Format for the Third National Report on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
United Nations Environment Programme
413 Saint-Jacques Street, Suite 800, Montreal, QC, H2Y 1N9, Canada
Tel : +1 514 288 2220 Fax : +1 514 288 6588
secretariat@cbd.int www.cbd.int

(This page was intentionally left blank)

GUIDELINES FOR USE OF THE REPORTING FORMAT

The following reporting format is prepared for the collection of data for the third National Report as required under Article 33 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. It consists of a series of questions based on the requirements of the Protocol as well as questions that relate to indicators of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the period 2011-2020.

The reporting format has been developed within the context of decisions BS-V/14, BS-VI/14 and BS-VI/15, taking into account comments for the improvement of the reporting format received from Parties during the second National Report exercise and the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan[1] as well as the recommendations of the Compliance Committee.

The general principles that have been applied in the development of the third National Report are as follows: *a) the retention of all questions from the second National Report format that require regular updating (i.e. refer to information and/or measurable indicators that may change between reporting times) as requested in decision BS-V/14, paragraph 8(a), point (i); b) the introduction of all questions from the survey on the indicators; c) the deletion of all questions from the second National Report format whose answers are already available to the Secretariat through the Biosafety Clearing-House; and d) the merging of all questions that were similar, or addressed the same issues, in both the second National Report format and in the dedicated survey on the indicators.*

Responses to these questions will help Parties review the extent to which they are successfully implementing the provisions of the Protocol. The responses will also assist the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (COP-MOP) in its assessment of the overall status of the implementation of the Protocol, including measuring the progress in implementation during its review of the Strategic Plan of the Protocol.

All questions listed in the report format contribute to measuring progress against the baseline adopted by decision BS-VI/15, paragraph 2. The reporting format is intended to gather important information regarding the implementation of the provisions of the Protocol. Most questions are in a multiple-choice format requiring only a tick in one or more boxes. Text fields are available as an option to Parties who wish to provide further details on the implementation of the various articles.

The questions follow the wording of the relevant articles of the Protocol as closely as possible, and the use of terms as per Article 3 of the Protocol.

Questions highlighted with grey background are not strictly based on either the provisions of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, or the indicators of the Strategic Plan, or the decisions of the COP-MOP, but are however included in the reporting format to help in the assessment and review of the Protocol in the context of Article 35.

The origin of each question in the third National Report is referenced in the relevant footnote indicated by the number in parenthesis next to the question.

The report is intended to cover implementation activities undertaken between the presentation of the second National Report (or the entry into force of the Protocol for reporting Parties that ratified or acceded to the Protocol after 11 September 2007) and the date of reporting for the third National Report.

The Executive Secretary welcomes any comments on the adequacy of the questions, challenges in completing the questions, and any further recommendation on how the reporting format could be improved. Space is provided for such comments at the end of the report.

It is recommended that Parties engage all relevant stakeholders in the preparation of the report in order to ensure a participatory and transparent approach, and the accuracy of the information requested.

This reporting format may also be submitted electronically through the Biosafety-Clearing House (BCH) at http://bch.cbd.int/managementcentre/edit/CPBnationalreport3.shtml

The deadline for the submission of the third National Report is 1 November 2015, i.e. 12 months prior to the eighth meeting of the COP-MOP. Late submissions will not be included in the analysis to be submitted COP-MOP at its eighth meeting.

---

1 Available at https://bch.cbd.int/database/reports/surveyonindicators.shtml.

(This page was intentionally left blank)

Third National Report
on the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Origin of the report

1.	**Country:**	**Czech Republic**
Contact person submitting the report		
2.	Name:	**Zuzana Doubkova**
3.	Title:	**National Focal Point for Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety**
4.	Organization:	**Ministry of the Environment**
5.	Mailing address:	**Vrsovicka 65, 100 10. Prague 10, Czech Republic**
6.	Telephone:	**+420 267 122 922**
7.	Fax:	**+420 267 126 922**
8.	E-mail:	**zuzana.doubkova@mzp.cz**
9.	Organizations/stakeholders who were consulted or participated in the preparation of this report:	**Czech Commission for the Use of Genetically Modified Organisms and Genetic Products - advisory body to the Ministry of the Environment; Ministry of Agriculture; supervisory authorities; universities and research institutions; NGOs**
Submission		
10.	Date of submission:	**[Type your text here]**
11.	Time period covered by this report:	**October 2011 - September 2015**

Signature of the reporting officer[†] _____

[†] This document is a protected form in MS Word format to enable further processing of the information contained therein by the CBD Secretariat. Only text entries and checkboxes may be changed. Once you finish filling in the form, please save it and print this first page for signature. This form is also available in the BCH for electronic submission at: http://bch.cbd.int/managementcentre/edit/CPBnationalreport3.shtml

IMPORTANT: To facilitate the analysis of the information contained in this report, it is recommended that Parties submit the report online through the Biosafety Clearing-House or as an attachment to an e-mail in MS Word format, together with a scanned copy of the first signed page, to the Secretariat at: secretariat@cbd.int.

