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INTRODUCTION

1. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) - Global Environment Facility (GEF) Project on the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs) is one of the main components of the GEF Initial Strategy for assisting countries to prepare for the entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, approved by the 16th GEF Council in November 2000. The project, which was initiated in June 2001 for a three-year duration, is designed to (a) assist up to 100 eligible countries to prepare their NBFs; and (b) to promote regional and subregional collaboration and exchange experience on issues of relevance to the NBFs. The overall objective of the project is to prepare countries for the entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol by, inter alia, assisting in the implementation of the following activities:

   (a) Assessing current technological capacity to manage biosafety issues, and the implications of this for implementation of an NBF;

   (b) Strengthening national capacity to develop national regulatory biosafety frameworks;

   (c) Strengthening national capacity for competent decision-making on notifications and requests relating to living modified organisms (LMOs), including the establishment of administrative systems to assist in this;

   (d) Applying other measures, according to the Protocol, taking into account the work of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP) and the decisions of the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol;

   (e) Supporting regional and subregional collaboration, including harmonization of the implementation of national regulations;

   (f) Raising public awareness and improving information flow to the public on the issues surrounding the release of LMOs, to promote informed debate and to ensure transparency with respect to the regulation of LMOs;

   (g) Providing all stakeholders with an opportunity to be involved in the design and implementation of the NBF.

2. The project is coordinated by the UNEP/GEF Biosafety Project Team. A regional coordinator for each region is available within the Team, to provide advice and support to countries throughout the implementation of their national projects to develop NBFs, which are intended to last a maximum of 18 months.

3. In parallel with the work with individual countries, the Biosafety Team already held regional workshops in Africa (Kenya, 16-19 January 2002), Central and Eastern Europe (Slovakia, 5-9 February 2002), and...
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2002), Asia-Pacific (China, 4-8 March 2002) and the Latin America and the Caribbean region (Buenos Aires, 8-10 May 2002), in order to improve countries’ understanding of the key issues of the development of NBFs. The workshops were targeted at National Project Coordinators (NPCs) of participating countries or potential NPCs from countries yet to join the project.

4. To assist progress at the subregional level, a series of 12 training workshops have been planned to take place from November 2002, to help build capacity in: the decision-making process (risk assessment, risk management, etc.); public participation; administrative systems; and regulatory systems. The first subset of six workshops, scheduled for November 2002 - May 2003, dealing with risk assessment and management, and public awareness and participation, was held in Anglophone Africa (Namibia, 12 to 15 November 2002); Latin America (Mexico, 10 to 13 December 2002); Asia (Malaysia, 21 to 24 January 2003); the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) (Fiji, 18 to 21 February 2003); Francophone Africa (Senegal, 22 to 25 April 2003); and the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (CEECCA) (Lithuania, from 27 to 30 May 2003).

5. It was decided that the second subset of workshops, scheduled for October 2003 to May 2004, would deal with “Development of a Regulatory Regime and Administrative Systems for NBFs”. Within this subset of workshops, to date, workshops have been convened for the following: Asian countries (Shiraz, Islamic Republic of Iran, from 19 to 22 October 2003); Latin America (Santiago, Chile, from 25 to 28 November 2003); countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (CEECCA) (Antalya, Turkey, from 9 to 12 December 2004); and countries of Anglophone Africa (Dar Es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania, from 9 to 12 March 2004). The Workshops were convened by the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Project Team, in collaboration with the Governments of the host countries.

6. The Francophone Africa Subregional Workshop on the Development of a Regulatory Regime and Administrative Systems for NBFs was held at the Ouaga 2000 Conference Centre, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, from 20 to 23 April 2004. It was convened by the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Project Team, in collaboration with the Government of Burkina Faso.

7. A list of participants is attached as Annex I to the present report.

I. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

8. The Workshop was opened at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, 20 April 2004.

Address by Mr. Samuel Yeye, National Project Coordinator and Director-General of Improving the Life Framework at the Ministry of Environment and Life Framework of Burkina Faso
9. Mr. Samuel Yeye, speaking also on behalf of the Organizational Committee, welcomed participants and expressed the pride and gratitude of the Government of Burkina Faso at being invited to host the current Workshop. He promised to do his utmost to help ensure the success of the Workshop, and wished participants an enjoyable stay in Ouagadougou.

Address by Mr. Christopher Briggs, Global Programme Coordinator, UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

10. Mr. Christopher Briggs explained how the current Workshop followed on from the Workshop on risk assessment and public participation, held in Senegal in 2003, whereby the aim now was to help countries to understand the components and choices inherent in the development of a regulatory regime and an administrative system for biosafety. He was pleased to note that the level of attendance at the Workshop showed the importance that Governments attached to the issues under consideration. He expressed gratitude to the Government of Burkina Faso for hosting the Workshop and for the high level of logistical support provided.

Address by Mr. Christian Lemaire, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Resident Representative in Burkina Faso

11. Mr. Lemaire welcomed participants and stressed that the implementing agencies of the GEF were at the countries’ disposal in support of activities for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, and to build capacities for the management of modern biotechnology, as a contribution to sustainable development and to protection of the environment and of human health. Underlining the importance of the current Workshop within the context of preventing potential risks from LMOs, he pointed to the value of an open debate on the issues raised and the importance of an exchange of experiences. Such an exchange would better equip countries in the setting up of their own NBFs. In conclusion, he expressed thanks to the Government of Burkina Faso for hosting the Workshop and for the excellent facilities provided.

Address by the Hon. Mr. Laurent Sedogo, Minister of Environment and Life Framework of Burkina Faso

12. Mr. Sedogo welcomed the participants from the subregion and others from outside Africa, who had gathered to share experiences. He underlined the importance of biotechnology for improving agriculture and the quality of life of people in the poorer parts of the world, and noted that the solutions provided by existing conventions were often not sufficient to meet the current challenges. The countries of the Sahel, in particular, could better meet their food security needs and roll back hunger by using modern biotechnology. However, there were also potential negative effects on human health and the environment, and the Cartagena Protocol was an important legal tool to deal with any problems that might emerge in that context. It was essential to
provide adequate financial support for its full implementation. He welcomed the UNEP/GEF initiative to support over 100 countries in the development of NBFs for the implementation of the Protocol.

13. Burkina Faso was honoured to host the current Workshop, which also fitted into the global preparations for the upcoming Tenth Summit of Francophone Nations, to be held in November 2004, which also touched upon the concept of sustainable development. The importance of the issues to be considered went beyond national boundaries, and called for a common vision of the problems and their solutions. The first meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, held in Kuala Lumpur in February 2004, had been a success and had given the African countries an opportunity for capacity-building to make the necessary choices and control the entry of LMOs and the potential associated risks. Burkina Faso wanted to increase agricultural production through modern biotechnology, in order to eliminate poverty and hunger. The country was also committed to the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. In that connection, he drew attention to the increasing public interest in the issue. To counter any potential drawbacks of biotechnology, Burkina Faso had initiated procedures prior to setting up a regulatory framework for biotechnology, and it was expected to be adopted soon as the basis for a regulatory regime. Burkina Faso welcomed the holding of an international conference on science and technology for agriculture in Africa.

14. In conclusion, reiterating the importance of the Workshop, he expressed thanks to UNEP/GEF and to UNDP for the support provided for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. Stressing that his country would do its utmost to ensure the success of the Workshop, he wished all participants fruitful deliberations.

15. Following his address, the Minister declared the Workshop to be officially open.

Introduction to the Workshop

16. Mr. Koffi Dantsey, Assistant Regional Coordinator for Africa, UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit, gave a brief introduction to the aims and content of the Workshop. He explained that the main objectives lay in providing participants with a better understanding of: the elements of regulatory regimes of NBFs; how the laws, regulations and guidelines formed part of the administrative process to operationalize an NBF; how a well-coordinated and well functioning NBF made it possible to meet the obligations under the Protocol; and how to promote interactions among National Project Coordinators (NPCs), with a view to enhancing regional and subregional cooperation. He introduced the work plan of the meeting (the work plan is contained in Annex II of the present report).
Ground rules of the Workshop

17. Participants agreed to adhere to the following set of ground rules for the Workshop:

- Switch off cell phones;
- Please talk to and through the Facilitator;
- Minimize background discussions, etc.

Expectations and concerns

18. Participants were invited to express their expectations and concerns in connection with the outcome of the Workshop. The resulting comments are summarized in the table contained in Annex III to the present report, as well as the comments made at the closing session of the Workshop, assessing whether the expectations had been met.

19. Mr. Charles Gbedemah, Regional Coordinator for Africa, UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit, explained that the current project was designed for capacity-building for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, whose provisions represented the bare minimum that countries were obliged to adhere to in their national framework of regulations. Thus, under the project it was inappropriate to make reference to any particular model law: first, because there were a number of model laws available; and second, while models were useful as a checklist, each country was sovereign and it was not possible to impose any one single model on the different national conditions and situations.

II. SETTING THE SCENE

Introduction to the UNEP/GEF Global Biosafety Development Project and the Implementation Projects

20. Mr. Briggs pointed to the GEF initial strategy on biosafety and its objectives and said that UNEP/GEF was implementing three main biosafety projects: the project on development of NBFs; the project on implementation of NBFs; and the project on capacity-building for the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH). He described the background facts, objectives, participation, status and budgets of the projects, as well as examples of the support provided and of the lessons learned to date. Concerning the upcoming BCH national-level capacity-building project, in particular, he described its principal objectives and planned
activities; the eligibility criteria and information on how to apply; the training materials to be made available under the project; and the elements that would soon be in place at the country level for setting up the project.

21. Following the presentation, participants sought further information and clarification on the following points: the time frame and official procedures to enable a country join the BCH project in the near future; the eligibility criteria and current participation level of the BCH project and of the implementation demonstration projects; the possibility of obtaining extensions and further funding in the case of delayed project start-up for the development of the NBF; the extent of the assistance available to a country under the BCH capacity-building project; the future relationship between the clearing-house mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the BCH; what special attention could be given to those countries lagging behind in the process of developing their NBF; and the nature of a country’s counterpart contribution to the projects.

Overview of key components of a National Biosafety Framework

22. Mr. Dantsey said that, while the NBFs differed from one country to another in line with national specific features, there were common, key elements that could be found within those NBFs. He described the five main elements of NBFs, which the Biosafety Team considered to be the key components. The first of them, biosafety policy, was usually part of a Government’s broader policy on biotechnology in general, and on agricultural production, health care and environmental protection. The second element, the regulatory regime for biosafety, was often a combination of laws, acts or decrees, complemented by implementing technical regulations and guidelines. The third element, a system to handle notifications or requests for certain activities (such as releases of LMOs) typically included administrative functions, decision-making and public participation. The fourth key element comprised systems for follow-up activities (such as enforcement and monitoring of environmental effects). And the fifth element involved approaches for public awareness, information and participation, whereby the stakeholders were informed and involved in the development and implementation of the NBF itself.

