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

Origin of report

Party:	Denmark
Contact officer for report	
Name and title of contact officer:	Lene Westergaard Head of Section, Pesticides and Gene Technology Environmental Protection Agency Danish Ministry of the Environment
Mailing address:	Danish Ministry of the Environment Environmental Protection Agency Pesticider og Genteknologi Strandgade 29 1401 København K Denmark
Telephone:	+45 72 54 45 76
Fax:	+45 33 32 22 28
E-mail:	mst@mst.dk
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting report:	Henrik Hagen Olesen Pesticides and Gene Technology Environmental Protection Agency Danish Ministry of the Environment
Date of submission:	November 14, 2008
Time period covered by this report:	Interim Report (2005) – 21 January 2007

Please provide summary information on the process by which this report has been prepared, including information on the types of stakeholders who have been actively involved in its preparation and on material which was used as a basis for the report:

This report updates the DK´s interim-implementation report submitted in 2005.

The First Regular National Report as well the Interim Report on the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol are based on publicly accessible information on relevant legislation and implementation.

Obligations for provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House

1. Several articles of the Protocol require that information be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House (see the list below). For your Government, if there are cases where relevant information exists but has not been provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH), describe any obstacles or impediments encountered regarding provision of that information (note: To answer this question, please check the BCH to determine the current status of your country's information submissions relative to the list of required information below. If you do not have access to the BCH, contact the Secretariat for a summary):
Denmark has provided the BCH with comprehensive information in the listed categories and is working to improve the information flow in this area. The Danish Biosafety Clearinghouse is not yet fully complete.

2. Please provide an overview of information that is required to be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House:

Type of information	*Information exists and is being provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information exists but is not yet provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information does not exist /not applicable*
a) Existing national legislation, regulations and guidelines for implementing the Protocol, as well as information required by Parties for the advance informed agreement procedure (Article 20.3(a))	X		
b) National laws, regulations and guidelines applicable to the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.5);	X		
c) Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Articles 14.2, 20.3(b), and 24.1);			X- Not applicable
d) Contact details for competent national authorities (Articles 19.2 and 19.3), national focal points (Articles 19.1 and 19.3), and emergency contacts (Article 17.2 and 17.3(e));	X		
e) In cases of multiple competent national authorities, responsibilities for each (Articles 19.2 and 19.3);			X- Not applicable
f) Reports submitted by the Parties on the operation of the Protocol (Article 20.3(e));	X		

g) Occurrence of unintentional transboundary movements that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17.1);	X		
Type of information	*Information exists and is being provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information exists but is not yet provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information does not exist /not applicable*
h) Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25.3);			X
i) Final decisions regarding the importation or release of LMOs (i.e. approval or prohibition, any conditions, requests for further information, extensions granted, reasons for decision) (Articles 10.3 and 20.3(d));	X		
j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);	X		
k) Final decisions regarding the domestic use of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.1);		X	
l) Final decisions regarding the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing that are taken under domestic regulatory frameworks (Article 11.4) or in accordance with annex III (Article 11.6) (requirement of Article 20.3(d))		X	
m) Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.6)		X	
n) Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12.1);			X
o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)			X
p) Cases where intentional transboundary movement may take place at the same time as the movement is notified to the Party of import (Article 13.1);			X
q) Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information		X	

regarding products thereof (Article 20.3(c)).			

Article 2 – General provisions

3. Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for implementation of the Protocol? (Article 2.1)	
a) full domestic regulatory framework in place (please give details below)	X
b) some measures introduced (please give details below)	
c) no measures yet taken	
4. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 2, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
The implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in the EC relies on a wide range of legislative measures applying to the use of GMOs within the European Union, including imports. The main measures are Directive 2001/18/EC on the deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms, Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 on GM food and feed and Regulation (EC) No 1946/2003 on the transboundary movements of GMOs (adopted in June 2003). As a member of the European Union Denmark has implemented Directive 2001/18/EC on the deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms. As an EU member state Denmark is obliged to ensure the enforcement of the EU regulation 1946/2003 on transboundary movement of GMOs in Denmark and of the EU regulation 1829/2003 on GM food and feed.	

