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

GUIDELINES FOR USE OF THE REPORTING FORMAT

The following format for preparation of the first regular national report on implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety called for under Article 33 of the Protocol is a series of questions based on those elements of the Protocol that establish obligations for Contracting Parties. Responses to these questions will help Parties to review the extent to which they are successfully implementing the provisions of the Protocol and will assist the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol to assess the overall status of implementation of the Convention.

The deadline for submission of the first regular national report is no less than 12 months prior to the fourth meeting of Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol. It is intended to cover activities undertaken between entry into force of the Protocol for the reporting Party and the date of reporting.

For subsequent national reports, the format is expected to evolve, as questions that are no longer relevant after the first national report may be deleted, questions that are relevant to ongoing progress in implementation will be retained, and additional questions will be formulated pursuant to future decisions of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

The wording of questions follows the wording of the relevant articles of the Protocol as closely as possible. The use of terms in the questions follows the meanings accorded to them under Article 3 of the Protocol.

The format tries to minimize the reporting burden on Parties, while eliciting the important information regarding implementation of the provisions of the Protocol. Many questions require only a tick in one or more boxes. 1/ Other questions seek a qualitative description of experiences and progress, including obstacles and impediments to the implementation of particular provisions. 2/ Although there is no set limit on length of text, in order to assist with the review and synthesis of the information in the reports, respondents are asked to ensure that answers are as relevant and as succinct as possible.

The information provided by Parties will not be used to rank performance or to otherwise compare implementation between individual Parties.

The Executive Secretary welcomes any comments on the adequacy of the questions, and difficulties in completing the questions, and any further recommendations on how these reporting guidelines could be improved. Space is provided for such comments at the end of the report**.**

It is recommended that Parties involve all relevant stakeholders in the preparation of the report, in order to ensure a participatory and transparent approach to its development and the accuracy of the information requested. A box is provided in which to identify those groups who have been involved.

Parties are requested to submit an original signed copy by post and an electronic copy on diskette or by electronic mail. An electronic version of this document will be sent to all national focal points and this will also be available from the Convention's website at: http://www.biodiv.org

---

1/ If you feel that, in order to properly reflect the circumstances, it is necessary to tick more than one box, please do so. In this case, you are encouraged to provide further information in the text answers that follow to enable any analysis of results to appropriately reflect the spirit of your answers.

2/ Please feel free to append to the report further information on any of the questions.

Completed reports and any comments should be sent to:

The Executive Secretary
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
World Trade Centre
413 St. Jacques Street West, suite 800
Montreal, Quebec
H2Y 1N9 Canada

Fax: (+1 514) 288 6588
e-mail: secretariat@biodiv.org

Origin of report

Party:	
Contact officer for report	
Name and title of contact officer:	**Secretary Estrella F. Alabastro** **Chairperson, National Committee on Biosafety of the Philippines**
Mailing address:	**Department of Science and Technology, General Santos Avenue, Taguig, Metro Manila, Philippines**
Telephone:	**(632)837-20-71 to 82 local 2510; (632)837-2939**
Fax:	**(632)837-2930/(632)837-8943**
E-mail:	**efa@dost.gov.ph**
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting report:	for Secretary Estrella F. Alabastro
Date of submission:	
Time period covered by this report:	**The report is the First National Report submitted as a Party since the Protocol entered into force for the Philippines on 8 January 2007 and covers biosafety regulations as early as 1990 i.e. EO 430 s. 1990 "Creation of the National Committee on Biosafety of the Philippines".**

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:

The preparation of this report was initiated by Technical Working Group of the National Competent Authorities, namely: Departments of Agriculture, Department of Science and Technology, Department of Environment and Natural Resources and Department of Health.

Public consultation was conducted on 29 April 2008 prior to the finalization of this 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):

The Philippines has not uploaded its BCH into the international portal. Thus, we are providing you the following information required by the international BCH.

Information required to be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House:

(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))

1. **Executive Order 514 series 2006 "Establishing The National Biosafety Framework, Prescribing Guidelines For Its Implementation, Strengthening the National Committee on Biosafety of the Philippines and For Other Purposes"**
2. **Executive Order 430 series 1990 "Constituting the National Committee on Biosafety of the Philippines"**
3. **Philippine Biosafety Guidelines, NCBP Series 1, 1990**
4. **Guidelines on Planned Release of Genetically Manipulated Organisms (GMOs) and Potentially Harmful Exotic Species (PHES), NCBP Series 1, May 1998**
5. **Department of Agriculture Administrative Order No. 8 series 2002 "Rules and Regulations on the Importation and Release Into the Environment of Plant and Plant Products Derived From the Use of Modern Biotechnology"**
6. **DA Memorandum Circulars Pursuant to DA AO No. 8**

