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

Origin of report

Party:	Papua New Guinea
Contact officer for report	
Name and title of contact officer:	Dr Wari Iamo – Secretary
Mailing address:	Department of Environment and Conservation PO Box 6601, Boroko, **Port Moresby** Papua New Guinea
Telephone:	(675) 3250180 / (675) 3235842 / (675) 3250195
Fax:	(675) 3250182
E-mail:	odir@daltron.com.pg
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting report:	
Date of submission:	15 August 2008
Time period covered by this report:	March 2006 to September 2008

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:

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):
Relevant information to be made available to the BCH currently exists but has not been provided to the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) for reasons that the Biosafety & Biotechnology Policy and Bill developed under auspices of the UNEP-GEF Project is still in draft form and is yet to be endorsed by Cabinet. As provided in the Biosafety and Biotechnology Bill, information types to be made available to the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) includes for the Department of Environment & Conservation to be National Focal Point to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and Competent National Authority (CNA). Although PNG has developed a National Biosafety Framework, it is still yet to develop a Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) although UNEP has provided initial funds for commencement of the add on-project. At the present time, the only information exists includes the CNA and National Focal Point. The National Executing Agency is now in the process of nomination an Emergency Contact Point to assist towards implementing the Protocol.

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

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

e) In cases of multiple competent national authorities, responsibilities for each (Articles 19.2 and 19.3);			X
f) Reports submitted by the Parties on the operation of the Protocol (Article 20.3(e));			X
g) Occurrence of unintentional transboundary movements that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17.1);			X
Type of information	*Information exists and is being provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information exists but is not yet provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information does not exist /not applicable*
h) Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25.3);			X
i) Final decisions regarding the importation or release of LMOs (i.e. approval or prohibition, any conditions, requests for further information, extensions granted, reasons for decision) (Articles 10.3 and 20.3(d));			X
j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);		X	
k) Final decisions regarding the domestic use of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.1);			X
l) Final decisions regarding the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing that are taken under domestic regulatory frameworks (Article 11.4) or in accordance with annex III (Article 11.6) (requirement of Article 20.3(d))			X
m) Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.6)			X
n) Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12.1);			X
o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)			X

p) Cases where intentional transboundary movement may take place at the same time as the movement is notified to the Party of import (Article 13.1);			X
q) Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information regarding products thereof (Article 20.3(c)).			X

Article 2 – General provisions

3. Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for implementation of the Protocol? (Article 2.1)	
a) full domestic regulatory framework in place (please give details below)	
b) some measures introduced (please give details below)	X
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:

PNG's National Biosafety Framework was developed as part of the UNEP-GEF Project. The project commenced in 2003 with the National Biosafety Framework eventually been placed on UNEP's Biosafety website in 2005 after endorsement by the Minister for Environment and Conservation. The draft Biosafety and Biotechnology Bill is still in process of being endorsement by Cabinet which contains some legal, administrative provisions as well as relevant measures to implement the Protocol.

The Biosafety & Biotechnology Bill currently contain one set of Regulations which relate to information Required for a Genetically Modified Organism License, Risk Assessment Plan and Field Testing Regulations. The Regulations specify in general information to be included in an application, information on GMO's, conditions of release, impacts of genetically modified on the environment, information relating to risk assessment plans and containment and field testing of genetically modified organisms. Other related specific standards and guidelines with respect to biosafety and biotechnology will need to be developed at the latter stages and envisage to form the basis for an implementation Project.

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	
b) no	X
6. Were you a Party of export during this reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X

7. Is there a legal requirement for the accuracy of information provided by exporters 1/ under the jurisdiction of your country? (Article 8.2)	
a) yes	
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	X
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	
d) not applicable – not a Party of export	X
9. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 9.2(c).	
a) yes	
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	X
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:	
PNG was not a Party of export of LMO's intended for release into the environment during the reporting period.	
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:	
No decisions were taken with respect to import of LMO's intended for release into the environment during the reporting period.	

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	
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	X

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

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)	X
b) no	
c) not relevant	
14. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 11.4?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	
15. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	
16. If your country has been a Party of import of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable. With respect to financial and technical assistance and capacity-building in respect of living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing, it should be noted the Biosafety & Biotechnology Policy clearly articulate the need to promote and strengthen human and institutional capacity building, identify capacity building program and strengthen and promote in-country capacity building programs relating to importation, exporting, assessment and handling of genetically modified organisms.	

Article 13 – Simplified procedure

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

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

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:	
Although the country has not entered into a bilateral, regional and multilateral agreement or arrangement, there are provisions within the draft Biosafety & Biotechnology Bill that provide for the Department of Environment & Conservation to be Competent National Authority (CNA) and responsible in establishing arrangements for information exchange with other countries and establishing linkages with capacity building organisations in other countries. Such provisions should require establishment of regional, bilateral or multi-lateral arrangements. During the reporting period, the Competent National Authority (CAN) has not received an application to develop and import GMO's.	

