication.</p>	<p>(a) Percentage of Parties that developed and disseminated capacity-building materials on public awareness, education and participation;</p> <p>(b) Percentage of Parties that developed or updated biosafety education programmes and strengthened institutional capacities;</p> <p>(c) Percentage of Parties that integrated biosafety in relevant educational programmes;</p> <p>(d) Percentage of Parties that established academic exchange and fellowship programmes;</p> <p>(e) Percentage of Parties that provided training on participation in decision-making, in accordance with national laws and regulations, including on the establishment of mechanisms to inform the public about modalities for participation;</p> <p>(f) Percentage of Parties that provided training on the development and implementation of biosafety public awareness programmes;</p>	<p>Through public awareness, education and participation, Parties ensure that the public is appropriately informed about the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs and involved in decision-making on the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs</p>

Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety				
Goals	Key areas for capacity-building	Capacity-building activities	Indicators	Outcomes
			(g) Percentage of Parties that provided training on biosafety communication.	
B.4. Parties enhance cooperation and coordination on biosafety issues at the national, regional and international levels	(1) Cooperation among and within Parties; (2) Involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities and stakeholders from relevant sectors; (3) Mainstreaming of biosafety in sectoral and cross-sectoral legislation, policies and plans.	(i) Organize activities to facilitate technical and scientific cooperation, access to and transfer of technology and sharing of information and experiences at all levels, in particular for developing country Parties and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition; (ii) Organize joint activities involving indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant stakeholders from different sectors.	(a) Percentage of Parties that organized activities to facilitate technical and scientific cooperation and information sharing at the bilateral, subregional and regional levels; (b) Percentage of Parties that organized joint activities involving indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant stakeholders from different sectors.	Through cooperation at the national, regional and international levels, and participation of stakeholders, Parties' implementation of the Protocol is more effective Increased awareness on the importance of biosafety across government and relevant stakeholders

CP-10/5. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (Article 20)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Reaffirming the key role of the Biosafety Clearing-House as an information-sharing mechanism facilitating the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and related capacity-building actions, and noting the increasing relevance of the Biosafety Clearing-House for online forums,

1. *Welcomes* the migration of the central portal of the Biosafety Clearing-House to its new platform and the improvements made in accordance with the joint modalities of operation for the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention, the Biosafety Clearing-House and the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearing-House endorsed in decision CP-9/2;

2. *Calls upon* Parties and other Governments to publish information available at the national level in the Biosafety Clearing-House in accordance with the obligations of the Protocol;

3. *Calls upon* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to review records they have previously published in the Biosafety Clearing-House to verify their accuracy on the new platform and to make any revisions or updates as necessary in a timely manner;

4. *Takes note* of goal A.2 and related capacity-building activities in the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety¹ and the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety² and invites Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to carry out related activities with a view to further strengthening the role of the Biosafety Clearing-House in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol;

5. *Welcomes* the successful implementation of the United Nations Environment Programme — Global Environment Facility “Project for Sustainable Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House” (BCH III Project) and invites the United Nations Environment Programme to develop further capacity-building projects related to the Biosafety Clearing-House;

6. *Also welcomes* the collaborative activities undertaken between the biosafety databases of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the Biosafety Clearing-House;

7. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue to maintain and make necessary improvements to the Biosafety Clearing-House, including:

(a) Translating further pages of the Biosafety Clearing-House, including new features and content as they are developed to ensure that the Biosafety Clearing-House is available in the six official languages of the United Nations;

(b) Exploring how the Bioland tool can be used to facilitate the linkage between national websites and the Biosafety Clearing-House, and other mechanisms that allow national clearing-houses to retrieve information from the Biosafety Clearing-House;

(c) Continuing to ensure information in the clearing-house is up-to-date;

8. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To develop capacity-building materials based on priorities identified by Parties and to conduct trainings on the new functionalities of the Biosafety Clearing-House including as a contribution to the key activities highlighted in the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety adopted in decision CP-10/4;

(b) To explore options for and implement a coordinated approach to the web infrastructure for online forums across the clearing-houses;

¹ Decision CP-10/3, annex.

² Decision CP-10/4, annex.

- (c) To continue collaborating with other biosafety-related databases and organizations.

CP-10/6. Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources (Article 28)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

1. *Welcomes* the eighth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund and its programming directions and the support this makes available to Parties for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

2. *Notes with concern* that very few projects were presented for supporting the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol during the seventh replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund;

3. *Recommends* that the Conference of the Parties, in adopting its guidance to the Global Environment Facility with respect to support for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, invite the Global Environment Facility:

(a) To strengthen its funding programme dedicated to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to support eligible Parties in implementing the Protocol, the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,¹ and the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;²

(b) To improve and simplify the modalities for access to its funding for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, to support eligible Parties in the implementation of the Protocol, the Implementation Plan and the Capacity-building Action Plan;

(c) To continue to make funds available in a timely manner to support eligible Parties in preparing and submitting their fifth national reports under the Cartagena Protocol;

(d) To continue to assist eligible Parties in undertaking activities in the following areas: development and implementation of legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol; risk assessment and risk management; detection and identification of living modified organisms; public awareness, education and participation; socioeconomic considerations; liability and redress; national reporting; information-sharing and the Biosafety Clearing-House; knowledge and technology transfer; and the implementation of compliance action plans regarding the achievement of compliance with the Protocol;

4. *Invites* the Council of the Global Environment Facility to examine the possibility of creating a finance window specifically for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

5. *Urges* Parties to the Convention that are also Parties to the Cartagena Protocol to include biosafety projects in their utilization of the funding allocated to them under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources for the eighth replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, taking into account the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and the guidance of the Conference of the Parties to the Global Environment Facility;

6. *Encourages* Parties to include needs and provisions for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in their national biodiversity finance plans and in their national implementation of the strategy for resource mobilization for the post-2020 period;³

7. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To identify and communicate sources of funding for biosafety to support Parties;

(b) To analyse the effectiveness of the financial mechanism for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in the sixth review of the effectiveness of the financial mechanism,⁴ while considering the relevance and process of creating a standalone window for biosafety, for consideration by the

¹ Decision CP-10/3, annex.

² Decision CP-10/4, annex.

³ See decision 15/7 of the Conference of the Parties.

⁴ See decision 15/15 of the Conference of the Parties.

Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its eleventh meeting.

CP-10/7. Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 35) and final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling the objective of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as set out in its Article 1,

Recalling also Article 22 of the Protocol, on capacity-building, and Article 28 of the Protocol, on the financial mechanism and resources,

1. *Recognizes* the usefulness of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020¹ in supporting national implementation;

2. *Also recognizes* that the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework must contribute to the implementation of and compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and acknowledges the relevance of the Protocol, the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety² and the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety³ to the achievement of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

3. *Welcomes* the contribution of the Liaison Group on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Compliance Committee to the fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020,⁴ and requests them to provide input to the fifth assessment and review and evaluation process of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, as appropriate;

A. National biosafety frameworks

4. *Welcomes* the progress in establishing functional administrative arrangements, noting that almost all Parties have permanent staff to administer the functions related to biosafety;

5. *Urges* Parties to allocate the necessary resources for the operation of their biosafety institutions, given the crucial role of these institutions in implementing the Protocol;

6. *Also urges* Parties to mobilize resources from all available national and international sources, including international cooperation and the private sector, to further support operation of their biosafety institutions;

7. *Notes with grave concern* that only about half of the Parties have fully introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures to implement their obligations under the Protocol and that limited progress has been made in this regard since the midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020;⁵

8. *Urges* Parties that have not yet fully done so to put in place legal, administrative and other measures to implement their obligations under the Protocol, in particular biosafety legislation, as a matter of priority, and recognizes that further support is needed in this area;

9. *Encourages* Parties to consider indigenous peoples and local communities, gender, women, youth and a human rights-based approach in their national biosafety frameworks;

B. Coordination and support

10. *Recognizes* the importance of coordination among relevant authorities and at various levels and of mainstreaming biosafety across relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral instruments, including national biodiversity strategies and action plans, for advancing the implementation of the Protocol;

¹ Decision BS-V/16, annex I.

² Decision CP-10/3, annex.

³ Decision CP-10/4, annex.

⁴ CBD/SBI/3/3, annexes I and II, respectively.

⁵ See decision CP-VIII/15.