    6.1 DA Memorandum Circular No. 11, Series of 2003, Additional Signatories to the Declaration of GMO Content Pursuant to DA Memorandum Circular No. 8 s. 2003

    6.2 DA Memorandum Circular No. 12, Series of 2003, Annexes I, I and II Pursuant to Memorandum Circular No. 8 s. 2003 and DA AO No. 8, s. 2002

    6.3 DA Memorandum Circular No. 17, Series of 2003, Additional Requirements for the Insect Resistance Management (IRM) Strategy in Bt Corn

    6.4 DA Memorandum Circular No. 8, Series of 2003, Guidelines for the Phytosanitary Inspection of Regulated Articles for Food, Feed and Processing, Pursuant to AO No. 8 (Series of 2002), "Rules and Regulations for the Importation and Release Into the Environment of Plants and Plant Products Derived from the Use of Modern Biotechnology"

6.5 DA Memorandum Circular No. 8, Series of 2005, Risk Assessment For Stacked Gene Products Imported for Direct Use as Food and Feed or Processing

6.6 DA Memorandum Circular No. 6, Series of 2004, Risk Assessment of Plants Carrying Stacked Genes For Release Into the Environment

6.7 DA Memorandum Circular No. 8, Series of 2005, Strengthening the DA's Science-Based Insect Resistance Management for Bt Corn and Amending Section III.a.(ii) of Memorandum Circular No. 17, Series of 2003

6.8 DA Memorandum Circular No. 2, Series of 2007, Guidelines for the Renewal of Permit of Regulated Articles for Propagation, Pursuant to A.O. No. 8, s. 2002, "Rules and Regulations for the Importation and Release into the Environmental of Plants and Plant Products Derived from the Use of Modern Biotechnology

6.9 DA Memorandum Circular No. 4, Series of 2007, Revised Procedural Guidelines and Templates for Bt Corn Insect Resistance Management (IRM) Monitoring and Reporting

6.10 DA Memorandum Circular No. 5, Series of 2007, Guidelines for the Safety Evaluation of Plants Derived from Modern Biotechnology Prior to Propagation

6.11 DA Memorandum Circular No. 6, Series of 2007, Guidelines for the Renewal of Permit of Regulated Articles for Direct Use as Food and Feed, or for Processing, Pursuant to A.O. No. 8, s. 2002, "Rules and Regulations for the Importation and Release into the Environmental of Plants and Plant Products Derived from the Use of Modern Biotechnology" as Amended by A.O. No. 8, s. 2002, "Approval Process for the Importation of Regulated Articles For Direct Use as Food or Feed, or for Processing"

7. DA AO No. 22 series 2007 "Amending Specific sections of Apart V of DA AO No. 8 s. 2002, "Approval Process For The Importation of Regulated articles for Direct Use as Food or Feed or for Processing"

(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);

Department of Agriculture AO No. 8s. 2002 and DA Memorandum Circular No. 8s. 2003

(c) Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Articles 14.2, 20.3(b), and 24.1)

- None at present/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));

Estrella F. Alabastro

Secretary, Department of Science and Technology

and Chairperson, National Committee on Biosafety for the Philippines

Gen. Santos Avenue, Bicutan, Taguig City

Telephone nos.: (632) 8372939 / 8372943

Email: efa@dost.gov.ph

Department of Agriculture

Office of the Undersecretary for Policy and Planning

Department of Agriculture, Elliptical Circle, Quezon City

Telephone no.: (632) 9267439

Telefax: (632) 9204084

Email: www.da.gov.ph

The Director, Bureau of Plant Industry

San Andres, Malate, Manila

Telephone nos.: (632) 5257-857 / 5222-987

Telefax: (632) 5217650

Email: buplant@yahoo.com

Department of Health

The Secretary, Department of Health

San Lazaro Compound, Sta. Cruz, Manila

Telephone no.: (632) 741-7048

Website: http//:www.doh.gov.ph

The Director, Bureau of Food and Drugs

Civic Drive, Filinvest Corporate City

Alabang, Muntilupa City

Telephone: (632)842-5606

Email: bfad@bfad.gov.ph

Website: http//www.bfad.gov.ph

Department of Environment and Natural Resources

The Secretary, Department of Environment and Natural Resources

Visayas Avenue, Elliptical Road

Diliman. Quezon City

Telephone no.: (632)929-6626

Website: http//www.denr.gov.ph

The Director, Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau

Quezon Ave., Diliman, Q.C.