Please *do not* send this report via fax or postal mail or in electronic formats other than MS Word.

12. If your country is not a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB), is there any national process in place towards becoming a Party? (2) *If the country is a Party please select "Not applicable"*	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q13 of the 2nd NR*
13. Here you may provide further details: [Type your text here]	
Article 2 – General provisions	
14. Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the Protocol? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 1.1.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 3.1.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ A domestic regulatory framework is fully in place ☐ A domestic regulatory framework is partially in place ☐ Only temporary measures have been introduced ☐ Only a draft framework exists ☐ No measures have yet been taken ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q15 of the 2nd NR*
15. If you indicated that a national biosafety framework exists in the above question, when did it become operational? (3) *If you indicated that a national biosafety framework does not exists in the above question, please select "Not applicable"* *This question is relevant to indicator 1.1.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ 2001 or earlier ☐ 2002 ☐ 2003 ☐ 2004 ☐ 2005 ☐ 2006 ☐ 2007 ☐ 2008 ☐ 2009 ☐ 2010 ☐ 2011 ☐ 2012 ☐ 2013 ☐ 2014 ☐ Not applicable

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

16. Which specific instruments are in place for the implementation of your national biosafety framework? (2)	☒ One or more national biosafety laws ☒ One or more national biosafety regulations ☒ One or more sets of biosafety guidelines ☒ Other laws, regulations or guidelines that indirectly apply to biosafety ☐ No instruments are in place ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q16 of the 2nd NR*
17. Has your country established a mechanism for the budgetary allocations of funds for the operation of its national biosafety framework? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q17 of the 2nd NR*
18. Does your country have permanent staff to administer functions directly related to the national biosafety framework? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q18 of the 2nd NR*
19. If you answered *Yes* to question 18, how many permanent staff members are in place whose functions are directly related to the national biosafety framework? (2) *If you answered No to question 18, please select "Not applicable"*	☐ One ☒ Less than 5 ☐ Less than 10 ☐ More than 10 ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q19 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

20. Has your country's biosafety framework / laws / regulations / guidelines been submitted to the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q20 of the 2nd NR*

21. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 2 in your country:

The Czech Republic is a member state of the European Union, therefore the Czech legislative framework has been harmonised with the European Union legislation. The EU legislation is listed and described in the parallel 3rd National Report of the European Union.

In the Czech Republic, the first basic national legal instrument regarding the use of GMOs was adopted already in 2000. Since February 2004, the Act 78/2004, on the Use of Genetically Modified Organisms and Genetic Products, as amended, with an implementing Decree 209/2004 have been in force. The Act transposes EU Directives 2001/18/EC and 2009/41/EC, therefore it covers the contained use, deliberate release of GMOs into the environment (e. g. field trials) and placing on the market of GMOs as or in products. It has been in force since February 2004.

General rules on the co-existence of genetically modified crops with conventional and organic farming are set by the Act 252/1997, on Agriculture, as amended, and specified by the Decree 89/2006, on detailed conditions for growing a genetically modified variety, as amended.

Re Q16: Amendments of some Acts and corresponding Decrees related to biosafety are under way, on the basis of recent developments and knowledge and in compliance with the new EU legislation.

More information is available through the Czech national node of the BCH at http:www.mzp.cz/biosafety

The EC Regulations 1829/2003 and 503/2013 concerning the authorisation of GM food and feed, Regulation 1830/2003 on traceability and labelling of GMOs and GM food and feed, Regulation 1946/2003 implementing the Cartagena Protocol and relevant implementing decisions have been directly applicable in the Czech Republic since its accession to the EU in May 2004. For more information on EU legislation, please refer to the EU report.

Article 5 – Pharmaceuticals

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

22. Does your country regulate the transboundary movement, handling and use of living modified organisms (LMOs) which are pharmaceuticals? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q22 of the 2nd NR*
23. If you answered *Yes* to question 22, has this information been submitted to the BCH? (1) *If you answered No to question 22, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q23 of the 2nd NR*

24. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 5 in your country:

According to the EU Regulation 726/2004, a medicinal product containing LMOs may only be placed on the market in the European Union after it has received a marketing authorisation granted by the centralised EU procedure. The assessment preceding the registration must include an environmental risk assessment in line with the requirements of Directive 2001/18/EC.