11. *Welcomes* the support for capacity-building provided in furtherance of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020, but notes with concern the lack of progress in meeting capacity-building needs in most regions;

12. *Underlines* the ongoing need for developing and strengthening the capacities of Parties to implement the Protocol, including in the light of the ongoing rapid development of biotechnologies relevant for the Cartagena Protocol, and recognizes the facilitative role that the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety can play in this regard;

13. *Encourages* Parties to cooperate in biosafety capacity-building, including at the regional level;

14. *Notes* with concern that fewer Parties had access to additional financial resources beyond their national budgets, compared to the third assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and midterm evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020;

15. *Urges* Parties and invites other Governments, donors and biosafety capacity-building initiatives to make resources available to support Parties in their efforts to strengthen capacities and enhance the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in the following priority areas: development and implementation of legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol; risk assessment and risk management; detection and identification of living modified organisms; public awareness, education and participation; socioeconomic considerations; liability and redress; national reporting; and technology transfer;

C. Risk assessment and risk management

16. *Welcomes* the progress made by Parties in carrying out risk assessments pursuant to the Protocol and in publishing risk assessment summary reports along with decisions in the Biosafety Clearing-House;

17. *Also welcomes* the progress made by Parties in adopting common approaches to risk assessment, in accordance with Annex III to the Cartagena Protocol, and risk management and in adopting or using voluntary guidance documents for the purpose of conducting risk assessments or evaluating risk assessment summary reports submitted by notifiers;

18. *Recognizes* the need for further support for risk assessment and risk management, including by strengthening human resource capacities and by facilitating access to sufficient financial resources, adequate scientific knowledge and technical infrastructure;

D. Living modified organisms or traits that may have adverse effects

19. *Commends* the large number of Parties that have established the capacities to detect, identify, assess and monitor living modified organisms or traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity;

20. *Recognizes*, however, that further support is needed for strengthening human resource and institutional capacities, especially through enhanced international cooperation among Parties, to identify living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, in accordance with Article 16, and for facilitating access to adequate technical infrastructure for identifying, assessing and monitoring living modified organisms;

E. Liability and redress

21. *Notes* the limited number of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety that have ratified the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress;

22. *Welcomes* the progress by Parties to the Supplementary Protocol in introducing measures to implement the Supplementary Protocol, while recognizing that support is needed for those Parties to the Supplementary Protocol that are facing challenges in this regard;

23. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of resources, to undertake activities to support ratification efforts, and invites other partners to also undertake awareness-raising activities on the Supplementary Protocol;

F. Handling, transport, packaging and identification

24. *Welcomes* the fact that almost all Parties have trained some laboratory personnel in the detection of living modified organisms, while recognizing that about half of these Parties have indicated that more training would be required;

25. *Notes* that most Parties reported having reliable access to laboratory facilities, yet notes with concern that other Parties continue to face challenges and that support is needed in that regard;

G. Socioeconomic considerations

26. *Notes* that about half of Parties have specific approaches or requirements that facilitate how socioeconomic considerations should be taken into account in decision-making with regard to living modified organisms;

27. *Also notes* that more information on methodologies and approaches should be gathered and shared, and encourages Parties to exchange research and information on socioeconomic considerations to support those Parties that wish to do so to take socioeconomic considerations into account in accordance with Article 26 and Article 20 of the Protocol;

28. *Encourages* Parties to promote the involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, women, and youth when undertaking research on socioeconomic considerations;

H. Transit, contained use, unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures

29. *Welcomes* the fact that approximately three quarters of Parties have measures in place to regulate contained use of living modified organisms and living modified organisms in transit;

30. *Also welcomes* the fact that nearly two thirds of Parties have the capacity to take appropriate measures in case of unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms;

31. *Encourages* Parties that have not yet done so to adopt the necessary measures to regulate contained use of living modified organisms and living modified organisms in transit as well as unintentional transboundary movement of living modified organisms, and recognizes the importance of supporting those Parties in adopting such measures and developing capacities in that regard;

I. Information-sharing

32. *Notes* the positive trends regarding information-sharing through the Biosafety Clearing-House, including in relation to the number of national records and reference records published, and the number of visitors;

33. *Calls* on Parties and encourages other users to ensure that records remain up to date;

34. *Welcomes* the fact that almost all Parties have designated their national focal point for the Cartagena Protocol and their focal point for the Biosafety Clearing-House;

35. *Notes* the progress by Parties in designating their point of contact for the purposes of receiving notifications under Article 17 (Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures);

36. *Urges* Parties that have not yet completely done so to make all required information available to the Biosafety Clearing-House and keep their records up to date, focusing in particular on information related to (a) national legislation, regulations and guidelines; (b) summaries of risk assessments; (c) final decisions regarding the importation or release of living modified organisms; (d) national focal points, national points of contact and competent national authorities; (e) information on bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements into which they have entered; and (f) information concerning illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms;

37. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to ensure that adequate support is provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House to enable the mechanism to function to its full capacity and potential;

J. Compliance and review

38. *Notes* considerable variations in progress by Parties to comply with key obligations under the Protocol;

39. *Welcomes* the progress made by Parties in complying with their obligations under the Protocol, including the obligations concerning (a) making certain information available to the Biosafety Clearing House, and (b) the designation of national focal points and competent national authorities;

40. *Notes with concern* that a large number of Parties are not in full compliance with key obligations under the Protocol, including (a) the obligation to take the necessary legal, administrative and other measures to implement the Protocol, and (b) the obligation to submit a national report in a timely manner;

41. *Recognizes* the need for Parties to have in place monitoring and enforcement systems for the implementation of the Protocol;

42. *Welcomes* the supportive role of the Compliance Committee, carried out pursuant to decision BS-V/1, as a contribution to the progress reported by Parties in implementing their obligations under the Protocol;

43. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, as appropriate and following guidance provided by the Compliance Committee, to continue following up with Parties that have not yet fully complied with their obligations under the Protocol, and requests Parties to collaborate fully in this regard;

K. Public awareness and participation, biosafety education and training

44. *Stresses* the importance of public awareness, education and participation for the implementation of the Protocol, recognizing that more support in this area is needed;

45. *Notes* the progress in the development of mechanisms for public participation in decision-making on living modified organisms and in the number of Parties that have academic institutions that offer biosafety education and training programmes;

46. *Encourages* Parties and invites other users to share relevant materials on public awareness, education and participation through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

L. Outreach and cooperation

47. *Stresses* the importance of cooperation among Parties in addition to cooperation among intergovernmental organizations to support the implementation of the Protocol;

48. *Also stresses* the importance of outreach and cooperation with indigenous peoples and local communities as well as women, youth and other relevant stakeholders for the effective implementation of the Protocol;

49. *Encourages* Parties to provide support, especially for developing countries, for effective participation in biotechnological and biosafety research activities, in accordance with Article 22 of the Protocol and Article 19 of the Convention.

CP-10/8. Review of effectiveness of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

A. Experience with concurrent meetings

Recalling decisions BS-VII/9, CP-VIII/10 and CP-9/8,

Having reviewed the experience in holding concurrently meetings of the Conference of the Parties, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, using the criteria agreed earlier,

Taking into account the views of Parties and observers that participated in the concurrent meetings held in 2016 and 2018 as synthesized and presented in the notes by the Executive Secretary on the review of experience in holding concurrent meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and meetings of the Parties to the Protocols,¹

1. *Notes with satisfaction* that the concurrent meetings were overall considered to have allowed for increased integration among the Convention and its Protocols, and improved consultations, coordination and synergies among the respective national focal points;

2. *Notes* that most of the criteria were considered as being met or partially met, and that further improvements in the functioning of the concurrent meetings are desirable, in particular to improve the outcomes and effectiveness of the meetings of the Parties to the Protocols;

3. *Reiterates* the importance of ensuring the full and effective participation of representatives of developing country Parties, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, and countries with economies in transition, in the concurrent meetings, and the importance, in particular, of ensuring adequate participation of representatives in meetings of the Parties to the Protocols by making funding available for such participation, and, in this regard, recalls decision 14/37, paragraphs 36 to 46;

4. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Bureau, to further improve the planning and organization of future concurrent meetings on the basis of the experience gained to date and the views expressed by Parties and observers;

B. Experience with virtual meetings

Recognizing the restrictions imposed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic since March 2020, which rendered in-person meetings impracticable and led to the convening of virtual meetings,

5. *Notes* the expeditious adjustments and arrangements made by the Secretariat, and the understanding and flexibility demonstrated by presiding officers and participants, which allowed the convening of a number of meetings and consultations in a virtual setting in response to the limitations caused by the pandemic situation, notwithstanding the inconveniences arising from such a setting, and the limitations that were agreed with regard to decision-making;

6. *Agrees* that the convening of formal meetings in a virtual setting, while important in terms of responding to the extraordinary circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, does not set a precedent for the future organization of similar meetings under the Convention and the Protocols;

7. *Encourages* Parties and observers to continue to participate in hybrid meetings, when applicable, and in extraordinary circumstances, in virtual meetings, while recognizing the need to ensure the full and effective participation of Parties, especially developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition, to

¹ See [CBD/SBI/2/16/Add.1](#) and associated information notes ([CBD/SBI/2/INF/1](#) and [INF/2](#)).

promote transparent and inclusive processes under the Convention and the Protocols, as long as no final decisions are taken virtually, with the exception of budgetary and procedural matters;

8. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to compile views from Parties, and relevant stakeholders, and the experience and relevant studies available, especially within the United Nations system, on conducting virtual and hybrid meetings held in 2021 and 2022, and to prepare options for procedures for such hybrid meetings, and under extraordinary circumstances, for virtual meetings, taking into account the specific challenges faced by delegations with network and connectivity difficulties, especially by developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and Parties with economies in transition, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities and observers, and by those delegations from countries where meetings are scheduled at difficult times, addressing issues about equity, participation and legitimacy for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, at its fourth meeting;

9. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Implementation to consider the compilation of views, analysis and options referred to in paragraph 8 above and to make recommendations to address the issues to the governing bodies of the Convention and the Protocols for consideration at their next meeting;

C. Other areas to improve effectiveness

10. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to prepare, in consultation with Parties, Bureau members, partners and stakeholders, an analysis of options to further improve the effectiveness of meetings under the Convention and the Protocols, including, inter alia, options to improve negotiating processes, to better follow up on previous decisions, to benefit from innovations in decision-making methods and technologies, and to explore modalities for the engagement of observers in processes under the Convention and the Protocols, while ensuring that the rules of procedure of the Convention and the Protocols are respected, and to submit such analysis of options to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for consideration at its fourth meeting.