Telephone nos.: (632) 924-6031 to 35

Website: http://www.pawb.gov.ph

(e) In cases of multiple competent national authorities, responsibilities for each (Articles 19.2 and 19.3);

1. National Committee on Biosafety of the Philippines (NCBP)

The NCBP is the lead body that coordinates and harmonizes inter-agency and multi-sector efforts to develop biosafety policies in the country (where such are not already stipulated by law) and sets scientific, technical and procedural standards on actions by agencies and other sectors to promote biosafety in the Philippines; oversees the implementation of the national biosafety framework; acts as a clearing house for biosafety matters; and coordinates and harmonizes the efforts of all concerned agencies and departments in this regard.

The members of the NCBP consist of the national competent authorities:

1.1 Department of Science and Technology (DOST)

The DOST, as the premier science and technology body in the country, shall take the lead in ensuring that the best available science is utilized and applied, in adopting biosafety policies, measures and guidelines, and in making biosafety decisions. The DOST shall ensure that such policies, measures, guidelines and decisions are made on the basis of scientific information that of the highest quality, multi-disciplinary, peer reviewed, and consistent with international standards as they evolve. In coordination with other concerned departments and agencies, and consistent with requirements of transparency and public participation, it shall exercise jurisdiction and other powers that it has been conferred with under existing laws. It shall also take the lead in evaluating and monitoring regulated articles for contained use.

1.2 Department of Agriculture

As the principal agency responsible for the promotion of agricultural development growth, rural development so as to ensure food security and contribute to poverty alleviation, the Department of Agriculture shall take the lead in addressing biosafety

issues related to the country's agricultural productivity and food security. In coordination with other concerned departments and agencies, and consistent with the requirements of transparency and public participation, it shall exercise jurisdiction and other powers conferred with under existing laws. It shall take the lead in evaluation and monitoring plant and plant products derived from the use of modern biotechnology, as provided in DA AO No. 008 s. 2002. The Department is also responsible for formulating biosafety regulations for GM animals including fish.

1.3 Department of Environment and Natural Resources

As the primary government agency responsible for the conservation, management, development and proper use of the country's environment and natural resources, the DENR shall ensure that environmental assessment are done and impacts identified in biosafety decisions. It shall take the lead in evaluating and monitoring regulated articles intended for bioremediation, the improvement of forest genetic resources, and wildlife genetic resources.

1.4 Department of Health

The DOH as the principal authority on health, shall formulate guidelines is assessing health impacts posed by modern biotechnology and its applications. The DOH shall also require, review and evaluate results on environmental health impact assessments related to modern biotechnology and its applications. In coordination with other concerned departments and agencies, it shall exercise such jurisdiction and other powers that have been conferred with under existing laws. It shall also take the lead in evaluating and monitoring processed foods derived from the use of modern biotechnology.

(f) Reports submitted by the Parties on the operation of the Protocol (Article 20.3(e));

Country Report – This is the first country report that will be submitted by the Philippines. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety entered into force in the country on 8 January 2007.

(g) Occurrence of unintentional transboundary movements that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17.1);

No official reports.

(h) Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25.3);

No official reports or confirmation. The Philippines is working on a mechanism that will validate reports on illegal transboundary movements of LMOs.

(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));

All importations of LMOs for contained, field test, commercial propagation and direct use as food and feed or for processing require a Plant Quarantine clearance. Under DA AO 8, approved LMOs are given a biosafety permit with the following duration : field test – two years, propagation – five years, direct use as food or feed or for processing – five years.

(j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);

The domestic regulations cover all importations. All LMO activities require a biosafety approval from the NCBP (contained use) or the DA (field test, propagation, and direct use as food and feed or processing.) All importations of LMOs need a Plant Quarantine clearance from the DA-Bureau of Plant Industry.

(k) Final decisions regarding the domestic use of Living Modified Organisms that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.1);

Approval Registry of FFP currently contains 46 LMOs. The permit for direct use as food or feed, or for processing is valid for five years.

Table 1: **Approval Registry of Regulated Articles for Direct Use as Food or Feed, or for Processing** *(As of April 21, 2008).*

Transformation Event	Introduced Trait and Gene	Date Approved	Other Countries with Similar Approval
Corn MON810	Contains *cry1A(b)* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* var. *kurstaki* which confers resistance to corn borer	Dec. 4, 2002 Renewed Dec 3, 2007	Argentina, Canada, EU, Japan, South Africa, USA, Argentina, Honduras, Philippines, Spain, Uruguay, Portugal, Colombia, Australia, China, Korea, Mexico,