23. During the discussion, participants sought clarification on: the process and procedures of the UNEP/GEF project to develop an NBF, particularly with regard to the need for a specific biosafety policy statement; the problem of obtaining relevant, up-to-date documentation in the French language; how notification procedures could involve stakeholders; the understanding of key elements of the terminology used in the Cartagena Protocol; the experience of countries in the transitional period prior to the setting up of laws to regulate biotechnology; the lack of activities for public awareness and participation in the subregion; and how to monitor and evaluate the functioning and effectiveness of the biosafety framework set up in a country, and the possibility of external support to that end.
III. TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF NBFS IN THE SUBREGION

Sharing of regional experiences on NBF development

24. Mr. Charles Gbedemah, Regional Coordinator for Africa, UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit, gave an overview of the current status of NBFS in the Francophone Africa subregion. He pointed to the rationale for an NBF and for a national vision, together with priorities and a policy. He noted that nine countries of the subregion were currently in phase one of the project to develop an NBF; five were in phase two; and seven were in phase three. One country in the subregion was currently implementing its NBF. He listed the contexts in which countries of the subregion had chosen to locate and formulate their national biosafety policies, stressing that the process was a dynamic one, as was the process for elaborating a national vision for biosafety. He pointed to the gaps identified in the legislation surveys carried out, noting that some countries lacked primary legislation; others had legislation without enforcement mandates; and in some countries the statutes were not LMO-sensitive or complementary to the Protocol. In that connection, however, it was worth noting that any existing relevant legislation provided a basis on which to move forward for the development of a regulatory regime. He outlined the challenges countries faced in deciding whether to modify existing legislation, or whether to opt for totally new laws to govern LMOs. In addition, he noted the gaps in the administrative systems of the countries of the subregion. In conclusion, he reiterated the importance of recognizing that how each country developed its NBF was a sovereign decision, provided the minimum requirements under the Cartagena Protocol had been met.

Country presentations

25. Following the introduction, participants from two countries in the subregion gave presentations on their national efforts for the development of NBFS, setting out how they had arrived at their current stages; what choices they had made; and what lessons had been learned.

26. Ms. Nadia Chenouf, Ministry of Land Management and Environment of Algeria, gave a presentation on the development of the NBF in Algeria. She described the background and history of the process, as well as the country’s national policy for biotechnology and biosafety and the elaboration of a national strategy for the environment, with an action plan for the environment and for sustainable development. In December 2000, Algeria had adopted Ministerial Decree Number 910, banning the import, production, distribution, marketing and utilization of GM plant material, and she explained the rationale behind that move. The country had also drafted a law on the movement of biological resources, monitoring of LMOs and
management of the risks associated with the use of modern biotechnology, and she described its objectives. Under that law, a National Authority for Biological Resources and Biosafety would be set up and failure to comply with its directives would constitute a criminal act. In addition, a draft law on seeds and plants had been prepared, which was currently before the National Assembly, and she described its aims and provisions. Moreover, a draft law on safety and biotechnology was being elaborated within the Ministry of Trade.

27. In conclusion, she said that, in order to protect itself from the risks of modern biotechnology Algeria would (a) set up rigorous legislation for all products that were likely to contain LMOs; (b) set up an effective system for monitoring seeds and plants and their products for consumption, and demand labelling of LMO products; (c) permit the establishment of private laboratories to detect LMOs in seeds, plants and foodstuffs; and (d) set up a National Biosafety Committee, comprising resource persons from different fields of expertise to handle questions of biosafety and develop tools to assist in decision-making.

28. Mr. Tanteliniaina Ninah Randrianaivo gave a brief presentation on the situation of the laws concerning LMOs in Madagascar. He described the process adopted by the country in setting up a legal regime, which had involved the inventorying and analysis of national and international legal texts, as well as national and regional consultations. He outlined the principal outcomes of the inventorying activity. He described the country’s MECIE Decree, governing investments and the environment, and pointed to its provision for the conduct of an environmental impact assessment before any LMOs could be introduced. He pointed to the lessons learned in inventorying the country’s laws and to the gaps identified, as well as the benefits of using what laws already existed. In conclusion, he described the various stages in the elaboration of the law on biosafety.

29. During the discussion, participants raised the following main points: the question of creating a proliferation of new institutions, rather than expanding the remit of existing bodies; the problems of enforcing a large number of new laws, instead of merging elements into already existing laws; the problems of harmonizing trade and environmental issues; and the issue of a moratorium on LMOs.

30. Participants also sought further information or clarification concerning: the specific features of the National Competent Authority and the National Biosafety Committee in Algeria, and their respective jurisdictions; how to monitor LMOs and compliance with the law; how it was ensured that the new laws would be in harmony with the Cartagena Protocol; the technical methods used for conducting risk assessment; how to differentiate between the legal issues pertaining to biotechnology and those pertaining to biosafety; how to address the issue of laws governing LMOs developed within a country; and what provisions were in place to help the public to understand the processes governing biosafety and biotechnology.
IV. INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS

Introduction to national obligations and rights under the Cartagena Protocol

31. Ms. Camilla Mathiesen, Biosafety Division of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, gave a presentation on a country’s responsibilities and national obligations once it became Party to the Cartagena Protocol. Referring to the major provisions of the Protocol, she pointed to specific requirements in the administrative, procedural and legal fields. She also described a Party’s rights within the process of decision-making to permit the introduction of an LMO and the different types of decisions available to Parties regarding LMOs *per se*, as well as LMOs intended for food, feed or processing. Within the decision-making process, she pointed to the need to set up mechanisms for the Advance Informed Agreement (AIA) procedure under the Protocol and the need to introduce measures for risk assessment and risk management. She briefly outlined the questions of confidential information; increasing the awareness and promoting the participation of the public; transboundary movements of LMOs destined for non-Parties; and other rights of States Parties to the Protocol. She also drew attention to the decisions of the recently concluded first meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol, which had been held in Kuala Lumpur in February 2004, particularly to those decisions pertaining to: information exchange and the BCH; capacity-building; handling, transport, identification and packaging of LMOs; liability and redress; compliance; and the medium-term programme of work.

32. In the subsequent discussion, participants highlighted: the possibility of using or forming subregional groupings to synergize the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol; the possible results of failure to comply with the Protocol; and the issues involved in the harmonizing of national laws and activities with the obligations under the Protocol.

Introduction to other international instruments and to national obligations and rights that may affect NBF regulatory systems

33. In her presentation, Ms. Estherine Lisinge-Fotabong, Programme Officer, UNEP-GEF Division of GEF Coordination, pointed to other international agreements and bodies that were relevant to biosafety issues, including the World Trade Organization (WTO) (particularly its instruments that were relevant to trade in LMOs, such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS), and the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade); the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC); agreements on intellectual property; the World Health Organization; and agreements on animal health. She considered the importance of relevant international agreements that had a binding force and invited participants to see why such agreements were important for biosafety and why they should be taken into account in the development of an NBF and its component parts. She drew particular
attention to the importance of synergies and mutual support between the different international instruments, as well as at the national level. In conclusion, she stated that the elaboration of a national biosafety policy called for a balance between different factors, ranging from the safeguarding of health, the pressure from consumers and producers, and the environmental protection groups, right up to the long-term interests linked to each country’s international commitments.

34. During the discussion, participants raised the following main issues: the need to differentiate between multilateral environmental agreements that were directly relevant to the Cartagena Protocol, and other agreements, such as trade-related treaties, that were not directly of relevance; the possible conflict in some countries between the provisions of the WTO and the implementation of the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol; what to do in the case of a conflict between the obligations under the Protocol and those under an already ratified agreement; and the importance of subregional activities in pursuit of synergies for the implementation of multilateral agreements.

Project overview and linkage to NBF

35. Mr. Gbedemah pointed to the importance of taking stock of the available resources, including both human and other factors and issues which might impact on biosafety, before proceeding to the third phase of the project, which inter alia entailed formulating the structure of a regulatory regime. The stocktaking would help to determine the scope and format of what would come next, and would provide a basis for the establishment of core structures, such as a drafting committee, to prepare an NBF. It was necessary to build gradually on what had been attained and on what legislation and administrative structures that were in place, looking at what was still needed and asking what resources would be required and whether they were available and attainable. In that connection, it was necessary to consider the involvement of the stakeholders, to ensure the acceptance of the outcome of the drafting process. He reiterated the importance of keeping in mind the sustainability of the system throughout the development process and in the future. The project had only a limited duration, but the NBF had to be durable and able to take into account a country’s future needs and priorities.

36. V. REGULATORY REGIME

Introduction to choices of a regulatory regime
37. Mr. David Townend, Sheffield (UK) Institute of Biotechnology Law and Ethics, Presenter, said that the obligations placed on signatory countries from the Convention on Biological Diversity (Article 8.g) and the Biosafety Protocol (Article 2) offered a considerable degree of choice in their implementation. The obligations were alongside broader requirements that States may have undertaken through other Treaties, for example the WTO, or simply from the broader issues and agenda of the Convention or their own biotechnology policy objectives. The Protocol did not prescribe a particular instrument with direct effect to implement into signatories’ domestic law; neither did it prescribe a method for implantation. It gave certain requirements and choices of how to include a particular internationally agreed set of minimum standards within the legal, scientific, trade, and socio-political cultures of the signatories’ countries. To that end, Parties must develop policy, evaluate their legal and scientific environment, draft regulations, test and refine them, and then evaluate and revise them. At all times consultation was crucial. That journey of development was not linear – the process of drafting would undoubtedly reopen questions of policy. Further, one should, in the initial stages, focus on the “guts” of the Regulatory Regime and move to fully worked instruments at the later stages of the process. One should also consider how the administrative system was given authority through the regulatory regime.