CP-10/9. Monitoring and reporting (Article 33)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling Article 33 and decision CP-9/5, in which Parties were requested to prepare and submit to the Secretariat their fourth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol,

Recalling also decision CP-9/5, in which it accepted the invitation of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention contained in decision 14/27, and decided to have a synchronized national reporting cycle,

A. Fourth national reports on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol

1. *Welcomes* the 135 complete fourth national reports submitted through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

2. *Expresses concern* about the low number of fourth national reports submitted;

3. *Also expresses concern* about delays in submitting the projects to the Global Environment Facility to support eligible Parties in the preparation of their fourth national reports, noting that such funding was not available before the deadline for the submission of fourth national reports, which is one of the factors that may have affected the submission rate;

4. *Urges* Parties that have not yet submitted their fourth national report to do so as soon as possible;¹

5. *Notes with concern* that, of the Parties that have not yet submitted their fourth national report, some Parties have also not submitted their third national report;²

6. *Reminds* Parties of their obligation to publish their national reports in the Biosafety Clearing-House, in accordance with Article 20 of the Protocol;

7. *Encourages* Parties that have submitted their report in an offline format to ensure its publication in the Biosafety Clearing-House in coordination with the Secretariat, as necessary;

8. *Urges* Parties that have submitted an incomplete fourth national report to provide the missing information as soon as possible;

B. Fifth national reports on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol

9. *Welcomes* the draft format for the fifth national reports as contained in the annex to document CBD/CP/MOP/10/5, and requests the Executive Secretary:

(a) To make any necessary adjustments to the questions in light of the final text of the indicators of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety as adopted in decision CP-10/3;

(b) To make the final format available online through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

10. *Requests* Parties to use the final format for the preparation of their fifth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

11. *Invites* Parties to prepare their reports through a consultative process involving indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth, and all relevant national stakeholders, as appropriate;

¹ Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Azerbaijan, Belize, Bolivia, Cabo Verde, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Fiji, Honduras, Jordan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mongolia, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago, and Yemen.

² Azerbaijan, Belize, Libya, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles and Syrian Arab Republic.

12. *Encourages* Parties to respond to all questions in the reporting format, and stresses the importance of the timely submission of fifth national reports in order to facilitate the midterm evaluation of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

13. *Requests* Parties and invites other Governments to submit to the Secretariat their fifth national report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety:

- (a) In an official language of the United Nations;
- (b) At the same time as the seventh national reports under the Convention are due;³
- (c) Through the Biosafety Clearing-House;

14. *Requests* Parties experiencing challenges submitting their national report through the Biosafety Clearing-House to coordinate with the Secretariat to facilitate the publication of their national report in the Biosafety Clearing-House;

15. *Recognizes* that the fifth national reports will also be an important source of information, along with other sources, for measuring progress under the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, as set out in paragraph 19 of the Capacity-building Action Plan;⁴

16. *Urges* eligible Parties to submit their letters of commitment to the implementing agency in a timely manner to ensure that projects to support the preparation of fifth national reports can be submitted to the Global Environment Facility for approval well before the deadline for the submission of the reports;

17. *Notes* decision 15/6 and decision 15/4 of the Conference of the Parties and encourages Parties to the Cartagena Protocol to contribute to national processes for the preparation of the seventh national reports under the Convention, including by providing information related to targets relevant for biosafety.

³ Decision 15/6 of the Conference of the Parties.

⁴ Decision CP-10/4, annex.

CP-10/10. Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting to the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling decision CP-9/13, paragraph 7, in which it decided to consider, at its tenth meeting, whether additional guidance materials on risk assessment are needed for (a) living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives, and (b) living modified fish,

Recalling also decision BS-VII/12, paragraph 17, in which it recommended to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention of Biological Diversity a coordinated approach with the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety on the issue of synthetic biology, taking into account the possibility that the provisions of the Protocol might also apply to living organisms resulting from synthetic biology,

Recalling further the importance of the precautionary approach, in accordance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Noting the existing voluntary guidance on the assessment of socioeconomic considerations in the context of Article 26 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

1. *Welcomes* the outcomes of the discussions of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment;¹
2. *Takes note* of the clarifications made by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on annex I to decision CP-9/13 regarding the process for identification and prioritization of specific issues of risk assessment of living modified organisms that may warrant consideration;²
3. *Welcomes* the analysis done by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on the topics of (a) living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives and (b) living modified fish pursuant to decision CP-9/13, annex I;
4. *Notes* the range of perspectives on the need for the development of guidance on risk assessment of living modified fish, decides not to proceed, at this stage, with the development of additional voluntary guidance materials on risk assessment regarding living modified fish, and encourages Parties and invites other Governments and relevant organizations to promote international cooperation, information sharing and capacity-building on risk assessment of living modified fish, and to make use of existing guidance materials, with a view to considering further guidance on living modified fish at its eleventh meeting, subject to the provisions of annex I to decision CP-9/13;
5. *Endorses* the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group that additional voluntary guidance materials to support case-by-case risk assessment of living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives should be developed, and agrees to develop such additional voluntary guidance materials as per the annex below;
6. *Decides* to establish an ad hoc technical expert group on risk assessment that will work according to the terms of reference annexed hereto;
7. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant organizations to submit to the Executive Secretary information relevant to the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment established in paragraph 6 above;
8. *Invites* Parties to also submit information on their needs and priorities for further guidance materials on specific topics of risk assessment of living modified organisms, including a rationale following the criteria set out in decision CP-9/13, annex I;
9. *Calls upon* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to continue to disseminate information and share experiences, especially through the Biosafety Clearing-House, that are

¹ CBD/CP/RA/AHTEG/2020/1/5.

² See CBD/CP/RA/AHTEG/2020/1/5, annex I, sect. III.

useful for risk assessments of living modified organisms, including living modified fish and organisms containing engineered gene drives;

10. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

(a) To commission, subject to the availability of resources and applying decision 14/33 on the procedure for avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in expert groups, the preparation of detailed outline of additional guidance materials on risk assessment of living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives to be reviewed by the online forum as a base for the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group;

(b) To convene online discussions of the Online Forum on Risk Assessment and Risk Management to review an outline of the additional voluntary guidance materials and to support the work of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group;

(c) To collect and synthesize relevant information to facilitate the work of the Online Forum and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group;

(d) To synthesize the views referred to in paragraphs 7 and 8 above and the discussions of the Online Forum and make them available to the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group;

(e) To convene, subject to the availability of resources, two meetings of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment, with at least one of the meetings as a face-to-face meeting;³

(f) To facilitate the process of identification and prioritization of specific issues of risk assessment of living modified organisms that may warrant consideration, as established in paragraph 6 of decision CP-9/13, by making information submitted by Parties on issues identified in accordance with annex I to the same decision, as well as information useful for the risk assessment of those topics, available through a dedicated web page within the Biosafety Clearing-House;

(g) To ensure the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the discussions and in the work on risk assessment under the Cartagena Protocol;

(h) To explore ways to facilitate and support capacity-building and knowledge-sharing and technology transfer regarding risk assessment and risk management of living modified organisms;

(i) To provide dedicated web pages in the Biosafety Clearing-House to facilitate easy access and raise awareness of available information that is relevant for risk assessment of living modified organisms, including living modified fish and organisms containing engineered gene drives;

11. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice to consider the outcomes of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Risk Assessment at its twenty-sixth meeting and to make a recommendation for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its eleventh meeting;

12. *Decides* to consider, at its eleventh meeting, additional issues on which guidance materials on risk assessment may be needed, further to the process for the identification and prioritization of specific issues of risk assessment of living modified organisms established in decision CP-9/13, taking into account priorities identified by Parties pursuant to paragraph 8 above and the report of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group as per paragraph 1 (e) of its terms of reference.

³ Depending on restrictions due to the pandemic situation.

*Annex***TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE AD HOC TECHNICAL EXPERT GROUP ON RISK ASSESSMENT**

1. The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (Group) on Risk Assessment shall:
 - (a) Be composed of experts selected in accordance with section H of the consolidated modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, ensuring specific scientific and technical expertise on organisms containing engineered gene drives and their potential effects on biodiversity as well as on issues relevant to the mandate of the Group, and including experts from relevant international organizations,⁴ as well as from indigenous peoples and local communities, and applying decision 14/33 on the procedure for avoiding or managing conflicts of interest in expert groups;
 - (b) Meet twice, subject to the availability of funds and prior to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, with at least one of the meetings being face-to-face, and perform necessary tasks between its two meetings supported by online means of communication and engagement;
 - (c) Develop additional voluntary guidance materials for conducting case-by-case risk assessments of living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives in accordance with Annex III to the Protocol. A specific focus of this material should be engineered gene drive mosquitos taking into account the current experience with the organism, the type of gene drive and specific issues of risk assessment, identified in annex I to decision CP-9/13, including existing reports,⁵ general considerations of living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives, and existing national and regional risk assessment experiences;
 - (d) Analyse the information submitted by Parties as per paragraph 8 of decision CP-10/10, and, on the basis of this, prepare a list of prioritized topics on which further guidance materials on risk assessment may be needed according to criteria in decision CP-9/13, annex I;
 - (e) Prepare a report, including draft additional voluntary guidance materials on living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives and a list of prioritized topics as per paragraph (d) above, on which further guidance materials on risk assessment may be needed, for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.
2. In undertaking its work, the Group shall consider the synthesis of views from the submissions and discussions in the online forum prepared by the Executive Secretary, existing resources, including those identified in the stocktaking exercise of the “study on risk assessment: application of annex I to decision CP-9/13 to living modified organisms containing engineered gene drives”,⁶ guidance materials already available, relevant decisions on risk assessment and risk management taken under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and any other relevant information collected by the Executive Secretary further to paragraph 10 (c) of decision CP-10/10.