			Russia, Switzerland, Taiwan,
Corn Bt11	Contains the *Bt* protein from *Bacillus thuringiensis* and *PAT* protein from *Streptomyces viridochromogenes* which confer resistance to corn borer and tolerance to herbicide respectively	July 22, 2003	Argentina, Australia, Canada, EU, Japan, Switzerland, UK, USA
Soybean 40-3-2	Contains *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp strain, CP4 which confers resistance tolerance to Round up family of agricultural herbicides	July 22, 2003	USA UK, European Union, Netherlands, Canada, Mexico, Argentina, Japan, Denmark, Switzerland, Romania, Russia, Korea, Thailand, Taiwan, Czech Republic, Poland, Australia and New Zealand (food) USA, UK, EU, Netherlands, Canada, Japan, Switzerland and Russia (feed)
Corn NK603	Contains *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. CP4 strain which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Sept. 10, 2003	Canada, Japan, South Africa, USA, Taiwan, Russia, Mexico, Australia, New Zealand and Korea
Corn MON863	Contains *cry3Bb1* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp *kumamotoensis* which confers resistance to corn rootworm	Oct. 7, 2003	Canada, Japan and USA
Corn 1507	Contains *Cry1F* and *PAT* proteins which confer resistance to certain lepidopteran pests such as the Asiatic corn borer and pink borer (*Sesamia* spp)	Oct. 7, 2003	USA, Japan, Canada, South Korea and South Africa (for food); USA, Japan, Canada and South Africa (for feed)
Corn DBT418	Contains *cry1Ac* gene from *Bacilllus thuringiensis* and the *bar* gene from *Streptomyces hrygroscopicus* that confers tolerance to the herbicide, phosphinotricin	Oct. 22, 2003	USA, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and other members of European Union
Canola Rt 73	Contains *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. CP4 strain and the *GOXv247* coding sequence from *Ochrobactrum anthropi* strain LBAA that confer tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Oct. 22, 2003	USA, UK, EU, Canada, Mexico, Japan, Australia and New Zealand (food); USA, Canada, EU, Japan and Mexico (feed)
Corn BT176	Contains Bt protein from *Bacillus thuringiensis* and *PAT* protein from *Streptomyces viridochromogenes* which confers tolerance to lepidopteran insect pest	Oct 24, 2003	USA, Canada, Japan, Switzerland, South Africa, EU, UK, Denmark, Netherlands, Australia, New Zealand (food); USA, Japan Switzerland, South Africa and EU (feed)
Corn GA21	Contains modified *epsps* gene from corn which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Nov. 20, 2003	Canada, Japan, USA, Australia and Korea
Corn DLL25	Contains the *bar gene* from bacterium, *Streptomyces hygroscopicus* that confers to herbicide , phosphinotricin	Nov. 20, 2003	USA, Argentina, Canada and China
Corn T25	Contains *PAT* protein from *Streptomyces viridochromogenes* which encodes for	Dec. 5, 2003	USA, Canada, Argentina, Japan, Taiwan, Australia, New Zealand,

	tolerance to herbicide, phosphinotricin		South Africa, EU, Bulgaria and Russia (food); USA, Canada, Argentina, Japan, South Africa, EU, Bulgaria, UK, Switzerland (feed)
Cotton 1445	Contains *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp strain, CP4 which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Dec. 5, 2003	USA, Argentina, Mexico, Australia and South Africa
Cotton 15985	Contains the *cry2Ab2* and c*ry1Ac* genes which encode proteins that convey protection from lepidopteran insect pests	Dec. 5, 2003	USA and Australia
Potato BT6 (RBBT 02-06) and SPBT 02-05	Contains *cryIIIA* coding sequence from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. t*enebriones* for tolerance to Colorado potato beetle	Dec. 5, 2003	USA, Japan, and Canada
Potato RBMT15-101, SEMT 15-02 & SEMT 15-15	Contains *cryIIIA* coding sequence from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp *tenebriones* strain B1256-82, which confers resistance to Colorado potato beetle and the PVY coat protein (PVYcp) isolated from PVY infected potatoes which confers resistance to the potato virus Y (PVY)	Dec. 22, 2003	Japan, Australia and Canada
Cotton 531	Contains *cry1Ac* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis var. kurstaki,* which confers resistance to lepidopteran pests	Feb. 5, 2004	USA, Argentina, Mexico, China, Indonesia, India, Colombia, Australia, South Africa, EU, Canada, Japan (food); USA, Argentina, Mexico, China, Indonesia, India, Colombia, Australia, South Africa, Canada and Japan (feed)
Potato RBMT21-129, RBMT21-350 and RBMT22-82	Contains *cryIIIA* coding sequence which confers resistance to Colorado potato beetle and resistance to potato leaf roll virus	Sept. 24, 2004	Australia, Canada, Japan and USA
Sugarbeet 77	Contains *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. strain, CP4 which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Oct. 21, 2004	Russia, Australia, New Zealand and Japan (for food as of April 2003), Australia, New Zealand and Japan (for feed as of April 2003
Sugarbeet H7-1	Contains *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. strain, CP4 which confers tolerance to glyphosate	July 28 ,2005	USA and Japan
Cotton MON88913	Contains *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp strain, CP4 which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Nov. 29, 2005	USA
Corn MON88017	Contains *Cry3Bb1* protein for resistance to the corn rootworm, *Diabrotica* spp and *CP4EPSPS* protein for tolerance to glyphosate resistance	March 8, 2006	USA
Corn LY038	Contains *cordapA* coding sequence which is under the control of the maize Glb1 promoter that expresses the *Corynebacterium glutamicum* derived lysine insensitive dihydrodipicolinate synthase enzyme in the germ to increase the level of lysine in grain for animal feed applications	May 19, 2006	USA