38. He said that the Legal and Scientific Audit already undertaken would have shown that within national law there were many rules and instruments addressing the use of biology in one’s country (for example, Food Laws, Health and Safety Laws, Import and Export Laws, perhaps GMO laws, and Patent Laws etc.). That was a most important resource for understanding how to meet the obligations and objectives for the implementation of the Protocol. It also showed that there were many different sorts or levels of instruments already in use within the broader biology regulatory regime and that there were many different labels for the instruments. There were, perhaps, five different levels of instruments available to be used, perhaps in combination, to create any regulatory regime: Level 1, instruments written and approved by legislature, Parliament, House of Assembly, and then promulgated with binding effect; Level 2, binding instruments created through power delegated to an individual or group requiring formal approval by the legislature before promulgation; Level 3, binding instruments created through power delegated to an individual or group without requiring formal approval by the legislature before promulgation; Level 4a, binding decisions interpreting the instruments of Levels 1-3 by Courts or other adjudicators; Level 4b, binding decisions of Courts creating law independent of other instruments; Level 5, non-binding instruments created through delegated power to individuals or groups (in or outside government). When one compared different jurisdictions, the labels for each of the Levels were very different or were used very differently. For example, “Regulation” was used to label different things at different levels of instruments in the EU, UK and USA, where the same term labelled different sorts of instrument. One should look to the function of the instrument to make the comparison, rather than to the semantics.
39. Asking what were the options in considering how to use instruments from those Levels, he stated that, first; it was essential to understand the obligations and objectives that each country wished to achieve. Then one could consider: can these obligations and objectives be achieved by amending existing laws, by adding extra elements to existing laws, or by creating new laws? Alongside this, there were further legal tools running through the consideration of how to develop the legal regime. These were “obligations”, “authority”, “accountability” and “Natural Justice”. Those broad concepts were discussed in detail in the supporting introductory paper on the Law, provided in the materials given to participants. Beyond this, there was a set of variable considerations that indicated what sorts of instruments were most appropriate to develop the regulatory regime. These were “adaptability”, “acceptance and confidence”, and “workability and sustainability”. Adaptability: because biotechnology was a constantly changing area, and many requirements were technical, the length of time both to create and change or revise any particular instrument had to be considered. If the function to be covered required regular change, was it appropriate to have an instrument that required many years to change? That was a first element in the balance. Acceptance and Confidence represented the second. The impact of a particular instrument on acceptance or confidence of both the public and the business community also had to be considered. The instruments must have legitimacy, which could relate to the method of their creation and inherent importance of their Level. Finally, was the regulatory regime envisaged both workable and sustainable? Was it affordable in terms of finance, and resources? In conclusion, he asked: would the choices made implement the obligations and objectives of the policy and achieve predictability, clarity, transparency, accountability, fairness and confidence in a practical regime?

40. During the discussion, participants sought clarification on: the interpretation of the legal term “discretion” and how a law could ensure flexibility within defined parameters; how to incorporate legal concepts specific to one legal system into a different legal system, such as was the case with the concept of common law; what transitional measures could be applied in the period until a country had a regulatory regime in place, and what support was available to that end; and how the subregion could ensure a common understanding of the terminology used within a biosafety regime.

Studies by CISD

41. Ms. Marie-Claire Cordonnier Segger, Center for International Sustainable Development, Presenter, made a brief presentation, first touching on the tools currently being developed by a team of jurists on how to develop a regulatory regime for biosafety and the different possible approaches to that task, and subsequently comparing case studies of the NBFs in New Zealand and the Philippines. She compared the Government policy; regulatory framework; permitting mechanism; monitoring and enforcement and public participation in each of those countries’ NBFs, highlighting the very different approaches chosen in the development of
the national NBF, despite the fact that common elements were in place. All participants were provided with the materials on the comparative case studies.

**Country presentations**

42. Mr. Papa Meissa Dieng gave a presentation on setting up a regulatory framework in Senegal. He described how its aims were formulated; the process of defining the elements of the methodology to be applied; the background to preparing a relevant legal decree; the institutional context; and the need to revisit laws. He explained how public perceptions and decision-makers’ views had been taken on board in the process and described the final plan for the NBF. Among the lessons learned from developing an NBF was the need to ensure good communications and to provide adequate information, in the appropriate languages and formats, to the stakeholders.

43. Mr. Maina Bila, in his presentation on the process for setting up an NBF in Niger, described the different stages the country had pursued and the difficulties encountered thereby. Among them had been the lack of specialist legal expertise; problems in collecting information and data; and disparities in legal texts. Although the process of preparing an NBF represented a significant step forward, the NBF still needed to be improved and harmonized with other regulatory texts and provisions.

44. Mr. Bather Kone described the development of the regulatory framework and NBF in Mali, setting out its justification; the factors influencing the choices made; and the methodology applied in making those choices. Concerning problems encountered, he pointed to the difficulties experienced with regard to the time frame of the activity; the lack of a national vision on biosafety; communications breakdowns and obstacles; the difficulty of ensuring adequate public participation; and the over-centralization of the process.

45. Mr. Kouassivi Bougonou Djeri-Allassani described the process used in developing the institutional and legal framework for biosafety in Togo, outlining its legal basis and its scope, covering both intentional and unintentional releases of LMOs. He described the organizational principles and institutional arrangements, and demonstrated two possible organigrams for a regulatory system in Togo, each based on a different option. He concluded that it was necessary to produce a definitive document identifying the elements of the framework and setting out the mechanisms for public participation in the process.

46. Mr. Samuel Yeye gave a presentation on the development of a regulatory framework for biosafety in Burkina Faso, outlining the structures and programmes for biotechnology research; the institutional and operational framework for biotechnology and biosafety; the legal texts and directives for the regulation of LMOs; and the process of development of a legal regulatory regime. He described the national structures for biosafety, and listed the relevant international agreements to which the country was Party and which could
impact on biosafety. He pointed to the project progress report on how to set up the institutional framework and drew attention to the new public perception of LMO-related issues. In conclusion, he noted the need to complete the setting up of the administrative, legislative and regulatory system for biosafety, to which end, in September 2003, the Government had tasked a number of ministries with the preparation of a national strategy for biotechnology and biosafety.

47. During the discussion, participants asked the presenters specific questions on the provisions in their respective countries, and raised the following points: the need to consider the role played by non-governmental organizations in shaping public awareness; the length of time taken to undertake the preparation process and the possibility of using existing structures as a stop-gap; the relationship between the competent authority and other sectoral ministries; the need to clarify and differentiate between the different responsibilities of the actors; the importance of decentralizing the public participation process; and the financial constraints that limited effective public participation.

Introduction to elements of a regulatory regime and general provisions

48. In his presentation, Mr. Townend said that Parties had considerable choices in the interpretation of the Protocol in their national law. They already had some law relating to the use of biology and biotechnology in their countries. The Protocol obligations must therefore be developed alongside the other regimes. Therefore the Parties, having assessed the law, could feel that the existing regime adequately met the obligations; that changing the interpretation of the regime would ensure compliance; that amending the existing law would be sufficient; that implementing new legislation to fill the gaps in the coverage was necessary; or, that a new legislative regime was required; to achieve a complete compliance. He referred participants to the draft UNEP Development Phase 3 Toolkit on regulatory regimes.

49. A regulatory regime must contain three elements: general provisions, operational provisions, and other provisions. That did not imply that there must be a new, single piece of legislation starting at general provisions and ending in other provisions. The elements must be visible in the regulatory regime. The general provisions, in particular, included elements that were matters of general principle in drafting, and would be elements running throughout the regime. The other elements might be addressed in specific places in the regime. General provisions included “objective”, “scope”, “definitions” (three general principles of drafting), “institutional provisions”, and “general obligations”. “Objective” defined the aims of each instrument in the regime – why the legislation had been created. That related the legislation to the underpinning policy of the regulatory regime. He gave examples of how such clauses might be drafted and
where in an instrument they might appear, stressing that the choice of how to include the objective was largely dependent upon the particular legal culture of the country.

50. Scope differed from objective, in that it made clear exactly what an instrument within the regulatory regime did and did not cover, and he gave examples. He underlined the importance of clarity in the language used and introduced the discussion of how to make definitions in the legislation. He also outlined examples to show why and how definitions of terms used in legal instruments were crucial to the effectiveness of the regulatory regime. The difference between the use of definitions in the scientific community and in the legal community was discussed, as was the need to achieve clarity in defining the institutions given responsibility for the work, together with general provisions placing various requirements on individuals and setting the regime in place. Mr. Townend concluded with a discussion of the transitional arrangements, especially in the light of comments about the urgency to have an interim regime in place in many countries.

51. During the discussion, participants pointed to the following issues: the hierarchy of legal standards, and the fact that in some legal systems, international law took precedence over national law; the issue of intellectual property; and the problems some countries faced in the light of certain provisions of the WTO.

Introduction to operational provisions of a regulatory regime

52. Mr. Francois Pythoud, Federal Office of the Environment, Forests and the Countryside of the Government of Switzerland, Facilitator, gave a brief presentation on the operational provisions relating to releases of LMOs into the environment in Switzerland. He demonstrated an example of the Swiss legal framework at Levels 1 (Parliament), 2 (Government) and 3 (Federal Office) and described its purpose to protect humans, animals and the environment. By means of a comparison between the legal situation seven years ago and the current status of the regulation in Switzerland, he showed how provisions governing the issue of authorizations, which had earlier been placed at Level 2 of the legal machinery, had now been moved up to become part of the more important Level 1 legislation, in line with the evolving approach to the issue. The law on LMOs had also had an impact on other laws and had resulted in modifications. He provided an organigram of the Swiss system, showing the situation of the National Competent Authority in relation to the functioning of the system, as well as the entry points for public participation.

53. During the discussion, participants sought clarification on specific aspect of the system set up in Switzerland, particularly concerning the harmonization of the operations of the regulatory system at the Federal and the local levels.
Introduction to other elements of a regulatory regime

54. Mr. Théophile Paré, Biotechnology Evaluator, Facilitator, gave a presentation on the situation with respect to the regulatory provisions for the contained use of LMOs by way of the example of Canada. He described Canada’s regulatory framework and its main principles and aims, listing the various ministries and agencies involved in the process. He also outlined Canada’s law on protection of the environment, which was amended every five years, and which in its section 6 related to micro-organisms for contained use, and pointed to the way in which it defined the term “biotechnology”. He described the regulations on contained use and the types of organisms, LMOs and non-LMOs, covered by such use. Pointing to the functional provisions for containment, he described the operational and physical requirements to be put in place for each of the four designated levels of containment, established according to the risk of the organism contained.

55. During the subsequent discussion, participants sought clarification on the situation in Canada regarding whether there were non-contained trials of micro-organisms; where the micro-organisms originated; and the legal consequences of violating the established provisions.

Focus Groups 1

56. For the purpose of an exercise, six focus groups were constituted, each of which was invited to consider the following questions:

- What might be released into the environment?
- Who may have jurisdiction over the release?
- How to reflect that in the law?