⁴ Such as the World Trade Organization, the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

⁵ Inter alia the Perseus report commissioned by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

⁶ CBD/CP/RA/AHTEG/2020/1/4.

CP-10/11. Detection and identification of living modified organisms

The Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling decision CP-9/11,

Noting the information provided by Parties in their fourth national reports relating to detection and identification of living modified organisms under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and acknowledging the findings in the fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol,

Noting also goals A.6 to A.8 of the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,¹ as well as goals A.6 to A.8 and related capacity-building activities of the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,²

Recognizing the importance of the field of detection and identification of living modified organisms for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, as well as its relevance and applicability to other fields,

Recognizing also the challenges identified by Parties associated with detection and identification of living modified organisms, including the lack of accessible validation and reference materials and financing,

Recognizing further the need for capacity-building activities on new detection techniques, as well as on detecting and identifying unauthorized living modified organisms,

1. *Welcomes* the publication of Biosafety Technical Series 05: *Training Manual on the Detection and Identification of Living Modified Organisms in the Context of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety*;

2. *Recognizes* the importance of the Network of Laboratories for the Detection and Identification of Living Modified Organisms and encourages Parties to continue to cooperate to develop regional networks of laboratories to facilitate the exchange of experience, sharing of information and building of expertise in the field;

3. *Invites* Parties and relevant organizations to submit information on their experience with new detection techniques, detecting newly developed and unauthorized living modified organisms, and developing reference materials, as well as ongoing collaborations involving national and regional laboratories, and also invites Parties, in particular those that have not yet done so, to submit information on their laboratories, including their specific activities, to the Biosafety Clearing-House using the Laboratory common format;

4. *Requests* the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at its twenty-fifth or twenty-sixth meeting to consider the information submitted by Parties and relevant organizations in response to paragraph 3 above and to prepare a recommendation to the Conference of Parties serving as a meeting of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its eleventh meeting regarding the need to update the training manual on the detection and identification of living modified organisms in the context of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety;

5. *Urges* Parties and invites international organizations to provide financial resources, in particular for developing countries, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States, and countries with economies in transition, to laboratories and to strengthen the infrastructure for detection and identification of living modified organisms;

6. *Encourages* Parties and international organizations to fund the capacity-building of personnel involved in the field of detection and identification of living modified organisms;

7. *Requests* the Executive Secretary:

¹ Decision CP-10/3, annex.

² Decision CP-10/4, annex.

- (a) To continue the work mandated under decision CP-9/11;
- (b) To synthesize the information gathered in response to paragraph 3 above and submit a report to the Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety at its next meeting;
- (c) To further enhance capacity-building in the field of detection and identification of living modified organisms, including the convening, in cooperation with relevant organizations, subject to the availability of resources, of regional and subregional capacity-building activities, such as online training and face-to-face workshops.

CP-10/12. Socio-economic considerations (Article 26)

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling Article 26, paragraph 2, of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,

Recalling also the preamble to decision CP-9/14,

Recalling further the voluntary “Guidance on the Assessment of Socio-Economic Considerations in the Context of Article 26 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety” noted in decision CP-9/14,

Recognizing the limited time available for Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and other stakeholders to make use of the voluntary Guidance,

Acknowledging the need to gather and share further information on methodologies and approaches,

Noting the information provided by Parties in their fourth national reports relating to Article 26 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, as well as the findings on socioeconomic considerations in the fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol and the final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020, as presented in decision CP-10/7,

Noting also the Goal and related capacity-building activities in the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety¹ and in the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety² relating to Article 26 of the Cartagena Protocol, and acknowledging the importance of capacity-building and regional and subregional cooperation for Parties wishing to take into account socioeconomic considerations,

1. *Takes note with appreciation* of the outcomes of the work by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socio-economic Considerations;³

2. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and other stakeholders to cooperate and share relevant experiences on taking socioeconomic considerations into account in decision-taking on living modified organisms in accordance with Article 26 of the Protocol;

3. *Also invites* Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and other stakeholders, as appropriate, to use the voluntary Guidance and submit experiences in the use of the Guidance to the Executive Secretary, as well as examples of methodologies and applications of socioeconomic considerations in the light of the elements of the voluntary Guidance;

4. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to contact those Parties that in their fourth national report indicated (a) having specific approaches or requirements that facilitate how socioeconomic considerations should be taken into account in decision-making on living modified organisms or (b) having taken into account socioeconomic considerations arising from the impact of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, and to invite them to share information on their experiences, as relevant to Article 26;

5. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to compile the information gathered in response to paragraphs 3 and 4 above and submit the overview for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, at its eleventh meeting, with a view to determining the need for further work.

¹ Decision CP-10/3, annex.

² Decision CP-10/4, annex.

³ As contained in document CBD/CP/MOP/10/11, annexes II and III.

CP-10/13. Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress

*The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and further serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress,*¹

Recalling decision CP-9/15,

Noting the information provided by Parties in their fourth national reports relating to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress,

1. *Welcomes* the additional instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety that have been deposited;

2. *Notes with regret* the limited number of Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety that have ratified the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress and invites all Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety that have not yet done so to deposit their instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress as soon as possible;

3. *Welcomes* the progress made by many Parties in the implementation of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress and urges Parties to the Supplementary Protocol to take the further necessary steps for its full and effective implementation;

4. *Underlines* the importance of awareness-raising and capacity-building activities to support further ratifications and implementation of the Supplementary Protocol as recognized in decision CP-10/7 on the fourth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol and final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020;

5. *Welcomes* the goal on the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress in the Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety² and in the Capacity-building Action Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety,³ as well as the related capacity-building activities, and recognizes that some of these activities are directed primarily at Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress;

6. *Reminds* Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to designate a competent authority to perform the functions set out in Article 5 of the Supplementary Protocol and to publish information on these competent authorities using the common format available for this purpose in the Biosafety Clearing-House;

7. *Welcomes* the study on financial security mechanisms (Article 10 of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol);⁴

8. *Reminds* Parties to the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress of the polluter pays principle and encourages them to take this principle into account, where applicable, when further developing financial security mechanisms;

9. *Requests* Parties to the Supplementary Protocol and invites other Governments to submit information to the Executive Secretary on the measures they have in place to provide for financial security

¹ In accordance with Article 14, paragraph 1, of the Supplementary Protocol and subject to paragraph 2 of Article 32 of the Convention, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol shall serve as the meeting of the Parties to the Supplementary Protocol. Consequently, the present decision has been taken by Parties to the Supplementary Protocol.

² Decision CP-10/3, annex.

³ Decision CP-10/4, annex.

⁴ Made available in document CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/1. The executive summary of the study is available in the six official languages of the United Nations in the annex to document CBD/CP/MOP/10/9.

for damage from living modified organisms, in particular where they have reported having such measures in place in their fourth national reports;

10. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to compile the information submitted further to paragraph 9 and submit it for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its eleventh meeting;

11. *Welcomes* the inclusion of questions on the Supplementary Protocol in the format for the fifth national report,⁵ and requests Parties to the Supplementary Protocol and invites other Governments to respond to these questions;

12. *Recalls* Article 13 of the Nagoya – Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress and decides that the first assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Supplementary Protocol shall be undertaken in the context of the fifth assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Cartagena Protocol.

⁵ See decision CP-10/9.

CP-10/14. Budget for the integrated programme of work of the Secretariat

The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol,

Recalling its decision CP-9/16,

Also recalling its decision CP-EM-1/1, in which it approved the extension of the budget for the biennium 2019-2020 and, on an exceptional basis, a core interim budget for 2021,

Further recalling its decision CP-10/1, in which it approved the extension of the budget for the biennium 2019-2020 and, on an exceptional basis, a core interim budget for 2022,

1. *Decides* to adopt an integrated programme of work and budget for the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing;

2. *Also decides* to share all costs for secretariat services among the Convention, the Cartagena Protocol and the Nagoya Protocol on a ratio of 72:15:13 for the biennium 2023-2024;

3. *Approves* a core (BG) programme budget for the Cartagena Protocol of 2,989,700 United States dollars for the year 2023 and of 3,257,200 United States dollars for the year 2024, representing 15 per cent of the integrated budget of 19,931,600 United States dollars for the year 2023 and 21,714,500 United States dollars for the year 2024 for the Convention and the Protocols, for the purposes listed in tables 1a and 1b below;

4. *Adopts* the scale of assessments for the apportionment of expenses for 2023 and 2024, in accordance with the current scale of assessments of the United Nations,¹ as contained in table 2 of the present decision;

5. *Notes with concern* that a number of Parties to the Convention and its Protocols have not paid their contributions to the core budgets (BY, BG and BB Trust Funds) for 2022 and prior years, including Parties that have never paid their contributions, and also notes that, in accordance with the International Public Sector Accounting Standards adopted by the United Nations,² arrears estimated at 556,128 United States dollars for the Cartagena Protocol are outstanding at the end of 2021 and are deducted from the fund balance to cover doubtful debt and, so, cannot be used for the benefit of all the respective Parties and requests the United Nations Environment Programme to accept contributions from all Parties to the Convention in a timely manner;

6. *Decides* to apply, *mutatis mutandis*, paragraphs 4 to 6, 8 to 17 and 19 to 39 of decision 15/34 of the Conference of the Parties.

¹ As per General Assembly resolution 76/238.

² See General Assembly resolution 60/283, sect. IV.