Alfalfa J101 and J163	Contains *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp strain, CP4 which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Aug. 9, 2006	USA and Canada
Corn 59122	Contains *cry34Ab1* and *cry35Ab1* from *Bacillus thuringiensis*, which confers resistance to certain coleopteran pests such as corn rootworm, *Diabrotica* sp. and the *pat* gene from *Streptomyces viridochromogenes* which provides tolerance to glufosinate- ammonium herbicides	Aug. 9, 2006	USA, Korea and Mexico
Corn MIR604	Contains modified *cry3A* (mCry3A) from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *tenebriones* which confers resistance to corn rootworm	Oct. 8, 2007	USA, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand
Soybean MON 89788	Contains *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp strain, CP4 which confers resistance tolerance to Round up family of agricultural herbicides	Nov.16, 2007	USA
Corn 3272	Expresses a synthetic thermostable alpha amylase protein, AMY797E that catalyzes the hydrolysis of starch into soluble sugars.	February 7, 2008	USA
Combined Trait Product*	**Introduced Trait and Gene**	**Date Approved**	**Other Countries with Similar Approval**
Corn MON 810 x Corn GA 21	Contains *cry1Ab* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* var *kurstaki* which confers resistance to corn borer and modified *epsps* gene from corn which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Nov 11, 2004	USA, Canada and Japan
Corm MON 810 x Corn NK 603	Contains *cry1Ab* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* var *kurstaki* which confers resistance to corn borer and *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. *CP4* strain which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Nov 11, 2004	USA and Canada
Corn MON 810 X Corn MON 863	Contains *cry1Ab* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* var *kurstaki* which confers resistance to corn borer and *cry3Bb1* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp *kumamotoensis* which confers resistance to corn rootworm	Nov. 11, 2004	USA, Canada and Japan
Corn NK 603 x Corn MON 863	Contains *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. *CP4* strain which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides and *cry3Bb1* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp *kumamotoensis* which confers resistance to corn rootworm	Nov 11, 2004	USA, Canada, Japan and Mexico (food); USA, Canada and Japan (feed)
Cotton 531 x Cotton 1445	Contains *cry1Ac* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* var. *kurstaki*, which confers resistance to lepidopteran pests and *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp strain, *CP4* which confers tolerance to the Roundup	Nov. 22, 2004	USA, Canada, Australia and Japan (food and feed); Mexico (food)

	family of agricultural herbicides		
Cotton 15985 x Cotton 1445	Contains the *cry2Ab2* and *cry1Ac* genes which encode proteins that convey protection from lepidopteran insect pests and *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp strain, CP4 which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Nov. 22, 2004	USA, Canada and Japan
Corn MON 863 x Corn MON 810 x Corn NK 603	Contains *cry3Bb1* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp *kumamotoensis* which confers resistance to corn rootworm and *cry1Ab* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* var *kurstaki* which confers resistance to corn borer and *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. *CP4* strain which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Feb. 7, 2005	USA, Canada and Japan
Corn 1507 x Corn NK 603	Contains *Cry1F* and *PAT* proteins which confer resistance to certain lepidopteran pests such as the Asiatic corn borer and pink borer (*Sesamia* spp) and *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. *CP4* strain which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Feb. 17, 2006	USA, Canada, Japan and Korea, Mexico (food and feed); USA, Canada and Mexico (feed)
Cotton 15985 x RR Flex Cotton (MON88913)	Contains the *cry2Ab2* and *cry1Ac* genes which encode proteins that convey protection from lepidopteran insect pests and the *cry3Bb1* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subs *kumamotoensis* which confers resistance to corn root worm and the *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. *CP4* strain which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	Apr. 20, 2006	USA, Canada, and Japan
Corn MON 88017 x Corn MON 810	Contains *cry3Bb1* for resistance to the corn rootworm, *Diabrotica* spp and *cp4epsps* for tolerance to glyphosate resistance and *cry1Ab* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* var *kurstaki* which confers resistance to corn borer	July 3, 2006	USA and Canada
Corn LY 038 x Corn MON 810	Contains *cordapA* coding sequence which is under the control of the maize Glb1 promoter that expresses the *Corynebacterium glutamicum* derived lysine insensitive dihydrodipicolinate synthase enzyme in the germ to increase the level of lysine in grain for animal feed applications and *cry1Ab* gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* var *kurstaki* which confers resistance to corn borer	Aug. 9, 2006	USA
Corn 59122 x Corn NK 603	Contains *cry34Ab1* and *cry35Ab1* from *Bacillus thuringiensis*, which confers resistance to certain coleopteran pests such as corn rootworm, *Diabrotica* sp. and the *pat* gene from *Streptomyces viridochromogenes* which provides tolerance to glufosinate- ammonium herbicides and *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. *CP4* strain which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural	Dec. 20, 2006	USA, Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and Korea