57. The designated rapporteurs of the respective groups reported to plenary on the outcome of their group’s deliberations. The results of the exercise in the focus groups are contained in Annex IV of the present report. During the discussion of the work of the focus groups the following points and issues were raised: the need to differentiate between import of an LMO for research purposes by a public body and import for research by a commercial enterprise; and the lack of agreement in the countries of the subregion on the understanding of the term “release” of an LMO.
58. Ms. Cordonnier Segger gave a brief overview of the other elements of the regulatory framework for biosafety, which supplemented the operational provisions. After describing the choice of frameworks for biosafety regulation, she outlined the levels of legislation possible and the different areas of jurisdiction that could be involved in the framework. She pointed to the five possible approaches in preparing a biosafety framework, namely: do nothing; reorient or reinterpret an existing system; modify an existing system; elaborate a system to fill gaps and provide a bridging framework; set up a new system. With reference to each of the other elements (covering transparency, information and public participation, monitoring, confidential information, labelling and tracing, emergency measures, information management, new information, revision of decisions, appeal system, liability and redress, transition period, offences and penalties, entry into force, application, ethical issues, etc.) she asked the questions: What is involved? Why? Who? and When? By way of the examples of the situation in Argentina, New Zealand and the Philippines, she illustrated the different ways in which the element of public participation could be incorporated into a regulatory framework for biosafety.

59. During the discussion, participants described the situation in their own countries concerning the other elements of the regulatory framework, and sought further clarification on the following points: how countries with operational regulatory frameworks factored into the system the high costs of effective public participation; how to identify stakeholders, and whether to concentrate on involving core groups, or whether to try to be all-encompassing; the procedures, if any, for the seeking of redress; the question of establishing liability for damage to third Parties caused by LMO releases; the lack of transparency in the decision-making process in many countries; and the need to involve civil society to a greater extent in the entire process of decision-making for importing and regulating LMOs.

Focus Groups 11

60. For the purpose of an exercise, six focus groups were constituted, three of which were invited to consider the following questions on confidentiality:

- What should be confidential and what should not?
- How to reflect this in the law?

61. The other three groups were invited to consider the following questions on review, the appeal system and new information:

- What should be reviewed?
- Who can bring an appeal?
• How is it funded?

62. The designated rapporteurs of the respective groups reported to plenary on the outcome of their group’s deliberations. The results of the exercise in the focus groups are contained in Annex V of the present report. During the discussion of the exercise, participants described the legislation in place in their own countries. Some participants, referring to the appeal process, sought further clarification on precisely which bodies or individuals were able to submit an appeal to a decision concerning LMOs, and how the appeal process itself would operate.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS

Introduction to general administrative tasks

63. In his presentation, Mr. Pythoud drew attention to the implementation toolkit, approved by the Intergovernmental Committee on the Cartagena Protocol (ICCP) and contained in Annex III to its recommendation 3/5, which included as a checklist the obligations found in the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in connection with administrative tasks, legal requirements and/or undertakings, and procedural requirements. Referring to the set of administrative duties to be carried out, he invited participants to consider, in the light of the various tasks incumbent upon them in the Articles of the Protocol, whether those tasks were of a purely administrative nature, or whether they required a legal basis. In addition, he invited participants to describe, based on their own experience, who in the country was responsible for carrying out the specific administrative duties. Starting with the example of the designation of a National Focal Point, he repeated the exercise for a number of the other administrative tasks set out in the Articles of the Protocol. He underlined the fact that, where provision of information was specified by the Protocol, e.g. to the BCH, it was often necessary to update such information to ensure its accuracy.

64. During the discussion, participants described their own experiences in dealing with the administrative tasks set by the Protocol. A number of them sought further clarification concerning: the ways in which countries that had already ratified the Protocol dealt with their respective administrative tasks within the regulatory system; how to disseminate the information obtained from the BCH to stakeholders at the national level; and the administrative functions that could be performed by the National Focal Points.
65. One participant expressed the view that the office or individual designated as the BCH focal point had a potentially heavy workload, and wondered whether that might lead to problems of coordination within the national regulatory framework for biosafety.

**Introduction to administrative tasks relevant under the AIA procedures and overview of when and where to apply the AIA or FFP procedures**

66. Ms. Mathiesen gave a presentation on the AIA procedure and the procedure under Article 11 of the Protocol, and set out the respective elements of the two procedures. She also provided comparative summaries of the two procedures, which listed the LMOs covered by each of them, as well as the actors and the trigger for the respective procedure. She compared the obligations under each procedure, and their requirements with regard to decisions and decision-making, and *vis a vis* the BCH.

67. During the discussion, participants raised the following points: the possible conflict of interest in having a risk evaluation of an LMO carried out by the applicant; the need for financial support to enable countries to make use of services from the roster of experts; who should bear specific parts of the costs of administering the regulatory procedure; the question of whether plants that have been genetically modified to produce pharmaceuticals could or should be covered by the Cartagena Protocol; and the need for harmonization of the methods use for risk assessment among different countries.

**Focus Groups 111**

68. Mr. Pythoud introduced a focus group exercise on administrative tasks related to an NBF. For the purpose of the exercise, six focus groups were constituted. Three of them were invited to consider the following issue from the ICCP3 Checklist: “Ensure that risk assessments are carried out for decisions taken under Article 10 and that they are carried out in a scientifically sound manner”. Three of the focus groups were invited to consider a second issue: “Promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs”.

69. For the relevant issue, each group was asked to answer the following questions:

- *What is the current status in your country to meet this obligation under the Cartagena Protocol?*
- *What still needs to be done, and how might it be done?*
70. The rapporteurs of the respective focus groups reported to plenary on the outcome of the work in their group.

71. The results of the work of the different subgroups are contained in Annex VI to the present report.

72. During the discussions on the outcome of the focus groups, participants described the situation in their own countries and drew attention to: the need to ensure the objectivity of risk assessments, and to ensure that there was no conflict of interest concerning those who prepared them and those who evaluated them; the need to clarify the role of the national scientific committee with regard to risk assessment – should it be deliberative or technical? and what degree of specialization should it include?; and the status of risk assessment capacities in the subregion.

73. One participant underlined the need to pool human, technical and other resources on a subregional basis for the harmonization of risk assessment and analysis. Mr. Gbedemah, noting that that point provided a direct link to the next issue on the agenda of the Workshop, namely regional and subregional cooperation, underlined the fact that biosafety regulation was very capital-intensive. It was important to see how to use networking and cooperation to maximize resource use in the Francophone Africa subregion.

Introduction to subregional grouping cooperation

The situation of the West African Economic Monetary Union (WEAMU)

74. Mr. Mallick Diallo, WEAMU, gave a presentation on the perspective of WEAMU, describing the organization’s origins, background, membership and the challenges facing the member countries, including combating desertification, improving the urban and rural environment, protection of resources, and exploiting new and renewable sources of energy. He described the objectives of the organization, and the means and mechanism to translate those objectives into practice, including the harmonization of customs and legislation throughout the member countries. He stressed that a product, which was allowed to enter one WEAMU country, was free to circulate throughout the whole community. He devoted particular attention to the agricultural policies and aims of WEAMU, noting that so far there was no clear-cut WEAMU policy on LMOs. WAEMU endeavoured to set up coordinated and harmonized regional policies, with their appropriate legal instruments. Surveys were being undertaken in relevant countries of the subregion, and it was expected that preliminary legislation on the subject would be in place early in 2005.
75. During the discussion, participants sought further information and clarification on the following points: the actual steps of the process to harmonize legislation in the WEAMU member countries; how WEAMU legislation incorporated quality assurance programmes; how to reconcile the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol concerning national sovereignty with the provisions of the Treaty setting up the WEAMU common market. One participant considered that a five-year moratorium on LMOs in the subregion should be declared, in order to allow time for sufficient information to be given to the public and to develop their awareness of biosafety issues.

Focus Group IV

76. For the purpose of an exercise, geographically-based groups were constituted, each of which was invited to answer the following questions:

- Could subregional cooperation be valuable?
- What topics could be covered?
- Should we do this?
- How could we do it?

77. The designated spokespersons for the groups reported back to plenary on the outcome of the discussions in the groups. The results of the exercise in the focus groups are contained in Annex VII of the present report.

78. During the discussion of the outcome of the work in the focus groups, participants provided further clarification on the situation pertaining in their countries and raised the following points: it was not necessary to have a full-fledged regulatory framework in place before permitting the import of LMOs; and the import of LMOs in the form of Bt cotton in some areas of the subregion had given rise to concern among some of the neighbouring countries.

VII. CONCLUDING SESSION OF THE WORKSHOP

79. On 23 April 2004, the Workshop held its concluding plenary session.

Expectations and Concerns – Revisited
80. At the closing session of the Workshop, Mr. Gbedemah invited participants to again go through the list of expectations and concerns that they had drawn up at the very opening of the Workshop four days previously, to see which of them had been met or not, and with what degree of success. The list of expectations and concerns is contained in Annex III to the present report.

Evaluation Exercise and Closure of the Workshop

81. Mr. Gbedemah informed participants that their comments on the Workshop would provide important feedback to help the Biosafety Team further refine the process, and invited them to complete the evaluation form provided for the purpose. In conclusion, on behalf of the Biosafety Team, he thanked all participants for their hard work, he reiterated his thanks to the Government and people of Burkina Faso for hosting the Workshop and for their hospitality, and thanked all who had participated and contributed to the success of the Workshop.

82. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Workshop closed at 4.30 p.m. on Friday, 23 April 2004.
Annex 1 Participants List
(Intentionally removed from this report published on Internet)
UNEP-GEF Project on Development of National Biosafety Frameworks
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## Annex II - Workplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day / Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 April, Day 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 10.00</td>
<td><em>Opening ceremony</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 10.15</td>
<td>Introduction of participants (nationality, name, professional responsibility, working place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45–11.15</td>
<td><strong>Introduction to the workshop:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives of the workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better understanding of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• elements of regulatory regimes of NBFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• how the laws, regulations, and guidelines are part of the administrative processes that make an NBF actually work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• how a well coordinated NBF makes it possible for countries to meet their obligations under CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• promote interactions among national coordinators that might lead to enhanced regional and subregional cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 – 11.30</td>
<td>Expectations and concerns for the workshop (brainstorm by participants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ground rules
- Switch off cell phones
- Please talk to facilitator
- Minimise background discussions etc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 12.00</td>
<td>Introduction to the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Projects and brief history (including GEF initial strategy) - Development, Implementation and BCH (10 min for each project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 12.15</td>
<td>Overview of key components of National Biosafety Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15 – 12.45</td>
<td>Discussion on presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.45 – 14.00</td>
<td>Overview of the present NBF status of the sub-region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trends in the development of NBF in the subregion: synthesis of regional experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 14.45</td>
<td>Country presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. What regulatory regime (laws, regulations, guidelines) and administrative systems does the country have in place or is the country putting in place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Why and how did the country arrive at this choice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Does it cut across government departments or centred in only one department?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What process/mechanism did the country establish to get all the Ministries or government machinery involved? Was it a stepwise process? Was there an established stakeholder process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45 – 15.45</td>
<td>Plenary: Discussion on subregional experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some possible questions from facilitator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. What lessons have the legal surveys brought out at country level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How are the consultation mechanisms of the surveys going?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Are scientists involved in the legal survey analysis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What are some of the possible laws etc that can address LMOs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.05 – 16.45</td>
<td>International obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to national obligations and rights under the Cartagena Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.45 – 17.15</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Introduction to other international instruments and to national obligations and rights that may affect NBF regulatory systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPPC, OIE, WTO with GATT, TBT, SPS etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30 – 18.00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 April, Day 2</td>
<td>Project overview and linkage to NBF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 9.15</td>
<td>How to pass from phase 1 and 2 to Phase 3 of the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What elements to consider in drafting the NBF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How to draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where to start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who will draft, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15 – 9.55</td>
<td>Regulatory regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to choices of a Regulatory Regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implications of biosafety policy on a regulatory regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation of different approaches for a legally binding system (including use of existing or new regulatory system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation of different terms, levels and principles of norms (law/regulations/guidelines/policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factors that may influence the choice and examples of legal approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.55 – 10.25</td>
<td>Approaches to choosing a regulatory regime: 2 Studies by CISDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25-11.30</td>
<td>Short presentations before discussions of the following experiences: Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify rationale for choosing one of the approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What factors influenced the choice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How did you make and justify the choice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 12.10</td>
<td><em>Introduction to elements of a Regulatory Regime and General provisions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10 – 13.00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 14.30</td>
<td><em>Introduction to operational provisions of a Regulatory Regime</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30 – 15.00</td>
<td>Worked example on one Operational Provision - release into the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.15 – 16.30</td>
<td>Focus Group exercises on Other Elements of a Regulatory Regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30 – 17.30</td>
<td>Presentation and discussions in plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 April, Day 3</td>
<td><em>Introduction to other elements of a Regulatory Regime</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15 – 10.45</td>
<td>(e.g. Enforcement, Transparency, Accountability, Information &amp; Public participation, Monitoring, Confidentiality, Emergency measures, Knowledge management, Offences and penalties, Appeal system, Transition period, Liability &amp; Redress, New information, Revision of decision, Labelling and traceability, Entry into Force, Ethical issues etc.) One worked example (information and public participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 12.00</td>
<td>Reports from focus groups and discussion in plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 13.00</td>
<td><strong>Administrative Systems</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 13.00</td>
<td><strong>Introduction to General Administrative Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implications of the general and specific administrative tasks required by the NBF (Refer: ICCP check list and all administrative tasks in CP, on top of AIA and FFE, eg art 20 etc). For example, implications of the designation of one national authority responsible for liaison with the Secretariat AND/OR competent authorities responsible for performing administrative functions under the Protocol. Discussions in plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 April, Day 4</td>
<td><strong>Introduction to administrative tasks relevant under the AIA procedures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30 – 9.00</td>
<td><strong>Overview on when and which to apply AIA (Art 7-10) or FFP (Art. 11) procedures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 9.30</td>
<td>Summary, discussion and introduction to focus group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30 – 10.30</td>
<td>Focus groups For the following question related to the Checklist items, discuss and record your thoughts <strong>What is the current status in your country?</strong> <strong>What still needs to be done and how might it be done?</strong> ICCP” Checklist items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45 – 11.30</td>
<td>Reports from Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Focus groups on “other elements”**
3 focus groups per topic
1. Confidentiality: What should be confidential? How to reflect this in the law?
2. Review: appeal system and new information: What should be reviewed? Who can bring an appeal? How is it funded?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.30 - 12.15</td>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15 – 13.35</td>
<td>Introduction to sub regional grouping</td>
<td><em>Discussions in small geographical groupings as to the way forward on cooperation, with short reports presented to plenary (ECOWAS, MAGREB, WAEMU, ETC.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.35 – 15.00</td>
<td>ASARECA: Conceptual Biosafety Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 – 16.30</td>
<td>Plenary discussions of geographical groupings reports</td>
<td>Discussion on presentations by groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 – 16:50</td>
<td>Response to “Expectations &amp; Concerns”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:50 – 17.20</td>
<td>Workshop evaluation by participants on standard forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.20 – 17.30</td>
<td>Closure of the workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Annex III (Expectations)**

Projet du PNUE-FEM sur le développement des structures nationales de biosécurité

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENTES</th>
<th>PREOCCUPATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meilleure compréhension du système administratif</td>
<td>Eviter les obstacles au développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modèles existants / expériences des autres pays</td>
<td>Harmonisation des différents cadres institutionnels au sein d’un pays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment bénéficier d’une assistance technique et de l’expérience des autres pays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connaitre les contraintes que rencontrent les autres pays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment échanger avec les autres pays, sur le plan institutionnel</td>
<td>Réduire les écarts entre les différents pays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echange d’expériences avec les pays les plus avancés</td>
<td>Nécessite de relations plus dynamiques entre les participants aux différents projets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approche coordonnée des cadres nationaux de biosécurité</td>
<td>Réduire le déficit de communication entre les différentes parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableau de bord de l’état de l’avancement du projet dans les différents pays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application de la loi modèle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratégies à mettre en place, à développer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex IV Focus Group 1 Exercise on Regulatory Regimes

- What might be released into the environment?
- Who may have jurisdiction over the release?
- How to reflect that in the law?

**ORANGE GROUP**

**Chair: Côte d’Ivoire**

**Rapporteur: Togo.**

The group began by brainstorming and discussed various specific aspects. The resulting report was presented as follows:

**Question 1:** The types of organisms for release could be:

- Plants (trees, seeds, crops).
- Animals (insects, fish, nematodes).
- Micro-organisms (viruses, fungus, yeast).

The group examined two forms of release, namely:

- Experimental
- Commercial use.

**Question 2:** Competence

- The NCA deals with all types of release.
- The NCA in many countries within the group, in line with the aims of the Cartagena Protocol, is the Minister of Environment. In some countries, the Minister responsible for agriculture and animal husbandry is the authority that takes charge. In all countries, the responsible Minister takes a decision on the basis of scientific advice provided by a committee. That committee may encompass sectoral sub-committees, responsible for the dossiers according to the nature and type of the organisms.

The question of competence may be set out as follows:

```
  Minister responsible for the environment
      ↓
Scientific committee
```
Question 3. In law, that may be reflected in the decision-making process within the different relevant parties.
**RED GROUP**

Chair : Haiti  
Rapporteur : Benin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>COMPETENCE(S)</th>
<th>LEGAL FRAMEWORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| -Maize seed  
-Risk: environmental flow of genes in pollen  
-Antibiotic resistance  
-Pollen cross  
-Allergies and human health  
-Invasive species  
-Disappearance of useful insects  
-Resistance in wild insects  
-Pesticides, soil impoverishment, microbial infections  
-Changes in the practices? | Ministry of Agriculture  
Phytosanitary quarantine  
Quarantine: Health, Food, Supply  
Scientific: Environment, Customs  
(Min of Trade and Finances), NCA convergence, (mechanism in each country)  
Civil society participation, Art 23 of the Protocol | Framework Law  
Specific accompanying laws  
The framework law (applicable decrees, ministerial communiques, where no laws exist, it is necessary to draft them)  
Art 1 of the Protocol |
**YELLOW GROUP**

Chair: Mali

Rapporteur: Djibouti

- Question 1: Any organism may be released that does not affect the environment and human health, and for which it is possible to assess and manage the risks.

- Question 2: Release by the Government. However, that authority has to set up a process of consultation, involving all stakeholders whose views could elucidate the decisions to be taken. An organigram of the decision-making hierarchy could be as follows:

```
Competent authority

Technical depts.  Private sector  NGOs  Civil society  Others
```

It needs to be remembered that the final decision will be made at the level of the government-designated authority.

- Question 3: The group determined the following points:
  1. For general rules
  2. Set up arrangements in line with the functions (Notification, risk evaluation, means of consultation and participation, etc.)
  3. Put in place directives

**GREEN GROUP**

Chair: Haïti

Rapporteur: Morocco

Question 1: The group considered that the Article of the Protocol dealing with the objective gave clear signs of which LMOs/GMOs were liable to be released into the environment, namely those which should not have unfavourable effects, particular on
the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, also taking into account the risks to human health. The following could be released:

- LMOs/GMOs for human and animal health;
- LMOs/GMOs for human and animal food;
- LMOs/GMOs used as seed;
- LMOs/GMOs used for phytosanitary or biological reasons;
- LMOs/GMOs used to improve the plant and animal stock;
- LMOs/GMOs to combat pollution.

2- Competence should lie with the administrative authority, acting on the technical advice of the scientific authorities. The following diagram shows the process:

3- On a legal level, the release may be reflected in:

- The executive (decree, directives, other regulations);
- Parliament (law).

LIGHT BLUE GROUP

QUESTION 1:

LMOs

- Bacteria (research)
- Viruses (direct use)
- Fungi (direct use)
- GM plants
  - Seeds (research and direct use)
  - Seedlings (research and direct use)
- Animals
  - Non-living organisms
  - Molecules
  - Foods based on GMOs
QUESTION 2

- Living modified micro-organisms
  - Health, environment, agriculture, scientific research, industry and trade, customs, husbandry and fisheries
- Transgenic plants:
  - Environment
  - Health/research
  - Agriculture
  - Industry/trade
  - Customs
  - Fisheries and husbandry
  - Cooperation
  - Land management
- Animals:
  - Environment
  - Health/research
  - Agriculture
  - Industry/trade
  - Customs
  - Fisheries and husbandry (animal production)
  - Cooperation
  - Land management
- Derived products:
  - Agriculture
  - Industry/trade
  - Fisheries and husbandry
  - Scientific research

QUESTION 3
- Before authorisation, notification is needed
- Information
- Risk evaluation
- Public participation
- Decision
- Risk management, follow-up and evaluation.

**DARK BLUE GROUP**

Release: unrestricted;

Experimental: transgenic seeds, LMOs for foodstuffs, animal husbandry/embryos
Placing on the market.

Competence: varies according to the country
- the health and environment departments play a major role
- the scientific committee is a consultative body

Translation into law.
ANNEX V Focus Group 11: Exercise on Regulatory Regime (Other elements)

CONFIDENTIALITY

- What should be confidential and what should not?
- How to reflect this in the law?

ORANGE GROUP

Question 1 : The group identified

(a) information that is not confidential
(b) information that must remain confidential

(a) Non-confidential information :
- Description of the LMO
- Name and address of the notifier
- Objective and place of production, of contained use, of release or placing on the market
- Plan and method of monitoring the LMO
- Emergency intervention measures
- Evaluation of the foreseen effects of the LMO (pathogenic or ecologically disturbing effect)
- Any other information which the authority considers to be important.