**Table 1a. Integrated budget for the Convention and its Protocols for the period 2023-2024
(by object of expenditure)**

<i>Object of expenditure</i>	2023	2024	<i>Total</i>
	<i>(Thousands of United States dollars)</i>		
A. Staff costs	11,890.2	12,267.1	24,157.3
B. Temporary assistance/overtime	100.0	100.0	200.0
C. Consultants/subcontractors	50.0	50.0	100.0
D. Training	5.0	5.0	10.0
E. Structural review	250.0	0.0	250.0
F. Bureau meetings	108.0	170.9	278.9
G. Expert meetings	130.0	350.0	480.0
H. Meetings of intergovernmental bodies*	2,241.6	3,343.0	5,584.6
I. Public awareness material/communications	50.0	50.0	100.0
J. Translation of CHM website/website projects	65.0	65.0	130.0
K. Travel on official business	320.0	320.0	640.0
L. Rent and associated costs	1,445.7	1,473.0	2,918.7
M. Information technology	65.0	65.0	130.0
N. General operating expenses	726.6	726.6	1,453.2
Subtotal (I)	17,447.1	18,985.6	36,432.7
II. Programme support costs (13%)	2,268.1	2,468.1	4,736.2
Subtotal (I + II)	19,715.2	21,453.7	41,168.9
III. Working Capital Reserve	216.4	260.8	477.2
Grand Total (I + II + III)	19,931.6	21,714.5	41,646.1
Cartagena Protocol share of the integrated budget (15%)	2,989.7	3,257.2	6,246.9
Less contributions from host country	-245.0	-249.7	-494.7
Less use of reserve	-30.8	-30.8	-61.6
Net total (to be shared by Parties)	2,713.9	2,976.8	5,690.7

* Meetings funded from the core budget:

Twelfth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions.

Twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

Fourth and fifth meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.

Sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention / Eleventh meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol / Fifth meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, held concurrently.

Table 1b. Integrated budget for the Convention and its Protocols for the period 2023-2024

	2023	2024	2023-2024
	<i>(Thousands of United States dollars)</i>		
A. Governing and Subsidiary bodies	2,479.6	3,863.9	6,343.5
B. Executive direction and management	2,909.8	3,028.0	5,937.8
C. Programme of work	8,909.1	9,094.9	18,004.0
D. Administrative support	3,148.6	2,998.8	6,147.4
Subtotal	17,447.1	18,985.6	36,432.7
Programme support costs	2,268.1	2,468.1	4,736.2
Working Capital Reserve	216.4	260.8	477.2
Total requirements	19,931.6	21,714.5	41,646.1

Cartagena Protocol share of the integrated budget (15%)	2,989.7	3,257.2	6,246.9
Less contributions from host country	-245.0	-249.7	-494.7
Less reserve	-30.8	-30.8	-61.6
Net total (to be shared by Parties)	2,713.9	2,976.7	5,690.6

Table 2. Contributions to the Trust Fund for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the biennium 2023-2024 ³

Party	Scale of assessments 2022-2024	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2023 (US\$)	Contribution due as of 1 January 2024 (US\$)	Total 2023-2024 (US\$)
Afghanistan	0.006	0.008	230	252	482
Albania	0.008	0.011	307	336	643
Algeria	0.109	0.154	4,176	4,581	8,757
Angola	0.010	0.010	271	298	569
Antigua and Barbuda	0.002	0.003	77	84	161
Armenia	0.007	0.010	268	294	562
Austria	0.679	0.959	26,015	28,534	54,549
Azerbaijan	0.030	0.042	1,149	1,261	2,410
Bahamas	0.019	0.027	728	798	1,526
Bahrain	0.054	0.076	2,069	2,269	4,338
Bangladesh	0.010	0.010	271	298	569
Barbados	0.008	0.011	307	336	643
Belarus	0.041	0.058	1,571	1,723	3,294
Belgium	0.828	1.169	31,724	34,796	66,520
Belize	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Benin	0.005	0.007	192	210	402
Bhutan	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0.019	0.027	728	798	1,526
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.012	0.017	460	504	964
Botswana	0.015	0.021	575	630	1,205
Brazil	2.013	2.842	77,126	84,594	161,720
Bulgaria	0.056	0.079	2,146	2,353	4,499
Burkina Faso	0.004	0.006	153	168	321
Burundi	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Cambodia	0.007	0.010	268	294	562
Cameroon	0.013	0.018	498	546	1,044
Cabo Verde	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Central African Republic	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Chad	0.003	0.004	115	126	241
China	15.254	21.535	584,438	641,032	1,225,470
Colombia	0.246	0.347	9,425	10,338	19,763
Comoros	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Congo	0.005	0.007	192	210	402
Costa Rica	0.069	0.097	2,644	2,900	5,543
Côte d'Ivoire	0.022	0.031	843	925	1,767
Croatia	0.091	0.128	3,487	3,824	7,311
Cuba	0.095	0.134	3,640	3,992	7,632

³ As per United Nations General Assembly resolution 76/238.

Party	Scale of assessments 2022-2024	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2023 (US\$)	Contribution due as of 1 January 2024 (US\$)	Total 2023-2024 (US\$)
Cyprus	0.036	0.051	1,379	1,513	2,892
Czechia	0.340	0.480	13,027	14,288	27,315
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.005	0.007	192	210	402
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.010	0.010	271	298	569
Denmark	0.553	0.781	21,187	23,239	44,427
Djibouti	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Dominica	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Dominican Republic	0.067	0.095	2,567	2,816	5,383
Ecuador	0.077	0.109	2,950	3,236	6,186
Egypt	0.139	0.196	5,326	5,841	11,167
El Salvador	0.013	0.018	498	546	1,044
Eritrea	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Estonia	0.044	0.062	1,686	1,849	3,535
Eswatini	0.002	0.003	77	84	161
Ethiopia	0.010	0.010	271	298	569
European Union		2.500	67,849	74,419	142,267
Fiji	0.004	0.006	153	168	321
Finland	0.417	0.589	15,977	17,524	33,501
France	4.318	6.096	165,439	181,459	346,898
Gabon	0.013	0.018	498	546	1,044
Gambia	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Georgia	0.008	0.011	307	336	643
Germany	6.111	8.627	234,135	256,808	490,943
Ghana	0.024	0.034	920	1,009	1,928
Greece	0.325	0.459	12,452	13,658	26,110
Grenada	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Guatemala	0.041	0.058	1,571	1,723	3,294
Guinea	0.003	0.004	115	126	241
Guinea-Bissau	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Guyana	0.004	0.006	153	168	321
Honduras	0.009	0.013	345	378	723
Hungary	0.228	0.322	8,736	9,581	18,317
India	1.044	1.474	40,000	43,873	83,872
Indonesia	0.549	0.775	21,034	23,071	44,105
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.371	0.524	14,214	15,591	29,805
Iraq	0.128	0.181	4,904	5,379	10,283
Ireland	0.439	0.620	16,820	18,448	35,268
Italy	3.189	4.502	122,182	134,014	256,197
Jamaica	0.008	0.011	307	336	643
Japan	8.033	11.340	307,774	337,578	645,352
Jordan	0.022	0.031	843	925	1,767
Kazakhstan	0.133	0.188	5,096	5,589	10,685
Kenya	0.030	0.042	1,149	1,261	2,410
Kiribati	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Kuwait	0.234	0.330	8,965	9,834	18,799
Kyrgyzstan	0.002	0.003	77	84	161
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.007	0.010	268	294	562
Latvia	0.050	0.071	1,916	2,101	4,017
Lebanon	0.036	0.051	1,379	1,513	2,892

Party	Scale of assessments 2022-2024	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2023 (US\$)	Contribution due as of 1 January 2024 (US\$)	Total 2023-2024 (US\$)
Lesotho	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Liberia	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Libya	0.018	0.025	690	756	1,446
Lithuania	0.077	0.109	2,950	3,236	6,186
Luxembourg	0.068	0.096	2,605	2,858	5,463
Madagascar	0.004	0.006	153	168	321
Malawi	0.002	0.003	77	84	161
Malaysia	0.348	0.491	13,333	14,624	27,957
Maldives	0.004	0.006	153	168	321
Mali	0.005	0.007	192	210	402
Malta	0.019	0.027	728	798	1,526
Marshall Islands	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Mauritania	0.002	0.003	77	84	161
Mauritius	0.019	0.027	728	798	1,526
Mexico	1.221	1.724	46,781	51,311	98,092
Mongolia	0.004	0.006	153	168	321
Montenegro	0.004	0.006	153	168	321
Morocco	0.055	0.078	2,107	2,311	4,419
Mozambique	0.004	0.006	153	168	321
Myanmar	0.010	0.010	271	298	569
Namibia	0.009	0.013	345	378	723
Nauru	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Netherlands	1.377	1.944	52,758	57,867	110,625
New Zealand	0.309	0.436	11,839	12,985	24,824
Nicaragua	0.005	0.007	192	210	402
Niger	0.003	0.004	115	126	241
Nigeria	0.182	0.257	6,973	7,648	14,621
Niue	0.010	0.010	271	298	569
North Macedonia	0.007	0.010	268	294	562
Norway	0.679	0.959	26,015	28,534	54,549
Oman	0.111	0.157	4,253	4,665	8,917
Pakistan	0.114	0.161	4,368	4,791	9,158
Palau	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Panama	0.090	0.127	3,448	3,782	7,230
Papua New Guinea	0.010	0.014	383	420	803
Paraguay	0.026	0.037	996	1,093	2,089
Peru	0.163	0.230	6,245	6,850	13,095
Philippines	0.212	0.299	8,123	8,909	17,032
Poland	0.837	1.182	32,069	35,174	67,243
Portugal	0.353	0.498	13,525	14,834	28,359
Qatar	0.269	0.380	10,306	11,304	21,611
Republic of Korea	2.574	3.634	98,620	108,169	206,789
Republic of Moldova	0.005	0.007	192	210	402
Romania	0.312	0.440	11,954	13,111	25,065
Rwanda	0.003	0.004	115	126	241
Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.002	0.003	77	84	161
Saint Lucia	0.002	0.003	77	84	161
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Samoa	0.001	0.001	38	42	80