	herbicides.		
Corn Bt 11 x Corn GA21	Contains the *Bt* protein from *Bacillus thuringiensis* and *PAT* protein from *Streptomyces viridochromogenes* which confer resistance to corn borer and tolerance to herbicide respectively and modified *epsps* gene from corn which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	January 23, 2007	United States and Canada (food and feed), Korea (food)
Corn 1507 x Corn 59122	Contains *Cry1F* and *PAT* proteins which confer resistance to certain lepidopteran pests such as the Asiatic corn bor er and pink borer (*Sesamia* spp) and *cry34Ab1* and *cry35Ab1* from *Bacillus thuringiensis*, which confers resistance to certain coleopteran pests such as corn rootworm, *Diabrotica* sp. and the *pat* gene from *Streptomyces viridochromogenes* which provides tolerance to glufosinate-ammonium herbicides	January 23 ,2007	USA, Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand Korea and Mexico
Corn 59122 x Corn 1507 x Corn NK 603	Contains *cry34Ab1* and *cry35Ab1* from *Bacillus thuringiensis*, which confers resistance to certain coleopteran pests such as corn rootworm, *Diabrotica* sp. and the *pat* gene from *Streptomyces viridochromogenes* which provides tolerance to glufosinate-ammonium herbicides Contains *Cry1F* and *PAT* proteins which confer resistance to certain lepidopteran pests such as the Asiatic corn borer and pink borer (*Sesamia* spp) and *cp4epsps* coding sequence from *Agrobacterium* sp. CP4 strain which confers tolerance to the Roundup family of agricultural herbicides	February 7, 2007	USA, Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand Korea and Mexico
Corn BT11 x Corn MIR 604	Contains the Bt protein from *Bacillus thuringiensis* and PAT protein from *Streptomyces viridochromogenes* which confer resistance to corn borer and tolerance to herbicide respectively and modified *cry3A* (mCry3A) from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *tenebriones* which confers resistance to corn rootworm	Dec. 13, 2007	Korea, Japan and USA
Corn MIR604 x Corn GA21	Contains modified *cry3A* (mCry3A) from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *tenebriones* which confers resistance to corn rootworm and modified *epsps* gene from corn which confers tolerance to the roundup Family of agricultural herbicides.	Dec. 13, 2007	Korea and Japan
Corn Bt11x MIR604 x GA21	Contains the Bt protein from *Bacillus thuringiensis* and PAT protein from *Streptomyces viridochromogenes* which confer resistance to corn borer and tolerance to herbicide respectively and modified *cry3A* (mCry3A) from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *tenebriones* which confers resistance to corn rootworm and modified *epsps* gene from corn	Mar. 3, 2008	Korea

	which confers tolerance to the roundup Family of agricultural herbicides.		

(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))

See List of approved LMOs for direct use as food and feed or for processing (Table 1).

(m) Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.6)

Department of Agriculture Memorandum Circular No. 8 series 2003 (May 15) "Guidelines for the Phytosanitary Inspection of Regulated article for Food, Feed and Processing Pursuant to AO No. 8 s. 2002 "Rules and Regulations on the Importation and Release into the Environment of Plant and Plant Products Derived From The Use of Modern Biotechnology".

DA MC 8s. 2003 requires that every shipment of a regulated article be accompanied by a Declaration of GM Content.

Other relevant issuances of the Department of Agriculture include: DA Memorandum Circular no.11, series 2003 (August 15) "Additional Signatories To The Declaration of GMO Content Pursuant to DA MC No. 8 s. 2003 and DA Memorandum Circular No. 12 series 2003 (August 15) "Annexes I, II and III Pursuant to MC no. 8 s. 2003 and DA AO No. 9 s. 2002".

(n) Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12.1);

All permits require that if in the event new information becomes available indicating that the regulated article could pose significant risks to human health and the environment, the applicant shall on its own immediately take measures necessary to protect human health and the environment. Likewise, once durations of permits have expired, an application for such use has to be refiled and undergo a review before the permit is renewed.