(b) Confidential information :

Mutually agreed information: certain elements concerning the manufacturing process, trade secrets (use of legal references), ethical questions

Question 2 :

In the:
- Arrangements for use
- Procedures for public information and participation
- Procedures linked to confidentiality
- Procedures linked to general obligations
- Others (see existing laws)
DARK BLUE GROUP

Chair Burkina Faso
Rapporteur Sénégal

Question 1: Non-confidentiality: at the discretion of the government of the importing party.

Confidentiality: responsibility of the exporter, who may, in his notification, set out the information that should be handled in a confidential manner. In any case, the information which, according to the Protocol, cannot be confidential has to remain so, since no Party has the right to set up national legislation that accords a lower level of protection than the Protocol.

Non-confidential information:
- As in Article 21.6 of the Protocol
- The site of release of the LMO
- The name and address of the physical or legal person importing the LMOs.

Question 2: Following the approach of the Protocol, which consists of:
- On the one hand, granting the exporter the right to set out in his notification those elements that he would prefer to keep confidential;
- On the other hand, to set out in law all other pieces of information which may not be subject to confidentiality.

GREEN GROUP

Rapporteur: Gabon

Question 1: Non-confidential elements

The group referred to Articles 7 and 21 of the Cartagena Protocol and to the experiences of each of the countries:
- The name and address of the notifier;
- A general description of the LMO;
- A summary of the risk evaluation and the impacts on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, taking into account the risks for human health;
- Methods and plans for emergency intervention;
- Communicate available information to the BCH;
- Communicate information on traceability;
- Notify the existence of a patent, if any.

Confidential elements:
- Industrial information;
- Commercial information;
- Information relating to R&D;
• Information relating to litigation between the notifier and the competent authority.

Question 2:

While retaining flexibility and harmony with the legal culture of each country, broad-ranging confidential information must be dealt with at Level 1, while confidential and non-confidential information of limited range may be covered by Level 2.

REVIEW OF THE SYSTEM OF APPEAL AND NEW INFORMATION

• What should be reviewed?
• Who can bring an appeal?
• How is it funded?

RED GROUP

Question 1: The decisions. The juridical connotation of the word « appeal » is in evidence.

Favourable or unfavourable decisions will be reconsidered (permits).

Question 2: The importer, the producer, the NBC, lobby groups, civil society.

Question 3: The appellant.

LIGHT BLUE GROUP

Question 1: The decision.

Lack of a decision (which can also represent a decision).

Question 2: For new information

Bad applications of the law
   i. By poor procedure
   ii. By lack of agreement on decisions

Mistakes in the decisions

Question 3: The notifier
Civil society

Question: How to appeal?
Answer: Administrative
       Contentious

Question: How to review?
Answer: On the basis of new scientific information
       By rectifying mistakes/or negligence/or poor procedure

Question: How is the review financed?
Answer: By the notifier
       By civil society
       By the State

Constraints on review: Slowness of the decision-making for review
                      Extremely high costs of the review
                      Moreover, is there a need to establish a hierarchy for the review?

YELLOW GROUP

The group considered it useful to consider two groups of decisions:

- Decision 1: Request refused by the NCA after examination of the dossier
- Decision 2: Request granted by the NCA, but a third party calls for a review.

Starting from these two types of decision, the group used examples of the kinds of elements that could be reviewed in each case.

The following table shows the outcome of the deliberations on the subject:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has to be reviewed</th>
<th>Who appeals</th>
<th>How is it funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Request refused by the NCA</td>
<td>Importer/exporter</td>
<td>The notifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Scientific opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Request accepted by the NCA and a third party calls for a review</td>
<td>Parties affected by the decision (NGO, neighbouring countries)</td>
<td>The one calling for the review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1 Scientific opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2 errors in understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 institutional problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 new scientific information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX VI  Focus Group 111: Exercise on Administrative Systems

- *What is the current status in your country to meet this obligation under the Cartagena Protocol?*
- *What still needs to be done, and how might it be done?*

*“Ensure that risk assessments are carried out for decisions taken under Article 10 and that they are carried out in a scientifically sound manner”*

**GREEN GROUP**

What is the current situation?

For most of the countries, risk evaluations were not carried out, with the exception of Morocco, which had carried out the evaluation when introducing maize.

What needs to be done?

There is a great disparity among the countries: three groups were identified:

- Well-advanced countries: Senegal, Morocco, Burkina Faso. These countries have an NCA in place, and the NCC, studies carried out, an identified roster of experts and laboratories, a draft law (Senegal) was in the process of adoption and a law existed (Morocco);

- Intermediate countries: Gabon, Congo, Haiti, Democratic Republic of Congo: These countries have set up the NCC and identified the NCA;

- The less advanced countries: essentially Cap Verde, which is at stage zero. No structure connected with the Protocol exists.

Conclusion

In a general sense, there remains the task of:

(c) Developing a regulatory framework;
(d) Conducting awareness campaigns;
(e) Ratifying the Protocol.

**DARK BLUE GROUP**

Chair: Madagascar
Rapporteur: Gabon
**Situation in each country:**

**Burkina Faso:** Evaluation by the Ministry of Research and the Scientific Committee to be established.

**Senegal:** Nothing exists apart from the Study on Environmental Impact in the Code on the Environment. A draft decree exists, which in its draft decision-making procedure sets up a scientific and technical committee and a bio-molecular genetics committee, which will ultimately take charge of the issue.

**Guinée Bissau:** Nothing has been done. The next stage is nomination of a biosafety project coordinator for the regulatory framework.

**Cote d’Ivoire:** The draft law sets out that risk evaluation has to be carried out by a third party. A National Biosafety Committee exists, which assesses the validity of the methodology and the results.

**Gabon:** Nothing has been done apart from a draft for a scientific and technical committee for risk evaluation.

**Madagascar:** No structure as yet, but a scientific committee will be set up.

**LIGHT BLUE GROUP**

Are risk evaluations currently being carried out in your country?
- If yes
- If no  N O

What has been set up for those evaluations?
- Regulatory framework
- Expert Committee
- Equipped laboratories
- Mechanism for access to information
- Mechanism for public participation
- International cooperation
- Institutional framework

1. Regulatory framework:
   - No specific regulatory framework for LMOs (to be set up)
   - existe sur les évaluations environnementales

2. Institutional framework: ditto, to be set up
2. Expert committee
   - Existence of a primary roster of experts (to be updated and validated)
3. Equipped laboratories
   • Exist, but no structure for containment in certain countries (thus, to be set up)

4. Mechanism for access to information
   • BCH to be set up
   • Need to optimize classic structures

5. Mechanism for public participation
   • Existence of practices
   • Establishment of a framework for public participation related to environmental assessment

6. International cooperation:
   • Existence of international cooperation, but less well exploited

Conclusion
   • Define transitional measures by capitalizing on those existing
   • Set up a framework for risk evaluation of LMOs.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

   • What is the current status in your country to meet this obligation under the Cartagena Protocol?

   • What still needs to be done, and how might it be done?

“Promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs”.

ORANGE GROUP

Rapporteur: Gabon

In general, all the countries have carried out some public awareness campaigns on the advantages and disadvantages of LMOs. The countries can be divided into two groups.

In the first group of countries, which are still doing stocking taking through their surveys, there is the need to identify the structures for public awareness and education and for public participation.

In the second group that have advance in the process of developing their NBFs, there are already campaigns in progress through:

   • The organization of workshops
   • Awareness campaigns on the transport, handling and use of LMOs
   • The creation of educational tools in support of public education
   • Identification of structures permitting public participation through the regulation.

These category however need to have the following completed:
• Have the regulatory framework adopted;
• Operationalize the regulation, which will inevitably lead towards:
  i. Creation of structures or mechanisms for public participation
  ii. Realisation of forums, campaigns and workshops;

**YELLOW GROUP**

Chair: Mali
Rapporteur: Djibouti

A detail round table discussion resulted in the following matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Current situation</th>
<th>What has not been done and what still needs to be done?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Phase 1 ongoing</td>
<td>Awareness and education have to be conducted with all affected parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Ongoing, awareness-raising carried out within the framework of other strategies set up in the countries (e.g. ex CBD)</td>
<td>Use all decentralization structures set up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Awareness raising carried out within the framework of decentralization.</td>
<td>Use decentralized structures. Develop a regulatory framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Raise awareness by organizing all actors; ratify the Cartagena Protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>At the very beginning of the process.</td>
<td>Set up structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Inventory of all stakeholders and their degree of perception.</td>
<td>Use all means of communication and information networks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information gleaned from the discussion

- The public does not know about LMOs and their potential effects;
- There is a need to strengthen human capacities at all levels;
- In general, countries are at the start of the process;
- Use existing structures or strategies in the country (e.g. struggle against poverty, decentralization…);
- There is a need to involve all the actors concerned to attain the objectives of awareness-raising;
- Set up regional cooperation;
- The NGOs can serve to transmit information from decision-makers and scientists to the community.
- Demarcation of responsibilities must be mentioned in the law
- Cross-cutting law and sectoral texts
• The law must reflect popular concerns.

**RED GROUP**

Chair: Haiti
Rapporteur: Gabon

With the exception of Burundi and Guinée Bissau, who are in phase 0, all the other countries in the group are advanced in this project.

What has been done:
- Competent authority;
- National Steering Committee for the project or NCC;
- NFP, usually the Ministry responsible for the environment;
- Awareness-raising workshops, conferences, debates;
- Data collection and conduct of studies.

What has not been done:
- Validation of the study reports (except Togo)
- Strengthening of awareness-raising workshops and public information
- Establishment of a regulatory framework
- Information clearing-house, with a designated national correspondent.
Annex VII Focus Group IV: Exercise on sub-regional cooperation

- Could subregional cooperation be valuable?
- What topics could be covered?
- Should we do this?
- How could we do it?

**ORANGE GROUP**

Rapporteur: Gabon

1. Subregional cooperation is useful within the framework of implementation and policy for biosafety and related aspects, such as capacity-building, training, etc.
2. The subjects covered could be:
   - Policies
   - Regulations
     - The procedure for permitting import of an LMO
     - The procedure for dissemination, for risk evaluation
     - Emergency measures.
3. Institutional systems in the context of setting up a subregional structure for homologation.
4. Strengthening of capacities
   - training
   - communication (IEC)
   - Databases
5. Through existing regional and subregional structures, such as CEDAO, WAEMU, CEEAC, CEMAC, Indian Ocean Commission. The setting up of information networks: expertise, technical documentation. The harmonisation of policies and regulations.