Party	Scale of assessments 2022-2024	Scale with 22% ceiling, no LDC paying more than 0.01%	Contribution due as of 1 January 2023 (US\$)	Contribution due as of 1 January 2024 (US\$)	Total 2023-2024 (US\$)
Saudi Arabia	1.184	1.671	45,363	49,756	95,120
Senegal	0.007	0.010	268	294	562
Serbia	0.032	0.045	1,226	1,345	2,571
Seychelles	0.002	0.003	77	84	161
Sierra Leone	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Slovakia	0.155	0.219	5,939	6,514	12,452
Slovenia	0.079	0.112	3,027	3,320	6,347
Solomon Islands	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Somalia	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
South Africa	0.244	0.344	9,349	10,254	19,602
Spain	2.134	3.013	81,762	89,679	171,440
Sri Lanka	0.045	0.064	1,724	1,891	3,615
State of Palestine	0.011	0.016	421	462	884
Sudan	0.010	0.010	271	298	569
Suriname	0.003	0.004	115	126	241
Sweden	0.871	1.230	33,371	36,603	69,974
Switzerland	1.134	1.601	43,448	47,655	91,103
Syrian Arab Republic	0.009	0.013	345	378	723
Tajikistan	0.003	0.004	115	126	241
Thailand	0.368	0.520	14,099	15,465	29,564
Togo	0.002	0.003	77	84	161
Tonga	0.001	0.001	38	42	80
Trinidad and Tobago	0.037	0.052	1,418	1,555	2,972
Tunisia	0.019	0.027	728	798	1,526
Türkiye	0.845	1.193	32,375	35,510	67,885
Turkmenistan	0.034	0.048	1,303	1,429	2,731
Uganda	0.010	0.010	271	298	569
Ukraine	0.056	0.079	2,146	2,353	4,499
United Arab Emirates	0.635	0.896	24,329	26,685	51,014
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4.375	6.176	167,623	183,854	351,477
United Republic of Tanzania	0.010	0.010	271	298	569
Uruguay	0.092	0.130	3,525	3,866	7,391
Uzbekistan	0.027	0.038	1,034	1,135	2,169
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	0.175	0.247	6,705	7,354	14,059
Viet Nam	0.093	0.131	3,563	3,908	7,471
Yemen	0.008	0.010	271	298	569
Zambia	0.008	0.010	271	298	569
Zimbabwe	0.007	0.010	268	294	562
Total	69.092	100	2,713,945	2,976,752	5,690,697

II. ACCOUNT OF PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity held its tenth meeting in conjunction with the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization.

2. Owing to the circumstances surrounding the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, the meeting was held in two parts. The first part was held online with limited in-person participation, in Kunming, China, on 12 and 13 October 2021. The second part was held in person. It commenced in Montreal, Canada, on 7 December 2022, was suspended on 19 December 2022, resumed in Nairobi on 19 October 2023 and was closed on 20 October 2023.

3. The present report contains the proceedings of the second part of the meeting.¹

4. The second part of the meeting was preceded by a ceremonial welcome by the Traditional Chief of the Onondaga Nation, Tadodaho Sid Hill, followed by statements by the Prime Minister of Canada, Justin Trudeau, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Minister of Ecology and Environment of China and President of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, Huang Runqiu, the Premier of Quebec, François Legault, the Mayor of Montreal, Valérie Plante, and the Mayor of Kunming, Liu Jiachen, as well as a cultural presentation, on 6 December 2022.

B. Attendance

5. All States were invited to participate in the second part of the meeting. The following Parties to the Cartagena Protocol attended:

Albania ^a	Burundi	Dominican Republic
Algeria	Cabo Verde	Ecuador ^a
Angola	Cambodia	Egypt
Antigua and Barbuda	Cameroon	El Salvador ^a
Armenia	Central African Republic	Eritrea
Austria	Chad	Estonia
Azerbaijan	China	Eswatini
Bahamas ^a	Colombia	Ethiopia
Bahrain ^a	Comoros	European Union
Bangladesh	Congo ^a	Fiji
Barbados	Costa Rica	Finland
Belarus	Côte d'Ivoire	France
Belgium	Croatia	Gabon
Belize ^a	Cuba	Gambia
Benin	Cyprus ^a	Georgia
Bhutan	Czechia	Germany
Bolivia (Plurinational State of) ^a	Democratic People's Republic of Korea ^a	Ghana
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Greece
Botswana	Congo	Grenada
Brazil	Denmark	Guatemala
Bulgaria	Djibouti	Guinea ^a
Burkina Faso	Dominica ^a	Guinea-Bissau
		Guyana ^a

¹ The report of the first part of the tenth meeting was issued as document CBD/CP/MOP/10/4.

Honduras ^a	Morocco	Slovakia
Hungary	Mozambique	Slovenia
India	Namibia	Solomon Islands ^a
Indonesia	Nauru ^a	Somalia
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Netherlands (Kingdom of the)	South Africa
Iraq ^b	New Zealand	Spain
Ireland	Nicaragua	Sri Lanka
Israel ^a	Niger	State of Palestine
Italy	Nigeria	Sudan
Jamaica	Niue ^a	Suriname ^a
Japan	North Macedonia ^a	Sweden
Jordan	Norway	Switzerland
Kazakhstan ^a	Oman	Syrian Arab Republic
Kenya	Pakistan	Tajikistan
Kiribati	Palau ^a	Thailand
Kuwait	Panama ^a	Timor-Leste ^a
Kyrgyzstan ^a	Papua New Guinea ^a	Tuvalu
Lao People's Democratic Republic ^a	Paraguay ^a	Togo
Latvia	Peru	Tonga
Lebanon ^a	Philippines	Trinidad and Tobago
Lesotho	Poland ^a	Tunisia
Liberia	Portugal	Türkiye
Libya ^a	Qatar	Turkmenistan
Lithuania	Republic of Korea	Uganda
Luxembourg	Republic of Moldova	Ukraine
Madagascar	Romania	United Arab Emirates
Malawi	Rwanda	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Malaysia	Saint Kitts and Nevis	United Republic of Tanzania
Maldives	Saint Lucia	Uruguay
Mali	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines ^a	Uzbekistan ^a
Malta ^a	Samoa ^a	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Marshall Islands	Saudi Arabia	Viet Nam ^a
Mauritania	Senegal	Yemen
Mauritius	Serbia ^a	Zambia
Mexico	Seychelles	Zimbabwe
Mongolia ^a	Sierra Leone	
Montenegro ^b		

Note: Parties with indicator “a” were represented at the second part of the meeting only; those with indicator “b” were represented at the resumed second part only; and those with no indicator were represented at both.

6. The following States not party to the Cartagena Protocol were represented at the second part of the meeting only: Liechtenstein, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Nepal. The following States not party to the Cartagena Protocol were represented at both the second part and the resumed second part: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, Cook Islands, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Holy See, Iceland, Russian Federation, Sao Tome and Principe, Singapore, South Sudan, United States of America and Vanuatu.

7. The list of organizations represented at the meeting is set out in document (CBD/COP/15/17/Add.1).

Item 1. Opening of the meeting

8. The 1st plenary session was held jointly with those of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya

Protocol, on 7 December 2022. The President of the three bodies, the Minister of Ecology and Environment of China, declared the second part of the meetings open at 10.25 a.m.²

Resumed second part

9. Following the suspension of the meeting on 19 December 2022, the meeting was resumed on 19 October 2023, at the 6th plenary session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.

10. The resumed meeting was opened at 4.05 p.m. by the Chair, Guomei Zhou, representing the President, Runqiu Huang, Minister of Ecology and Environment of China.

11. Opening remarks were made by the Chair and the Acting Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, David Cooper.³

Item 2. Organizational matters

A. Election of officers

12. Pursuant to Article 29, paragraph 3, of the Protocol, the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention also served as the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.

13. At its 1st plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol noted that the President, the Vice-Presidents and the Rapporteur who had served during the first part of the tenth meeting would continue to fulfil their functions, with the exception of two of the Vice-Presidents, who had since been replaced.⁴

14. At the 5th plenary session, on 19 December 2022, following the lack of consensus with regard to nominations of Bureau members and the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, as well as the lack of a quorum to make a decision in that regard, the President proposed to suspend the second part of the meetings of the three bodies to allow Parties to consider the matter at a resumed session of the meetings, to be convened at a later date.⁵

Resumed second part

Election of substitute officers

15. At the 6th plenary session of its fifteenth meeting, on 19 October 2023, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention elected 10 representatives to serve as members of the Bureau, as well as the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, each for a term of office commencing upon the closure of the fifteenth meeting and ending at the closure of the sixteenth meeting. As all 10 elected members of the Bureau were from countries party to the Cartagena Protocol, those members would also serve as the Bureau for the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, without the need for designating substitute members. For the same reason, the chairs of the subsidiary bodies did not need substitutes.

16. Consequently, the Bureau comprised the following members:

- Abderahmane Zino Izourar (Algeria)
- Hlobsile Sikhosana (Eswatini)
- Somaly Chan (Cambodia)

² See CBD/COP/15/17, paras. 9–23, for opening remarks and statements.

³ Ibid., paras. 26–28, for opening remarks.

⁴ Vinod Mathur (India) was replaced by Naresh Pal Gangwar, and Andrea Meza Murillo (Costa Rica) was replaced by Eugenia Arguedas Montezuma.