Articles 15 and 16 – Risk assessment and risk management

21. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, were risk assessments carried out for all decisions taken under Article 10? (Article 15.2)	
a) yes	
b) no (please clarify below)	
c) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
22. If yes to question 21, did you require the exporter to carry out the risk assessment?	
a) yes – in all cases	
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
23. If you took a decision under Article 10 during the reporting period, did you require the notifier to bear the cost of the risk assessment? (Article 15.3)	
a) yes – in all cases	
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
24. Has your country established and maintained appropriate mechanisms, measures and strategies to regulate, manage and control risks identified in the risk assessment provisions of the Protocol? (Article 16.1)	
a) yes – fully established	
b) not yet, but under development or partially established (please give further details below)	X
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	
b) not yet, but under development or partially adopted (please give further details below)	X
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	
b) yes – in some cases (please give further details below)	X
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)	
b) no (please give further details below)	X
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:	
PNG has not being a party of import, export or transit during reporting period and that no decisions were taken with respect to Articles of the Protocol. The Biosafety & Biotechnology Bill is specifically focused in addressing GMO's as a broader issue and specify institutional arrangements including the National Biosafety Biotechnology Council (NBBC) working in liaison with stakeholders and the Competent National Authority (CNA). There are adequate provisions in establishing mechanisms, measures and strategies to regulate, manage and control risks identified in the risk assessment provisions. Such measures in summary include; a person applying for a license to prepare a risk assessment plan and should cover matters as set out in the Regulations. These include, impacts and the risks posed by the proposed activity, whether the proposed activities will promote and contribute towards the principle of sustainable development., socio-economic impacts and whether the proposed activity confirms to cultural, ethical and the traditional values of the local communities and people. The Bill further provides for views and expert opinion of stakeholders. relating to risks associated with an application. The National Biosafety & Biotechnology Council when assessing the risk assessment plan will take into account measures to prevent, reduce and eliminate any risks posed by the proposed activity. Further the draft Biosafety and Biotechnology Bill contain provisions for risk assessment and risk management to be conducted for activities involving usage and development of a genetically modified organism. information requirements includes information on genetically modified organisms, conditions of release, containment conditions, commercialisation and information on the receiving environment, impacts and risk posed by the genetically modified organisms etc. and other information as set out in the Regulations. Section 28 pertaining to Application for a Licence also make provisions additional information as prescribed by Regulations and other information as required by the Competent National Authority or the National Biosafety & Biotechnology Council.	

Regarding the transboundary movement of LMO's, the Biosafety and Biotechnology Bill specifically provide that no genetically modified organisms shall be imported, developed, field tested or field released without a license and that offenders will be convicted and fined according to amounts stated in the Bill. As provided for in the draft Biosafety & Biotechnology Bill and Policy, the country endeavours that any living modified organism, whether imported or locally developed, undergoes an appropriate period of observation commensurate with life cycle and generation time. Specifically, the Bill outlines that a licence holder shall monitor the field test site two years after the experiment to ensure the effects of the field test do not adversely affect the social, cultural and ethical values of the community and their ecosystem,

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:
No information has yet being provided to the BCH. This is further complicated by the fact that PNG has not yet developed a national Biosafety Clearing House (BCH). Participation in the project is forthcoming and has being endorsed by UNEP for PNG to participate in this project. It is envisaged the PNG Project will have a national BCH at the end of the project phase and that we can proceed in making relevant existing information available to the BCH. The major constraint in not commencing the project has being shortage of manpower. Staff have either gone on training and this has being further compounded by problems in implementing the new organisational structure due to inadequate budget allocation.

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)	
b) not yet, but under development	X
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	
b) not yet, but under development	X
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	
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	X
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:	
According to the Biosafety & Biotechnology Bill and Policy, the National Biosafety & Biotechnology Council will be established to carry out these functions including the need to develop Regulations relating to importation, development, field test, release, usage, handling, administration, labelling, awareness, monitoring and enforcement of genetically modified organisms. The current Bill and Policy does not at the present time contain specific provisions relating to handling, packaging, transportation and identification and is envisage to form the next phase in implementing the National Biosafety Framework.	

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:
It is anticipated the BCH Project should commence shortly to emanate in the establishment of a national BCH to facilitate information exchange between countries and Biosafety Focal Point of the CBD. Delays in commencing the project have being due to shortage of manpower and lack of financial resources.