**YELLOW GROUP**

1. Yes, it could be useful in so far as countries do not have the same level of information.
2. Harmonisation of legislation and scientific and technical cooperation on the subject of biosafety (norms)
3. YES
4. Creation of networks,
   Mixed committee for cooperation,
   Communal programmes within the framework of subregional organizations.
RED GROUP

1. Yes, because it allows an exchange on the implementation of the Protocol and a synergy between countries in the field of biosafety.

2. Scientific and technical aspects
   - Exchange of data and information (subregional BCH)
   - Exchange of experience and expertise
   - Research and training to strengthen capacities.
   - Policy, administrative and legal aspects

Should one undertake such cooperation?

Yes, because:
   - The Protocole encourages us;
   - Subregional practices and structures exist
   - A response to globalization.

3. How?
   - Through existing appropriate subregional structures
   - Official and effective participation by existing subregional organizations in the forums of the Convention.

GREEN GROUP

1- YES
2- All the relevant subjects dealing with biosafety, namely in the field of:
   - information
   - legislation
   - administrative and technical

3- YES
4- By setting up an adequate subregional institutional framework
   - Supporting the creation of national and subregional BCHs
   - Encouraging the harmonisation of legislation on the subject
   - By promoting exchanges and technical cooperation between research establishments at the subregional level
   - Encouraging informal exchanges.
LIGHT BLUE GROUP

1- Yes, even indispensable because of the porous frontiers.

2-  
   - Exchange of information, training
   - Expertise
   - Research for the creation of centre of excellence
   - Harmonisation of legislation and of procedures for public participation.

3 - YES

4 Information : BCH or NGO
   o expertise : creation of networks
   o research: networks of researchers (CORAF, SADC, ASAREC, ADRAO…)
   o laboratories and institutes: ICRISAT , ITA
   o training, exchange of experience

Harmonisation of policies, legislation and procedures by means of regional and continental institutions: UEMOA, UDEAC, CEDEAO, CEPGL.

DARK BLUE GROUP

1- Yes, subregional coooperation is useful, because it is a factor in harmonization policies. The natural resources are immense and the financial resources are insufficient.

2-  
   a. Biotechnology/LMO
   b. Capacity-building
   c. Exchange of information and experience
   d. Harmonisation of tests.

3- YES

4-  
   a. Promoting workshops for exchange, information and training
   b. Using existing subregional organizations as staging posts (UEMOA, Agence Africaine de Biotechnologie)
   c. Envisaging a kind of moratorium to enable each country to take the time to understand what is involved.

Supporting the implementation of the BCHs.
Annex VIII Workshop Evaluation by Participants

Introduction

The Francophone African Countries Sub-regional Workshop on the development of a regulatory regime and administrative systems, was held from April 20 –23, 2004, at the Ouaga 2000 Conference Centre, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. The UNEP/GEF Biosafety Project Team, in collaboration with the Government of Burkina Faso, convened the Workshop.

At the end of the workshops, participants were asked to evaluate the workshop both in terms of the expected results, and workshop organisation and design. The purpose of the evaluation by participants was to:

1. Provide feedback to the Biosafety team on the workshop so that the lessons learned, in terms of content and format, could be used to improve the design of future workshops;
2. Provide an assessment by participants of the quality of the inputs from the Biosafety team;
3. Enable the Biosafety team to assess the extent to which the workshop achieved its stated objectives;

Methodology

The form used for evaluation (see below) of the workshop asked participants to give a quantitative indication, on a scale of 1 to 6, of their assessment of:

1. The expected results from the regulatory regime and administrative systems workshop, Section A, questions (i) to (x).
2. An overall assessment of the workshop, Section B, questions (i) to (ix).

The rating for each question, on a scale of 1 to 6, was converted to a percentage figure based on the mean of all the responses for that particular question. This figure, in conjunction with the range of scores for each question, gave an indication of the overall assessment by participants for each of the questions.

In addition, participants were also asked to give a short written assessment of the overall workshop. This allowed them the opportunity to comment on any aspect of the workshop. All evaluation forms were anonymous so that respondents were free to give their honest opinion of the workshop.

Results

The overall evaluation by participants of the workshop was good, with an overall rating of 72% (±4%) (see Figure 1) and all participants gave positive feedback on the contents and organisation of the workshop. The results also showed that participants considered the workshop to be successful in achieving the expected results in terms of learning about the development of a regulatory regime and administrative systems for their NBF.

The results for the technical and overall assessments are discussed below under Parts A and B; this is followed by a discussion of the written comments from participants.
Part A: Regulatory and Administrative Issues
The evaluation of this workshop is discussed under each of the ten questions in the evaluation form (see annex IX). These questions are based on the expected results from the workshop as formulated by the biosafety team. The numerical results are also summarised in a chart (Figure 1).

The overall rating for the technical aspects of the workshop was 72% ± 4; this indicates a quite a high level of satisfaction by participants of the technical content of the workshop. The results for individual areas of the workshop are discussed below under each question (see Figure 1 below):

(i). Improved understanding of national rights and obligations under the Cartagena Protocol and other international agreements that may impact on an NBF.
The purpose of this question was to find out if participants had improved their understanding of the national rights and obligations resulting both from the Cartagena Protocol and other relevant international agreements. This is an important aspect of the training and was designed to help participants see the development of their regulatory regime within the broader context of relevant international agreements, and was therefore carried out in the early stages of the workshop. This question received a rating of 75% ± 16% indicating that the participants found this aspect of the workshop to be very useful.

(ii). Improving your understanding of the specific needs of your country in terms of national priorities and policies in setting up the regulatory regime and administrative systems for your NBF.
The purpose of this question was to see if participants were able to better understand the need to develop their biosafety regulations within the overall context of their national priorities and policies. Although there was no specific part of the training that addressed this aspect, both the session on sub-regional experiences and focus group discussions allowed participants an opportunity to discuss this aspect. The responses to this question gave a rating of 76% ± 16% indicating that again participants found the workshop to be useful in improving their understanding of the national policy context in developing their NBF.

(iii). Improved understanding of what are the main elements of a regulatory regime for an NBF.
This question addressed one of the main aims of the entire workshop, i.e. whether participants had improved their understanding of the main elements of a regulatory regime that they would need to include in their NBF. An understanding of the overall concept of the regulatory regime is necessary if participants are to develop the specific provisions needed for a workable regime. The rating given by participants for this aspect of the training was excellent at 75% ± 18%, indicating that the participants found the workshop to be very useful in improving their understanding of this crucial aspect of the training.

(iv). Improved understanding of the different approaches that can be taken in developing a regulatory regime for an NBF.
This question was designed to find out if participants considered that the presentation on this topic at the workshop, and the plenary discussions with examples from other countries that had gone through the same process, had given them a better understanding of making choices in deciding on their regulatory regime. The results showed that the respondents gave a rating of good to this question, 72%±18%, indicating that they had found this session of the workshop to be useful.
(v) Improved understanding of what General provisions that need to be included in the regulatory regime of an NBF.
This question sought to find out whether participants’ thought that the presentation on the general provisions that needed to be included in their regulatory regime and the subsequent focus group discussions had helped them to understand what general provisions they needed to include in their draft regulations. The results indicated that participants found this session to be useful, with a score of 77% ±18%.

(vi) Improved understanding of what Operational provisions need to be included in the regulatory regime of an NBF.
This question sought to find out if participants had found this session, the presentation plus the plenary discussions and examples, to be useful in improving their understanding of the operational provisions in a regulatory regime. The score for this session was 70% ±18%, indicating that participants had found the session to be useful.

(vii) Improved understanding of what other elements or consideration need to be included in the regulatory regime of an NBF.
This question addressed the next session of the workshop, which included both a presentation on the subject and focus group discussions, the results, 68% ±18% indicated that participants also found the session to be useful in improving their understanding of this subject.

(viii) Improved understanding of the linkages between a regulatory regime and administrative systems in an NBF.
The purpose of this session was to help participants to understand the linkages between the regulatory regime and the administrative system in formulating their NBF; this session was intended to provide the interface between the two topics covered by the workshop. The results showed that respondents gave a rating of useful, 71% ±17%, to this session.

(ix) Improved understanding of the legal and administrative requirements for AIA in your NBF.
This question sought to determine whether participants had improved their understanding of the legal and administrative requirements for AIA in their NBF. The responses to this question showed that participants also found the session to be useful in improving their understanding of requirements for AIA, with a rating of 70% ±18%. These results, supported by the results of the question on FFP (see next question) indicating that participants found the presentations to be appreciably useful in improving their understanding of these complex topics.

(x) Improved understanding of the legal and administrative requirements for Article 11 (FFP) in your NBF.
This question addressed the parallel issue of FFPs and whether participants felt that they had improved their understanding of the legal and administrative requirements for Article 11 on FFP. The results reflect the difficulty that participants are facing in making the distinction between the two procedures of FFPs and the AIA. This is indicated by the rating of 68% ±18.
Figure 1. A Regulatory & Administrative Issues

- A(i). Improving your understanding of national rights and obligations under the Cartagena Protocol and other international agreements that may impact on your specific needs of your country in terms of national priorities and policies in setting up the regulatory regime and what are the main elements of a regulatory regime for an NBF?
- A(ii). Improving your understanding of the different approaches that can be taken in developing a regulatory regime for your NBF?
- A(iii). Improving your understanding of what General provisions need to be included in the regulatory regime of an NBF?
- A(iv). Improving your understanding of what Operational provisions need to be included in the regulatory regime of an NBF?
- A(v). Improving your understanding of what other elements or consideration need to be included in the regulatory regime of an NBF?
- A(vi). Improving your understanding of the linkages between a regulatory regime and administrative systems in an NBF?
- A(vii). Improving your understanding of the legal and administrative requirements for AIA in your NBF?
- A(viii). Improving your understanding of the legal and administrative requirements for Article 11 (FFP) in your NBF?

Tot A: 72%

A: 72%

A+B: 75%

A(ii): 76%

A(iii): 78%

A(iv): 72%

A(v): 77%

A(vi): 72%

A(vii): 70%

A(viii): 71%

A(ix): 70%

A(x): 68%
**Fig 2.B Overall workshop assessment**

- B(i). Has the workshop improved your understanding of how to develop a regulatory regime for your NBF? (72%)
- B(ii). Has the workshop improved your understanding of how to set up the necessary administrative systems for your NBF? (71%)
- B(iii). Has the workshop improved your understanding of how your country could handle individual applications for the importation and/or release of LMOs? (67%)
- B(iv). Has the workshop helped you to learn more about how other countries in Africa are developing or implementing their NBF? (76%)
- B(v). How useful was the workshop for you as an individual? (78%)
- B(vi). How well organised was the workshop? (71%)
- B(vii). How did you find the balance of presentations and discussions? (65%)
- B(viii). How well did the speakers present their materials? (70%)
- B(ix). Overall, how would you rate the workshop? (76%)
**Part B: Overall workshop assessment**

The evaluation of this workshop is discussed under the nine headings based on the nine questions in the evaluation form (see annex IX). These questions are based on the expected results from the workshop and are intended to give the participants’ evaluation of the overall workshop, as well as focusing on its organisation. The overall assessment of 72% ± 4% indicating a good level of satisfaction with the workshop as a whole, including its organisation and the participants’ assessment of the overall contribution of the workshop to their understanding of their NBF.