⁵ See CBD/COP/15/17, paras. 29–34, for further information.

- Krishneel Nand (Fiji)
- Teona Karchava (Georgia)
- Angela Lozan (Republic of Moldova)
- María Teresa Becerra Ramírez (Colombia)
- Gillian Guthrie (Jamaica)
- Eric Schauls (Luxembourg)
- Norbert Bärlocher (Switzerland)

17. The chairs of the subsidiary bodies were as follows:

- Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice: Senka Barudanović (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
- Subsidiary Body on Implementation: Chirra Achalender Reddy (India)

B. Adoption of the agenda

18. The agenda for the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, as adopted during the first part of the meeting, was as follows:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters.
3. Report on the credentials of representatives to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol.
4. Reports of subsidiary bodies.
5. Report of the Compliance Committee.
6. Administration of the Protocol and budget for the trust funds.
7. Implementation plan and capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol.
8. Monitoring and reporting (Article 33).
9. Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 35) and final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020.
10. Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources (Article 28).
11. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (Article 20).
12. Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives.
13. Review of effectiveness of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols.
14. Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16).
15. Detection and identification of living modified organisms.
16. Socioeconomic considerations (Article 26).
17. Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress.
18. Other matters.
19. Adoption of the report.
20. Closure of the meeting.

C. Organization of work

19. At its 1st plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered a note by the Executive Secretary on the proposed organization of work for

the second part of its tenth meeting (CBD/CP/MOP/10/1/Add.4/Rev.1) and agreed to organize its work as set out therein. The three bodies, which held the session jointly, established two working groups to serve them and elected Rosemary Paterson (New Zealand) as Chair of Working Group I and Helena Jefferey-Brown (Antigua and Barbuda) as Chair of Working Group II.

First stocktake session

20. On 10 December, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol held its 2nd plenary session, which served in part as a stocktake session. The session was held jointly with the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, and the Chairs of Working Groups I and II and of the contact group on budget reported on the progress made to date.⁶

First meeting of the heads of delegation

21. On 14 December, a meeting of heads of delegation was held jointly with the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, to discuss the progress made to date on the key issues under consideration.⁷

Ministerial consultations

22. On 15 December, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol held the opening plenary session of the high-level segment of the meeting jointly with the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol.⁸

Second stocktake session

23. On 17 December, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol held its 3rd plenary session, which served as a second stocktake session. The session was held jointly with the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol, and the Chairs of Working Groups I and II and of the contact group on budget reported on the progress made to date.⁹

Second meeting of the heads of delegation

24. On 18 December, a second meeting of heads of delegation was held jointly with the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol to review the draft decisions prepared by the President for the key agenda items associated with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.¹⁰

Resumed second part

25. At its 6th plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol considered a document prepared by the Secretariat on the proposed organization of work for the resumed second part of its tenth meeting (CBD/CP/MOP/10/1/Add.6, annex II) and agreed to organize its work as set out therein, except that the election of officers, under agenda item 2, would be held immediately after the consideration of credentials (agenda item 3).

Item 3. Report on the credentials of representatives to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol

26. At its 1st plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol noted that, in accordance with the relevant rules of procedure for meetings of the Conference of the Parties, the Bureau had reviewed the list of observers admitted to the meeting

⁶ See CBD/COP/15/17, para. 58, for statements.

⁷ Ibid., para. 60, for statements.

⁸ Ibid., para. 61, for further information on the ministerial consultations.

⁹ Ibid., paras. 63–66, for further information.

¹⁰ Ibid., para. 68, for statements.

(CBD/COP/15/INF/2) and would examine the credentials of delegations and report thereon at a later session.

27. Accordingly, at the 2nd plenary session, Eric Okoree (Ghana), designated by the Bureau during the first part of the tenth meeting as its representative to report on credentials, informed the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that 161 Parties were registered as attending the meeting. The Bureau had examined the credentials of the representatives of 122 Parties that were attending the meeting. The credentials of 105 delegations were in full compliance with rule 18 of the rules of procedure, while those of 17 delegations did not fully comply with it and a further 39 delegations had not presented their credentials to date.

28. At the 4th plenary session, on 19 December 2022, Ms. Jeffrey-Brown, speaking on behalf of Mr. Okoree, presented the report on credentials (CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/9/Rev.1). She informed the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that 168 Parties were registered as attending the meeting. The Bureau had examined the credentials of the representatives of 148 Parties that were attending the meeting. The credentials of 135 delegations were in full compliance with rule 18 of the rules of procedure, while those of 13 delegations did not fully comply with it and a further 20 delegations had not presented their credentials to date.

29. A number of heads of delegations had signed a declaration to the effect that they would submit their credentials, in the proper form and in their original version, to the Executive Secretary within 30 days of the closure of the meeting and no later than 19 January 2023. In keeping with past practice, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol agreed to the Bureau's proposal that those delegations that had yet to submit their credentials or that had submitted credentials that did not fully comply with the provisions of rule 18 should be allowed to participate in the meeting on a provisional basis.

30. As at 18 December 2022, formal credentials issued by the Head of State or Government, by the Minister for Foreign Affairs or, in the case of a regional economic integration organization, by the competent authority, as provided for in rule 18 of the rules of procedure, had been submitted for the representatives of the following 135 Parties participating in the second part of the tenth meeting: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Cuba, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, European Union, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, State of Palestine, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

31. As at 19 January 2023, the following eight additional Parties had submitted valid credentials: Gabon, Honduras, Malaysia, Mali, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

Resumed second part

32. At the 6th plenary session, Mr. Okoree informed the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol that 129 Parties were registered as attending the resumed second part of the meeting. The Bureau had examined the credentials of the representatives of 123 Parties that were attending the meeting. The credentials of 122 delegations were in full compliance with rule 18 of

the rules of procedure, while those of 1 delegation did not fully comply with it and a further 6 delegations had not presented their credentials to date.

33. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol took note of the report on credentials.

34. At the 7th plenary session, on 20 October 2023, the Secretariat provided an update on credentials. As at that date, valid credentials had been received from the following 123 Parties to the Cartagena Protocol: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, European Union, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Item 4. Reports of subsidiary bodies

35. At its 1st plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol had before it reports of the intersessional work undertaken since the first part of its tenth meeting, namely, the report of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice on its twenty-fourth meeting (CBD/SBSTTA/24/12), the report of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation on its third meeting (CBD/SBI/3/21) and the reports of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework on the second part of its third meeting and on its fourth and fifth meetings (CBD/WG2020/3/7, CBD/WG2020/4/4 and CBD/WG2020/5/5, respectively).

36. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol then heard oral reports from the Chairs of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.

37. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol took note of the information provided and agreed to consider the subsidiary bodies' recommendations under the relevant agenda items.

Item 5. Report of the Compliance Committee

38. At the 1st plenary session, the Chair of the Compliance Committee under the Cartagena Protocol provided a brief review of the report of the Compliance Committee on the work of its sixteenth and seventeenth meetings, as set out in document CBD/CP/MOP/10/2, which had been presented in full during the first part of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol. In accordance with the organization of work, substantive matters arising from the report were referred to Working Group II for consideration.

39. Pursuant to notification No. 2022-054, issued by the Secretariat on 1 September 2022, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol extended the term of five members of the Committee, one from each region, for two more years. It also agreed that 10 new

members, 2 from each region, would be elected later in the meeting to replace the 10 members listed in the annex to the notification whose terms would end on 31 December 2022.¹¹

40. Working Group II considered agenda item 5 at its 2nd meeting, on 8 December 2022. It had before it a draft decision based on the recommendations of the Compliance Committee contained in the annex to document CBD/CP/MOP/10/2, as set out in the compilation of draft decisions (CBD/CP/MOP/10/1/Add.5).

41. The representative of the European Union and its 27 member States made a statement.

42. Working Group II agreed that its Chair would prepare a revised draft decision for its consideration, taking account of the statement made.

43. At its 4th meeting, on 9 December 2022, Working Group II considered the revised draft decision submitted by its Chair and approved it for transmission to the plenary session as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.3.

44. At its 2nd plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision as decision CP-10/2.

Resumed second part

45. At its 7th plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol noted that the Bureau had agreed at its meeting held in May 2023, given the uncertainty at the time over when the meeting would resume, to extend until 31 December 2024 the terms of the members, in order to enable the Compliance Committee to continue its work over the intersessional period.

46. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol endorsed the extension of the terms of the members and observers concerned.

Item 6. Administration of the Protocol and budget for the trust funds

47. At the 1st plenary session, the Executive Secretary reported on the activities of the Secretariat and presented the proposed budget for the programmes of work of the Convention and its Protocols for the biennium 2023–2024 (CBD/COP/15/7).

48. The three bodies established a contact group on budget, chaired by Hamdallah Zedan (Egypt), with the mandate to consider the proposed budget for the biennium 2023–2024 in detail.

49. The Chair of the contact group on budget reported on the group's work at the two stocktake plenary sessions.

50. At the 5th plenary session, the Chair of the contact group on budget presented his final report on the group's work.

51. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol then considered draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.15 submitted by the Chair of the contact group on budget and adopted it as decision CP-10/14.

Item 7. Implementation plan and capacity-building action plan for the Cartagena Protocol

52. Working Group II considered agenda item 7 at its 1st meeting, on 7 December 2022. It had before it two draft decisions based on recommendation 3/4 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, as set out in the compilation of draft decisions.

53. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Brazil, European Union and its 27 member States and Norway.