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	X
c) not applicable – not a Party of import / no such requests received	
39. If you answered yes to the previous question, please provide information on your experience including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:	
The draft Biosafety & Biotechnology Bill and Policy has provision to some extent to protect confidential information received under the Protocol. The Bill in general states that any confidential commercial information contained in the documents as determined by the Competent National Authority (CNA) shall not be released to the public.	
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:	
PNG not a party of export during the reporting period.	

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:	
PNG was among one of the Pacific Island Countries to participate in the UNEP/GEF Project to develop its National Biosafety Framework enabling it to comply with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Through this project human resource and institutional capacity was developed to some extent in the NEA and among stakeholders.	
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)	X
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developing country Party	
44. If yes to question 43, how has such cooperation taken place:	
As a participating country to the UNEP/GEF Project on Development of National Biosafety Frameworks, capacity building to other developing countries has being minimal. As one of the participating country in the Pacific Region, our participation in biosafety has being through UNEP/GEF Biosafety Regional workshops and through the Biotechnology Working Group hosted through South Pacific Commission (SPC) and other regional stakeholders. In the region, capacity building has mainly focused on information sharing and sharing of experiences in the Development of National Biosafety Frameworks. The national project coordinated through UNEP has provided opportunity to build capacity in fields relevant to biosafety and modern biotechnology in the country. The country projects working with regional organisations have recommended key issues which need developing at regional level and anticipated to form the basis for a future implementation regional biosafety project. The activities identified include; public awareness materials, development of biosafety standards, development of legal instruments, sharing of facilities etc.	
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)	X
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	
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)	X
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	
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)	X
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	
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:	
PNG's participation in the UNEP/GEF Projects to develop National Biosafety Frameworks has to some extent built human resource and institutional capacity in areas of biosafety and biotechnology among the CNA and stakeholders. Despite this, PNG has not had the opportunity to participate in number of training workshops especially on risk assessment and risk management on Biosafety. In addition, very little progress has being made with respect to cooperation for technical and scientific training for enhancement of technological and institutional capacities in biosafety. Obstacles especially in learning institutions and some academic institutions has been shortage of manpower where those who have being involved in the Development project have progressed to higher studies overseas. Currently there are students from the University of Technology, Biotechnology Centre currently pursing higher degrees overseas in Biotechnology.	

Article 23 – Public awareness and participation

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

a) yes – fully	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
52. Does your country, in accordance with its respective laws and regulations, consult the public in the decision-making process regarding living modified organisms and make the results of such decisions available to the public? (Article 23.2)	
a) yes – fully	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
53. Has your country informed its public about the means of public access to the Biosafety Clearing-House? (Article 23.3)	
a) yes – fully	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	X
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:	
The draft Biosafety & Biotechnology Bill contains specific provisions for publication of an Application and Public Access to certain documents. The draft Bill provides for publication of an application in the National Gazette, newspapers, radios and other means which the National Biosafety & Biotechnology deems appropriate. The notice in particular will be required to contain the following information; • The proposed risk assessment and risk management plan • Invite written or oral submissions on whether a License should be issued. • Provide details of oral submissions including dates and period (3 months) from when the submissions be made to the National Biosafety & Biotechnology Council In addition, provisions for public access to documents upon request to the Competent National Authority exist upon lodgement of a prescribed fee. The development and implementation of a Public Awareness Strategy will form a core basis for a future implementation project.	

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	
b) no	X
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:	
Not applicable	

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	
b) no	X
58. Have there been any illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms into your country during the reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
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:	
Although there are no records on the transboundary movement of living modified organisms, there are reports on illegal importation of food products that are genetically modified.	

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	X
d) not a Party of import	
61. Has your country cooperated with other Parties on research and information exchange on any socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms, especially on indigenous and local communities? (Article 26.2)	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
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:	
No application to import or to develop a genetically modified organism was received by the Competent National Authority (CNA).	

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	
b) yes – received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions	X
c) both	
d) neither	

64. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
The only assistance PNG received with respect to financial resources for the purposes of implementing of the Protocol was from UNEP/GEF Project to assist countries develop their National Biosafety Framework. Development of a National Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) to be funded by UNEP is forthcoming.

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:
Although PNG has a draft Bill developed as part of a UNEP/GEF Project to implement the Protocol, the draft Bill is yet to be endorsement by Cabinet. During the reporting period, no applications from an exporter both in-country and out of the country was received by the Competent National Authority (CNA). . Although information with respect to the questions appear clear, information available to compile this National Report has being poor and more time is needed to be spent with stakeholders to provide a much more comprehensive and clear situation of what is occurring in the country. The feed back from stakeholders has being poor and that the Competent National Authority (CNA) needs to take proactive efforts in carrying out a nationwide survey on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in the country.

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:

Questions appear to be straight forward and easy to respond to.