The numerical results are also summarised in a chart (Figure 2).

(i). Improved understanding of how to develop a regulatory regime for an NBF.

This question sought to find out if participants considered that the workshop had managed to achieve one of its major aims, i.e. to help them improve their understanding of how to develop one of the pillars of their NBF, a regulatory regime. The responses to this question indicated that participants had found the workshop to be very useful in improving their understanding of this concept, with a rating of 77% ± 16%. Thus the workshop was highly successful in achieving its main aim on improving participants understanding for the development of a regulatory regime.

(ii) Improved understanding of how to set up the necessary administrative systems for an NBF.

This question sought to find out if participants considered that the workshop had managed to achieve its other major aim, i.e. to help them improve their understanding of how to develop one of the pillars of their NBF, an administrative system. The responses to this question indicated that participants had found the workshop to be useful in improving their understanding of this concept, with a rating of 71% ± 17%. Thus the workshop was also appreciably successful in achieving its second main aim.

(iii) Improved understanding of how a country could handle individual applications for the importation and/or release of LMOs.

This question addressed a practical outcome of the workshop, i.e. whether participants had found that the workshop had helped them to better understand how their NBF systems would work in practice. This aspect was addressed through presentations of a number of practical examples from countries with existing systems in place rather than through formal presentations of the subject. The results showed that the rating was slightly lower at 67% ± 16% indicating that participants found that the workshop was useful in improving their understanding of how to handle applications for import and/or release.

(iv) Helped participants to learn more about how other countries in Anglophone Africa are developing or implementing their NBF.

This question addressed one of the main objectives of the workshop, which was to promote an exchange of experiences between countries in Africa on the development of their NBF. The intention had been to provide a forum for exchange of experiences throughout the workshop by allowing participating countries to discuss their own experiences in order to illustrate various points raised by the presenters. The results showed that the participants found the workshop to be useful in promoting this exchange of experiences and gave a rating of 76% ± 18%.

(v). How useful was the workshop for you as an individual?

This question sought to find out if participants had found this workshop to be useful to them as individuals. This is an assessment of the workshop from their viewpoint as individuals and is in
many ways one of the most important questions in evaluating the overall success or otherwise of the workshop. The participants gave this question the highest rating of any question for this workshop at 78% ± 16%, indicating that participants had found the workshop very useful to them as individuals.

(vi). How well organised was the workshop?
This question addressed the organisational aspects of the workshop rather than the technical inputs and discussions. The overall rating for this question was 71% ± 17%, indicating a good level of satisfaction for the organisation of the workshop as a whole.

(vii). How did you find the balance of presentations and discussions?
This question was designed to address one of the main features of an interactive workshop, i.e. the balance between presentations to convey difficult concepts and discussions to draw out experiences and opinions from participants. The results indicated that participants found difficulty with this aspect with a rating of 65% ± 16%. These results indicate that this aspect of the workshop could be further strengthened in future workshops.

(viii). How well did the speakers present their materials?
This question asked participants to assess the speakers in terms of how well they presented their materials in order to provide feedback on the quality of the presentations. The results indicated that participants rated this aspect at 70% ± 15% indicating that they found the presentation materials to be useful in helping them to understand the concepts.

(ix). Overall, how would you rate the workshop?
This final question sought a general evaluation of the workshop as a whole from the viewpoint of the participants. This question received the one of the highest ratings of any of the questions, 76% ± 12%, indicating that most of the participants found the workshop to be very useful. These results indicate that participants, as the intended clients, gave the entire workshop a rating of good.

Written comments from participants

Participants were asked to provide written comments on the workshop in order to enable a more qualitative assessment to support the quantitative evaluation. This assessment focussed on three questions and the responses from participants are summarised below under each of the questions.

(i) What did you consider to be the most helpful part of the workshop?
The participants expressed their satisfaction at the usefulness of the content of the workshop to their individual country agenda in biosafety. They appreciated very much the presentations, the sharing of experiences and the developing of linkages and contacts among themselves.

The country presentations and experience shared (50%) and the group work exercises (50%) were selected equally among the participants as being useful during the workshop.

Some participants found the interaction between the NGOs and the private sector in a side event also very rewarding.
These can be summarised in the following comments from participants:

“L’exchange d’experience avec les autres pays francophones”

“L’evenement parallel a l’atelier: confrontation entre l’ONGs et la position de multinational”

“Travaux de groupe”

“Les differentes approaches pour developer une cadre reglementaire pour une SNB”

”Apprendre deavantage sur les autres pays francophones d’Afrique qui developpent ou mettent en place le SNB”

“Experiences presentees par les pays”

“Les debats en pleniere et dans les groupes de travaux”

(ii). What did you find the least helpful about the workshop?

Most participants made no comments under this section or just wrote “nothing”. However the few who made comments found some of the presentations were rather too long. Some participants also found the long interventions by other participants disruptive such as is stated in the statement below:

“Il fallait interrompre les longues interventions inutiles (comme les commentaries repetitives)

(iii). What suggestions do you have for improving future workshops?

Most participants highlighted the devotion of more time towards experience exchange among countries. Some participants would also prefer wholly French-speaking presenters without any form of interpretation as noted below.

“Donner plus de temps aux travaux de groupes”

“Reducer le temp de paroles des intervenants en pleniere”

“Faire l’effort de recruter des expert francophones car la traduction n’est pas tres fidele”.

“Aussi la prochaine fois il faut trouver des experts francophones et annuler le traduction simultanee”

Conclusions

The evaluation of the workshop by participants indicated that the workshop has achieved its set objectives: Better understanding of elements of regulatory regimes of NBFs, how the laws, regulations, and guidelines are part of the administrative processes that make an NBF actually work, how a well coordinated NBF makes it possible for countries to meet their obligations under
CP and promote interactions among national coordinators that might lead to enhanced regional
and sub regional cooperation.

Participants found it very useful listening to and learning other country experiences.

The assessment of the workshop in terms of its usefulness to participants was high as was
the overall organisation of the workshop.
Annex IX: Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaire d’évaluation de l’atelier

Atelier sous-régional pour les pays francophones d’Afrique sur l’élaboration d’un cadre de réglementation et de systèmes administratifs pour les Structures Nationales de Biosécurité (SNB)
Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, 20-23 avril 2004

Consignes :

1. Merci de prendre quelques minutes pour répondre aux questions suivantes afin de nous aider à évaluer notre atelier.
2. Dans chaque cas, merci d’indiquer votre réponse en entourant le chiffre correspondant à la réponse qui décrit avec le plus d’exactitude votre propre évaluation de l’atelier.
A : Questions administratives et réglementaires

L’atelier vous a-t-il aidé à (sur une échelle de 1 à 6, veuillez évaluer l’utilité de l’atelier) :

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i). mieux comprendre les obligations et les droits nationaux établis par le Protocole de Cartagena et d’autres accords internationaux susceptibles d’influer sur votre SNB ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inutile</td>
<td>utile</td>
<td>très utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii). mieux comprendre les besoins spécifiques de votre pays en termes de priorités et de politiques nationales servant à élaborer les systèmes administratifs et les cadres réglementaires pour votre SNB ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inutile</td>
<td>utile</td>
<td>très utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii). mieux comprendre les éléments principaux qui constituent un cadre réglementaire pour une SNB ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inutile</td>
<td>utile</td>
<td>très utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv). mieux comprendre les différentes approches envisagées pour développer un cadre réglementaire pour votre SNB ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inutile</td>
<td>utile</td>
<td>très utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v). mieux comprendre les dispositions générales à inclure absolument dans le cadre réglementaire d’une SNB ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inutile</td>
<td>utile</td>
<td>très utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi). mieux comprendre les dispositions opérationnelles à inclure absolument dans le cadre réglementaire d’une SNB ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inutile</td>
<td>utile</td>
<td>très utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii). mieux comprendre les autres éléments ou considérations à inclure absolument dans le cadre réglementaire d’une SNB ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inutile</td>
<td>utile</td>
<td>très utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii). mieux comprendre les liens qui existent entre les systèmes administratifs et le cadre réglementaire dans une SNB ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inutile</td>
<td>utile</td>
<td>très utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix). mieux comprendre les exigences administratives et juridiques liées à la procédure d’accord préalable en connaissance de cause pour votre SNB ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inutile</td>
<td>utile</td>
<td>très utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x). mieux comprendre les exigences administratives et juridiques liées à l’Article 11 dans votre SNB?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inutile</td>
<td>utile</td>
<td>très utile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B: Évaluation globale de l’atelier

**Sur une échelle de 1 a 6, veuillez évaluer l’atelier dans son ensemble en entourant le chiffre correspondant à votre réponse :**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i). L’atelier vous a-t-il permis de mieux comprendre comment développer un cadre réglementaire pour votre SNB ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inutile       utile très utile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) L’atelier vous a-t-il permis de mieux comprendre comment établir les systèmes administratifs nécessaires à votre SNB ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inutile       utile très utile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) L’atelier vous a-t-il permis de mieux comprendre comment votre pays pouvait gérer de son côté l’importation et/ou la libération d’organismes vivants modifiés (OVM) ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inutile       utile très utile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) L’atelier vous a-t-il permis d’apprendre davantage sur les autres pays francophones d’Afrique qui développent ou qui mettent en place leur SNB actuellement ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inutile       utile très utile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v). Dans quelle mesure l’atelier vous a-t-il été utile au niveau personnel ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inutile       utile très utile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi). Comment avez-vous trouvé l’organisation de l’atelier ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mauvaise    bonne très bonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii). Comment avez-vous trouvé l’équilibre entre les exposés et les débats ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mauvais    bon très bon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii). Comment avez-vous trouvé les présentations faites par les intervenants ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mauvaises    bonnes très bonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix). Dans l’ensemble, comment avez-vous trouvé l’atelier ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inutile       utile très utile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vos commentaires personnels sur l’atelier :

(i). Quelle partie de l’atelier vous a-t-elle paru la plus utile ?

(ii). Quelle partie avez-vous trouvé la moins utile ?

(iii). Quelles sont vos suggestions pour améliorer nos ateliers à l’avenir ?

Merci de remettre votre questionnaire rempli à l’un des organisateurs de l’atelier avant de quitter la salle.