¹¹ Owing to the suspension of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol (see CBD/COP/15/17, para. 34), the matter of the election of the members of the Compliance Committee was eventually postponed until the second part of the meeting was resumed.

54. Working Group II agreed to establish a contact group chaired by Rita Andorkò (Hungary) and Rigobert Ntep (Cameroon) with the mandate to resolve the issues associated with bracketed text in the draft decisions.

55. At its 6th meeting, on 10 December 2022, Working Group II heard an interim report on the work of the contact group.

56. At its 7th meeting, on 13 December 2022, Working Group II heard a further report on the work of the contact group.

57. At its 8th meeting, on 13 December 2022, Working Group II considered two revised draft decisions submitted by its Chair and approved them, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary session as draft decisions CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.13 and CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.14.

58. At its 5th plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decisions as decisions CP-10/3 and CP-10/4, respectively.

Item 8. Monitoring and reporting (Article 33)

59. Working Group II considered agenda item 8 at its 1st meeting. It had before it a draft decision, as set out in the compilation of draft decisions, a note by the Executive Secretary containing an overview of the status of submission of fourth national reports and the draft reporting format for the fifth national reports (CBD/CP/MOP/10/5) and, as an information document, a reference table showing how the questions in the format for the fifth national report correspond to questions in the fourth national report (CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/3).

60. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Colombia, European Union and its 27 member States, India, Malaysia, New Zealand and South Africa.

61. Working Group II agreed that its Chair would prepare a revised draft decision for its consideration.

62. At its 4th meeting, Working Group II considered the revised draft decision submitted by its Chair and approved it, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary session as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.4.

63. At its 2nd plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision as decision CP-10/9.

Item 9. Assessment and review of the effectiveness of the Protocol (Article 35) and final evaluation of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011–2020

64. Working Group II considered agenda item 9 at its 1st meeting. It had before it a draft decision based on recommendation 3/2 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, as set out in the compilation of draft decisions and, as an information document, an update to the analysis of data from the fourth national reports (CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/2).

65. Working Group II agreed that its Chair would prepare a revised draft decision for its consideration.

66. At its 4th meeting, Working Group II considered the revised draft decision submitted by its Chair and approved it, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary session as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.9.

67. At its 2nd plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision, as orally amended, as decision CP-10/7.

Item 10. Matters related to the financial mechanism and resources (Article 28)

68. Working Group II considered agenda item 10 at its 2nd meeting. It had before it a draft decision, as set out in the compilation of draft decisions, a note by the Executive Secretary (CBD/CP/MOP/10/6) and

a report of the Council of the Global Environment Facility to the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention (CBD/COP/15/8).

69. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Brazil, European Union and its 27 member States, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and South Africa.

70. Working Group II agreed that its Chair would prepare a revised draft decision, taking account of the statements made.

71. At its 8th meeting, Working Group II considered the revised draft decision submitted by its Chair and approved it, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary session as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.12.

72. At its 5th plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision as decision CP-10/6.

Item 11. Operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (Article 20)

73. Working Group II considered agenda item 11 at its 1st meeting. It had before it a draft decision, as set out in the compilation of draft decisions, and notes by the Executive Secretary on the operation and activities of the Biosafety Clearing-House (CBD/CP/MOP/10/7), the key features and developments of the new platform of the Biosafety Clearing-House (CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/7) and a needs assessment survey report on the Biosafety Clearing-House (CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/8).

74. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Belarus, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Eswatini, European Union and its 27 member States, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Kenya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Republic of Korea, South Africa (on behalf of the African States) and Uganda.

75. The representative of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development also made a statement.

76. Working Group II agreed that its Chair would prepare a revised draft decision for its consideration.

77. At its 4th meeting, Working Group II considered the revised draft decision submitted by its Chair and approved it, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary session as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.7.

78. At its 2nd plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision as decision CP-10/5.

Item 12. Cooperation with other organizations, conventions and initiatives

79. Working Group II considered agenda item 12 at its 2nd meeting. It had before it a report on cooperation with other conventions, international organizations and initiatives (CBD/CP/MOP/10/8).

80. Working Group II took note of the information provided.

Item 13. Review of effectiveness of structures and processes under the Convention and its Protocols

81. Working Group II considered agenda item 13 at its 2nd meeting, in conjunction with agenda item 17 of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and agenda item 12 of the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Nagoya Protocol. It had before it a draft decision based on recommendation 3/13 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, as set out in the compilations of draft decisions of the three bodies (CBD/CP/MOP/10/1/Add.5, CBD/COP/15/2 and CBD/NP/MOP/4/1/Add.5, respectively).

82. At its 6th meeting, Working Group II considered a revised draft decision submitted by its Chair under agenda item 17 of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and,

following the latter's approval under that agenda item, also approved it, with the appropriate changes, for transmission to the plenary session as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.11.

83. At its 2nd plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision as decision CP-10/8.

Item 14. Risk assessment and risk management (Articles 15 and 16)

84. Working Group II considered agenda item 14 at its 1st meeting. It had before it a draft decision, based on recommendation 24/5 of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, as set out in the compilation of draft decisions.

85. Working Group II agreed to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Ntakadzeni Tshidada (South Africa) and Werner Schenkel (Germany), with the mandate to resolve the issues associated with the bracketed text in paragraphs 4, 6, 9 and 11 (a) and the annex to the draft decision.

86. At the 2nd meeting of Working Group II, the Co-Chair of the contact group reported that the group had completed its work.

87. At its 4th meeting, Working Group II considered a revised draft decision submitted by its Chair and approved it, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary session as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.8.

88. At its 2nd plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision as decision CP-10/10.

Item 15. Detection and identification of living modified organisms

89. Working Group II considered agenda item 15 at its 1st meeting. It had before it a draft decision, as set out in the compilation of draft decisions, and notes by the Executive Secretary on the detection and identification of living modified organisms (CBD/CP/MOP/10/10/Rev.1), a synthesis of information on detection and identification of living modified organisms (CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/4) and a summary of the online discussions of the network of laboratories for the detection and identification of living modified organisms (CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/5).

90. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Brazil, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt (on behalf of the African States), European Union and its 27 member States, Kenya, Malawi, Namibia, New Zealand, Republic of Korea and South Africa.

91. The representative of Argentina also made a statement.

92. Working Group II agreed that its Chair would prepare a revised draft decision for its consideration, taking account of the statements made.

93. At its 4th meeting, Working Group II considered the revised draft decision submitted by its Chair.

94. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt (on behalf of the African States), European Union and its 27 member States, Kenya, Pakistan, Paraguay, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic and Tajikistan.

95. Working Group II agreed that bilateral discussions would be held as necessary to resolve an outstanding issue.

96. At its 5th meeting, on 9 December 2022, Working Group II resumed its consideration of the revised draft decision and approved it, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary session as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.10.

97. At its 2nd plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision, as orally amended, as decision CP-10/11.

Item 16. Socioeconomic considerations (Article 26)

98. Working Group II considered agenda item 16 at its 2nd meeting. It had before it a draft decision, as set out in the compilation of draft decisions, and a note by the Executive Secretary (CBD/CP/MOP/10/11).

99. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Eswatini, European Union and its 27 member States, Guatemala, Namibia, Norway, Malaysia, Mexico, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, South Africa, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Zimbabwe (on behalf of the African States).

100. The representative of Argentina also made a statement.

101. Working Group II agreed that its Chair would prepare a revised draft decision for its consideration, taking account of the statements made.

102. At its 4th meeting, Working Group II considered the revised draft decision submitted by its Chair and approved it, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary session as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.6.

103. At its 2nd plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision as decision CP-10/12.

Item 17. Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress

104. Working Group II considered agenda item 17 at its 1st meeting. It had before it a draft decision, as set out in the compilation of draft decisions, a note by the Executive Secretary (CBD/CP/MOP/10/9) and a study on financial security mechanisms (Article 10 of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress) (CBD/CP/MOP/10/INF/1).

105. Statements were made by representatives of the following Parties: Brazil and European Union and its 27 member States.

106. Working Group II agreed that its Chair would prepare a revised draft decision for its consideration, taking account of the statements made.

107. At its 4th meeting, Working Group II considered the revised draft decision submitted by its Chair and approved it, as orally amended, for transmission to the plenary session as draft decision CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.5.

108. At its 2nd plenary session, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol adopted the draft decision as decision CP-10/13.

Item 18. Other matters

109. In view of the President's decision, under sub-item 2 A of the agenda, to suspend the meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol did not consider agenda item 18 until the meeting resumed.

Resumed second part

110. No other matters were considered.

Item 19 Adoption of the report

111. In view of the President's decision, under sub-item 2 A of the agenda, to suspend the meeting, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol did not consider agenda item 19 until the meeting resumed.

Resumed second part

112. The present report was adopted at the 7th plenary session, on the basis of the draft report presented by the Rapporteur (CBD/CP/MOP/10/L.1/Rev.2) and on the understanding that the Rapporteur would be entrusted with its finalization.

Item 20. Closure of the meeting

113. As indicated under sub-item 2 A of the agenda, it did not prove possible to conduct the election of officers and conclude the second part of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its 5th plenary session.

114. Accordingly, the President proposed to suspend the tenth meeting to allow Parties to resolve their differences relating to the election of officers at a resumed session of the meeting, to be convened at a later date, and requested members of the Bureau of the meeting and officers of other bodies to remain in office until the conclusion of the resumed session. No Party expressed any view otherwise.

115. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the President suspended the meeting at 1 a.m. on 20 December 2022.

Resumed second part

116. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the meeting was declared closed at 1.15 p.m. on 20 October 2023.