Articles 7 to 10 and 12: The advance informed agreement procedure

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

5. Were you a Party of import during this reporting period?	
a) yes	X
b) no	
6. Were you a Party of export during this reporting period?	
a) yes	X
b) no	
7. Is there a legal requirement for the accuracy of information provided by exporters 1/ under the jurisdiction of your country? (Article 8.2)	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	

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

d) not applicable – not a Party of export	
8. If you were a Party of export during this reporting period, did you request any Party of import to review a decision it had made under Article 10 on the grounds specified in Article 12.2?	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	X
d) not applicable – not a Party of export	
9. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 9.2(c).	
a) yes	X
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	
10. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for release into the environment during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Articles 7 to 10 and 12, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
There has been no export from Denmark of LMOs intended for release into the environment .	
11. If your country has taken decisions on import of LMOs intended for release into the environment during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Articles 7 to 10 and 12, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Denmark has not taken decisions on import of LMOs intended for release into the environment. Imports of LMOs intended for release into the environment is covered by EU common legislation – therefore referring to the first national report submitted by the European Community.	

Article 11 – Procedure for living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing

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

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

14. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 11.4?	
a) yes	
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	X- No decisions
15. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
During the reporting period Denmark has not been a country of export of LOMs intended for direct use for food, feed, or for processing.	
16. If your country has been a Party of import of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
The EC has developed a comprehensive legal framework on GMOs which also addresses the import of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed or for processing therefore refer to the EC-report. For further detail reference is therefore made to the submitted First Regular National Report of the European Community.	

Article 13 – Simplified procedure

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

17. Have you applied the simplified procedure during the reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
18. If your country has used the simplified procedure during the reporting period, or if you have been unable to do so for some reason, please describe your experiences in implementing Article 13, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Denmark has not used the simplified procedure.	

Article 14 – Bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements and arrangements

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

19. Has your country entered into any bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
20. If your country has entered into bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements, or if you have been unable to do so for some reason, describe your experiences in implementing Article 14 during the reporting period, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Please check the report submitted by the European Community which stats: "The EC has not entered into any bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements as per Article 14(1). The EC has determined as per Article 14(4) and 9 (2) (c) that it relies on its existing legislative framework for intentional movements of GMOs within the Community and for imports of	

GMOs into the EC. This decision has been communicated to other Parties through the Biosafety Clearing-House."

Articles 15 and 16 – Risk assessment and risk management

21. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, were risk assessments carried out for all decisions taken under Article 10? (Article 15.2)	
a) yes	
b) no (please clarify below)	
c) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X- for reason given in the EU report Q 11: "The EC applies its domestic legislative framework instead of the Protocol's advance informed agreement procedure. This framework is compatible with the provisions of the Protocol. The EC's domestic legislative framework is built on a range of legislative measures described above and listed in the annex to this report. Under Directive 2001/18/EC, a company intending to market a GMO must first obtain a written consent to this end. The authorisation procedure for placing the GMO on the market involves all Member States, as authorised products are granted free movement throughout the territory of the EU. The application (called "notification") is first submitted to the

	competent national authority of an EU Member State. The notification must include a full evaluation of the impact on human health and the environment. Having received the notification, the national authority must issue an opinion which will take the form of an "assessment report". This assessment report may be favourable or unfavourable. In the event of a favourable opinion for the placing on the market of the GMO concerned, the Member State, after having received the notification and produced the assessment report, informs the other Member States via the European Commission. The other Member States and the Commission examine the assessment report and may issue their own observations and objections. If there are no objections by other Member States or by the European Commission, the competent authority that carried out the original assessment authorises the placing on the market of the

	product and may stipulate conditions for placing on the market. The authorisation has a maximum duration of ten years and may be renewed provided certain conditions are met (for example on the basis of the results of the post-market monitoring programme). If objections are raised, the procedure provides for a conciliation phase among the Member States and the Commission. The objective of this phase is to resolve the outstanding questions. If at the end of the conciliation phase the objections are maintained, a decision must be taken at Community level. The Commission first asks for the opinion of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) on the maintained objections. EFSA is the independent scientific advisory body on food safety and some environmental issues such as the environmental risk assessment of GMOs in the European Community. The Commission then presents a draft decision to the

	Regulatory Committee composed of representatives of the Member States for an opinion. If the Committee gives a favourable opinion by qualified majority, the Commission adopts the decision. In case the Regulatory Committee gives a negative opinion or is not able to reach a qualified majority either in favour or against, then the draft Decision is submitted to the Council of Ministers for adoption or rejection by qualified majority. If the Council does not act within three months or does not obtain a qualified majority for the adoption or rejection of the Commission's proposal, the Commission shall adopt the decision. Within 30 days after the adoption of the Decision, the national Competent Authority which has first received the notification grants the written consent. During the notification process, the public is also informed and has access to the publicly available data on the Internet. A person or a company who wishes to introduce GMOs into the