(o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)

All LMOs are regulated and have to undergo the relevant regulation. There are no

exemptions except those provided for by the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

(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); and

The Philippines does not have a simplified procedure according to Article 13 as the country has already put into place domestic regulations for LMOs in the market.

(q) Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information regarding products thereof (Article 20.3(c)).

Please access the Biosafety Clearing House Pilipinas website:

http://bch.dost.gov.ph

The products that underwent environmental risk assessment are the following:

1) corn MON 810
2) corn Bt 11
3) corn NK 603
4) stacked corn MON 810 x NK 603

All LMOs approved for food, feed or processing have undergone risk assessment.

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		**X**	

procedure (Article 20.3(a))			
(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);			**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**	
(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);			**Information does not exist**
(h) Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25.3);			**Information does not exist**
(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);			**Not applicable**
(o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)			**Not applicable**
(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);			**Not applicable**
(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)	**Yes**
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 Philippines has, as early as 1990, established the foundations of a regulatory framework for LMOs to ensure the safe and responsible use of products of modern biotechnology so that benefits can be secured from its application while avoiding or minimizing the risks associated with its use. The Philippines has continuously enhanced its regulatory framework to address issues and developments associated with the use of LMOs.

To date, the relevant issuances and commitments include the following:

(1) 1990 Executive Order 430 "Creation of the National Committee on Biosafety of the Philippines (NCBP)"

The NCBP, an inter-agency committee, is composed of representatives of DOST, DA, DENR and DOH, a biological scientist, environmental scientist, physical scientist, social scientist, and two community representatives. The NCBP supervises research of genetically engineered organisms and recommends measures to minimize risks.

(2) 2002 Department of Agriculture Administrative Order No. 8

DA AO No 8 regulates the use of LMOs for field release, commercial propagation and direct use as food and feed or processing through the conduct of a risk assessment. Risk assessment is a step-by-step, case by case assessment scientific and technical procedure conducted by the DA through the Bureau of Plant Industry and other DA regulatory agencies and an independent panel of non-DA scientists. The risk assessment is the basis for the approval or dis-approval of GM applications.

(3) **2006 Executive Order 514 "Establishing the National Biosafety Framework of the Philippines, Prescribing Guidelines For Its Implementation, Strengthening the National Committee on Biosafety of the Philippines and For Other Purposes"**

The NBF aims to strengthen the existing science-based determination of biosafety to ensure the safe and responsible use of modern biotechnology, enhance the decision-making, and guide implementation of international obligations on biosafety. The NBF puts together into the framework the existing biosafety regulations, delineates the responsibilities of each biosafety agencies, strengthens the National Committee on Biosafety of the Philippines and provides a venue for discussion of overlapping policy issues.

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	**Yes**
b) no	
6. Were you a Party of export during this reporting period?	
a) yes **In only one occasion. GM corn (MON 810) planting material for research purposes was exported to South Africa from the Philippines. South Africa as the Party of import gave a written consent prior to the exportation.**	
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	**Yes**
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
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	**No**
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	**Yes**
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	
10. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for release into the environment during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Articles 7 to 10 and 12, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	

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

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:
Our rules and regulations require a case-by-case and step-by-step risk assessment. Permits need to be secured for every step: (`1) contained use (2) field test (3) commercial propagation.

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 **The responsible officer or authorized representative of the applicant certifies that based on his personnel knowledge and/or authentic documents: (i) all the information on the application are true and correct; (ii) the application contains all information and views on which to base a decision and includes relevant data and information known to the applicant which are favorable to the application. The applicant also warrants that the regulated article to be imported is solely and exclusively for direct use as food and feed or processing.**	**Yes**
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) **Yes. For this reporting period, the Philippines has been a recipient of capacity building from various donors such as the USAID, PBS, USDA, UNEP-GEF, FAO-Japan, AusAID, ISNAR, SEARCA-BIC, including government offices such as DA, DENR, DOH and DOST. NGOs which provided capacity building includes: GENOK, TWN, CropLife, BCP, ISAAA, ILSI. Because of the development in the technology, the Philippines is in need of continuous capacity-building assistance.**	**Yes**
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	**Yes**
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	

15. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
Not applicable. The Philippines is not yet a Party of export of LMOs intended for direct use for food or 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:
Only those regulated articles or LMOs for direct use as for food and feed or processing which have passed a satisfactory risk assessment conducted in accordance to domestic rules and regulations and are listed in the approval registry, are allowed entry. We have ensured that all importations allowed into the country are approved LMOs.

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	**No**

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:
The Philippines, having put into place a regulatory framework, does not use the simplified procedure (Article 13).