	environment for experimental purposes must first obtain written authorisation from the competent national authority of the Member State within whose territory the experimental release is to take place. It is given on the basis of an evaluation of the risks presented by the GMO – or GMOs – for the environment and human health. Hence, the authorisation procedure is simpler than the one referred to above. It is a purely national procedure as it is only applicable in the Member State where the notification was submitted. However, the other Member States and the European Commission may make observations to be examined by the competent national authority. To obtain authorisation for placing on the market of food or feed containing or consisting of a GMO, the applicant has also the possibility of filing an application under Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 on GM food and feed pursuant to the "one door, one key" principle: With a

	single application he can obtain an authorisation for the deliberate release of a GMO into the environment – in accordance with the criteria established by Directive 2001/18/EC – and the authorisation to use this GMO in food and feed – in accordance with the criteria established by Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 (for more details the response to question 16). Updated lists of GMOs authorised under Directive 2001/18/EC and of pending authorisations under this instrument are available at http://ec.europa.eu/environment/biotechnology/index_en.htm. Updated lists of GMOs authorised under Regulation 1829/2003 and of pending authorisations under this instrument are available at http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/authorisation/index_en.htm. A Community register of authorised genetically modified food and feed, also including products that are subject to

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

b) yes – in some cases (please give further details below)	
c) no (please give further details below)	
d) not applicable (please give further details below)	
27. Has your country cooperated with others for the purposes specified in Article 16.5?	
a) yes (please give further details below)	X
b) no (please give further details below)	
28. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Articles 15 and 16, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
The competent Danish authorities conduct necessary risk assessments on the basis of the relevant EU legislation which provides a comprehensive system of risk assessment and risk management dealing with releases into the environment or placing on the market of GMOs, whether imported into or developed within the EC. The aim of the environmental risk assessment is on a case by case basis to identify and evaluate potential adverse effects of the GM both direct and indirect, immediate or delayed on human health and the environment. For an outline of the EU procedure please see the submitted First Regular National Report of the European Community.	

Article 17 – Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures

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

29. During the reporting period, if there were any occurrences under your jurisdiction that led, or could have led, to an unintentional transboundary movement of a living modified organism that had, or could have had, significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health in such States, did you immediately consult the affected or potentially affected States for the purposes specified in Article 17.4?	
a) yes – all relevant States immediately	
b) yes – partially consulted, or consultations were delayed (please clarify below)	
c) no – did not consult immediately (please clarify below)	
d) not applicable (no such occurrences)	X
30. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences in implementing Article 17, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable.	

Article 18 – Handling, transport, packaging and identification

31. Has your country taken measures to require that living modified organisms that are subject to transboundary movement within the scope of the Protocol are handled, packaged and transported under conditions of safety, taking into account relevant international rules and standards? (Article 18.1)	
a) yes (please give details below)	X
b) not yet, but under development	

c) no	
d) not applicable (please clarify below)	
32. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms for direct use as food or feed, or for processing, clearly identifies that they 'may contain' living modified organisms and are not intended for intentional introduction into the environment, as well as a contact point for information? (Article 18.2(a))	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
33. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are destined for contained use clearly identifies them as living modified organisms and specifies any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information, including the name and address of the individual and institution to whom the living modified organisms are consigned? (Article 18.2(b))	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
34. Has your country adopted measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment of the Party of import and any other living modified organisms within the scope of the Protocol, clearly identifies them as living modified organisms; specifies the identity and relevant traits and/or characteristics, any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information and, as appropriate, the name and address of the importer and exporter; and contains a declaration that the movement is in conformity with the requirements of this Protocol applicable to the exporter? (Article 18.2(c))	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
35. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as a description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 18, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Denmark has implemented the relevant EU legislation including provisions for handling, transport and packaging. This includes details about the labelling of products containing or consisting of LMO. For further detail reference is made to the submitted First Regular National Report of the European Community.	

Article 19 – Competent national authorities and national focal points

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

Article 20 – Information-sharing and the Biosafety Clearing-House

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

36. In addition to the response to question 1, please describe any further details regarding your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 20, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
Denmark awaits an update of a European Community Biosafety Clearing House.

Article 21 – Confidential information

37. Does your country have procedures to protect confidential information received under the Protocol and that protect the confidentiality of such information in a manner no less favourable than its treatment of confidential information in connection with domestically produced living modified organisms? (Article 21.3)	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
38. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, did you permit any notifier to identify information submitted under the procedures of the Protocol or required by the Party of import as part of the advance informed agreement procedure that was to be treated as confidential? (Article 21.1)	
a) yes	
If yes, please give number of cases	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of import / no such requests received	X
39. If you answered yes to the previous question, please provide information on your experience including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:	
For further detail reference is made to the submitted First Regular National Report of the European Community.	
40. If you were a Party of export during this reporting period, please describe any impediments or difficulties encountered by you, or by exporters under your jurisdiction if information is available, in the implementation of the requirements of Article 21:	
None.	