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	**No**

20. If your country has entered into bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements, or if you have been unable to do so for some reason, describe your experiences in implementing Article 14 during the reporting period, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:

Articles 15 and 16 – Risk assessment and risk management

21. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, were risk assessments carried out for all decisions taken under Article 10? (Article 15.2)	
a) yes	**Yes**
b) no (please clarify below)	
c) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	
22. If yes to question 21, did you require the exporter to carry out the risk assessment?	
a) yes – in all cases	**Yes**
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	
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	**Yes**
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	
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	**Yes (appropriate mechanisms have been established for plant and plant products derived from modern biotechnology)**
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	**Yes**
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	**Yes**
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)	**Yes**
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:	
Risk management measures form part of conditions of a permit for a regulated article. Discussions with the would-be permit holder are done to discuss the conditions imposed to mitigate probable risks.	

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)	**No such occurrences**

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:
Our approval registry lists all LMOs that are allowed in the country. Those LMOs not listed in the approval registry are not allowed entry. The Philippines is working on a mechanism that will validate reports on illegal transboundary movements of LMOs.

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)	**Yes**
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	**Yes**
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	**Yes**
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	**Yes**
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:

Our regulations require a declaration of GM content for every shipment:

For FFPs – may contain transformation events (TEs)
For contained use, field test, commercial propagation – is (TE)

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:

The Philippines is a recipient of the UNEP-GEF assistance for Biosafety Clearing House. To date, an inter-agency technical working group is still developing the Philippine BCH for uploading to the BCH Central Portal in compliance with Article 20 of the Cartagena Protocol.

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	**Yes**
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	**Yes**
If yes, please give number of cases	**In all applications for a permit**
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of import / no such requests received	

39. If you answered yes to the previous question, please provide information on your experience including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:
Our rules and regulations provide that " If there are portions of the applications for field test, commercial propagation and direct use for food and feed or processing , which contain trade secrets or confidential business information, each page of the application containing such information shall be marked "Commercial-in-Confidence" (CIC) by the applicant. In addition, portions of the application which are deemed "CIC" shall be designated. The applicant shall also submit one (1) copy of the applications with all the CIC deleted, but marked with "CIC deleted" on each page where the CIC is deleted. If the application does not contain CIC, then the first page of all copies submitted to BPI shall be marked "No CIC". **In no case, however, shall the following information be considered CIC:** **1. Name and address of the applicant** **2. Description of the regulated article** **3. Description of the intended destination (including all intermediated and final destinations), uses, and distribution of the regulated article;** **4. Summary of the risk assessment of the effects of the regulated article on the environment and human health;** **5. Where appropriate, description of the proposed procedures, processes and safeguards which will be used by the applicant to prevent escape and dissemination of the regulated article at each of the intended destinations;** **6. Description of the methods and plants for emergency response in case of accidental release of the regulated article into the environment; and** **7. Description of the proposed method of final disposition of the regulated article.** **Our rules and regulation identify the information that shall not be considered CIC.**
40. If you were a Party of export during this reporting period, please describe any impediments or difficulties encountered by you, or by exporters under your jurisdiction if information is available, in the implementation of the requirements of Article 21:
Not applicable

Article 22 – Capacity-building

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

c) not applicable – not a developed country Party	**Not applicable**
42. If yes to question 41, how has such cooperation taken place:	
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	**No**
c) not applicable – not a developing country Party	
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)	**Yes**
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)	**Yes**
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	
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)	**Yes**

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:	

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	**Yes**
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
50. If yes, do you cooperate with other States and international bodies?	
a) yes – significant extent	**Yes**
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	**Yes**
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	**Yes**
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	**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:

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	**Yes**
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:	
Our rules and regulations which are consistent with the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety require pre-market risk assessment and an informed consent through a permit issued by our regulatory agencies, whether importation is from a Party or a non-Party. **In connection with the Philippine importation of rice under US PL480 program, the Philippines ensured that, consistent with its approval registry for food, feed and processing, the importation did not contain any unapproved LMOs which currently include GM rice. The PL480 importation was subjected to testing both at the point of origin and point of destination, with the appropriate and available sampling and detection methods. A representative from the regulatory agency inspected and validated the process required under our regulation.**	

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	**Yes**
b) no	
58. Have there been any illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms into your country during the reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	**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:

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	**Yes**
c) no	
d) not a Party of import	
61. Has your country cooperated with other Parties on research and information exchange on any socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms, especially on indigenous and local communities? (Article 26.2)	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	**No**
62. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 26, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
A socio-economic consideration is an integral part of decision-making. Our National Biosafety Framework will consider the standards for socio-economic considerations.	

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	**Yes**
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:	
We have received assistance from UNEP-GEF for the National Biosafety Framework and the Biosafety Clearing House.	

Other information

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

Comments on reporting format

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