Article 22 – Capacity-building

41. If a developed country Party, during this reporting period has your country cooperated in the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety for the purposes of the effective implementation of the Protocol in developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and in Parties with economies in transition?	
a) yes (please give details below)	X
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developed country Party	
42. If yes to question 41, how has such cooperation taken place:	
Denmark has cooperated on an EU-level in a range of biosafety-related capacity building projects. The	

EC and its Member States have contributed to capacity-building initiatives in the field of biosafety for the effective implementation of the Protocol in developing country Parties as well as in Parties with economies in transition. The European Commission has co-financed the workshop on capacity building on Article 18 of the Cartagena Protocol held in November 2004 in Bonn, Germany. For further detail reference is made to the submitted First Regular National Report of the European Community.	
43. If a developing country Party, or Party with an economy in transition, during this reporting period has your country contributed to the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety for the purposes of the effective implementation of the Protocol in another developing country Party or Party with an economy in transition?	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developing country Party	X
44. If yes to question 43, how has such cooperation taken place:	
45. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training in the proper and safe management of biotechnology to the extent that it is required for biosafety?	
a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	X
46. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training in the use of risk assessment and risk management for biosafety?	
a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	X
47. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training for enhancement of technological and institutional capacities in biosafety?	
a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	

c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	X
48. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 22, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
No further comments.	

Article 23 – Public awareness and participation

49. Does your country promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms in relation to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health? (Article 23.1(a))	
a) yes – significant extent	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
50. If yes, do you cooperate with other States and international bodies?	
a) yes – significant extent	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
51. Does your country endeavour to ensure that public awareness and education encompass access to information on living modified organisms identified in accordance with the Protocol that may be imported? (Article 23.1(b))	
a) yes – fully	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
52. Does your country, in accordance with its respective laws and regulations, consult the public in the decision-making process regarding living modified organisms and make the results of such decisions available to the public? (Article 23.2)	
a) yes – fully	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
53. Has your country informed its public about the means of public access to the Biosafety Clearing-House? (Article 23.3)	
a) yes – fully	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	

54. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 23, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
Reference on this question is made to the submitted First Regular National Report of the European Community.

Article 24 – Non-Parties

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

55. Have there been any transboundary movements of living modified organisms between your country and a non-Party during the reporting period?	
a) yes	X
b) no	
56. If there have been transboundary movements of living modified organisms between your country and a non-Party, please provide information on your experience, including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:	
As regards exports of LMOs, notification requirements of the exporter to the competent authority of the Party of import established by Regulation (EC) No 1946/2003 apply regardless of whether the country of import is a Party or a non-Party to the Protocol. Copies of the respective documents are, inter alia, sent to the European Commission (Article 6).	

Article 25 – Illegal transboundary movements

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

57. Has your country adopted appropriate domestic measures to prevent and penalize, as appropriate, transboundary movements of living modified organisms carried out in contravention of its domestic measures? (Article 25.1)	
a) yes	X
b) no	
58. Have there been any illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms into your country during the reporting period?	
a) yes	X
b) no	
59. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences in implementing Article 25, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Question 57: Denmark has implemented domestic measures and penalize illegal transboundary moement (for details see answer to question 4 above) Additionally see the submitted First Regular National Report of the European Community.	

Article 26 – Socio-economic considerations

60. If during this reporting period your country has taken a decision on import, did it take into account socio-economic considerations arising from the impact of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, especially with regard to the value of biological diversity to indigenous and local communities? (Article 26.1)	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import	X
61. Has your country cooperated with other Parties on research and information exchange on any socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms, especially on indigenous and local communities? (Article 26.2)	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	X
62. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 26, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
The EC´s domestic legislative framework includes Socio-economic considerations. This framework is compatible with the provisions of the Protocol. Socio-economic considerations have been i.e. relevant at Member State level for the question of co-existence. Additionally see the submitted First Regular National Report of the European Community.submitted EU-report.	

Article 28 – Financial mechanism and resources

63. Please indicate if, during the reporting period, your Government made financial resources available to other Parties or received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions, for the purposes of implementation of the Protocol.	
a) yes – made financial resources available to other Parties	X
b) yes – received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions	
c) both	
d) neither	
64. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
No further comments.	

Other information

65. Please use this box to provide any other information related to articles of the Protocol, questions in the reporting format, or other issues related to national implementation of the Protocol:
No further comments.

Comments on reporting format

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

No difficulties encountered.