EU Regulation 1946/2003 reflects the provisions of the Protocol as regards the export of LMOs, including pharmaceuticals.

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Article 6 – Transit and Contained use	
25. Does your country regulate the transit of LMOs? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 1.8.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q25 of the 2nd NR*
26. Does your country regulate the contained use of LMOs? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 1.1.2 and 1.8.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q26 of the 2nd NR*
27. If you answered *Yes* to questions 25 or 26, has this information been submitted to the BCH? (1) *If you answered No to both questions 25 and 26, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q27 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

28. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 6 in your country:

- Contained use:

Act 78/2004, on the Use of Genetically Modified Organisms and Genetic Products, as amended, and its implementing Decree 209/2004, on Detailed Conditions for the Use of Genetically Modified Organisms and Genetic Products, as amended, transpose Directive 2009/41/EC on the contained use of genetically modified micro-organisms, and covers contained use of other GM organisms (plants and animals) as well.

- Transit:

Act 78/2004, on the Use of Genetically Modified Organisms and Genetic Products, as later amended and its implementing Decree 209/2044, on Detailed Conditions for the Use of Genetically Modified Organisms and Genetic Products, as amended, apply also for export, import and transit of GMOs and genetic products.

EU Regulation 1946/2003 that is directly applicable in the Czech Republic, addresses transboundary movement of GMOs, and specifically sets requirements for exports of GMOs to third countries.

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Articles 7 to 10: Advance Informed Agreement (AIA) and intentional introduction of LMOs into the environment	
29. Has your country adopted law(s) / regulations / administrative measures for the operation of the AIA procedure of the Protocol OR a domestic regulatory framework consistent with the Protocol regarding the transboundary movement of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment? (4) *This question is relevant to indicators 1.1.2 and 3.1.4 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
30. Has your country established a mechanism for taking decisions regarding first intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q31 of the 2nd NR*
31. If you answered *Yes* to question 30, does the mechanism also apply to cases of intentional introduction of LMOs into the environment that were not subject to transboundary movement? (2) *If you answered No to question 30, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q32 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

32. Has your country established legal requirements for exporters under its jurisdiction to notify in writing the competent national authority of the Party of import prior to the intentional transboundary movement of an LMO that falls within the scope of the AIA procedure? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q35 of the 2nd NR*
33. Has your country established legal requirements for the accuracy of information contained in the notification? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q36 of the 2nd NR*
34. Has your country ever received an application / notification regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment? (2) *This question is relevant to indicators 1.1.4 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
35. Has your country ever taken a decision on an application / notification regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 1.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q38 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

36. If you answered *Yes* to question 35, how many LMOs has your country approved to date for import for intentional introduction into the environment? (1) *If you answered No to question 35, please select "Not applicable"*	☐ None ☐ Less than 5 ☐ Less than 10 ☐ More than 10 ☒ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q39 of the 2nd NR*
37. If you answered *Yes* to question 35, how many LMOs, not imported, has your country approved to date for intentional introduction into the environment? (1) *If you answered No to question 35, please select "Not applicable"*	☐ None ☐ Less than 5 ☐ Less than 10 ☐ More than 10 ☒ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q40 of the 2nd NR*
38. In the current reporting period, how many applications/notifications has your country received regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment? (2)	☒ None ☐ Less than 5 ☐ Less than 10 ☐ More than 10
39. In the current reporting period, how many decisions has your country taken regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment? (1)	☒ None ☐ Less than 5 ☐ Less than 10 ☐ More than 10
If you replied <u>None</u> to question 39 please go to question 46	

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

40. With reference to the decisions taken on intentional transboundary movements of LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment, has your country received a notification from the Party(ies) of export or from the exporter(s) prior to the transboundary movement? (1)	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q43 of the 2nd NR*
41. Did the notifications contain complete information (at a minimum the information specified in Annex I of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety)? (1)	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q44 of the 2nd NR*
42. Has your country acknowledged receipt of the notifications to the notifier within ninety days of receipt? (1)	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q45 of the 2nd NR*
43. Has your country informed both the notifier(s) and the BCH of its decision(s)? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ In some cases only the notifier ☐ In some cases only the BCH ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q46 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

44. What percentage of your country's decisions fall into the following categories? (2)	[%] Approving the import without conditions [%] Approving the import with conditions [%] Prohibiting the import [%] Requesting additional information [%] Extending the period for the communication of the decision ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q48 of the 2nd NR*
45. In cases where your country approved an import with conditions or prohibited an import, did it provide reasons on which its decisions were based to the notifier and the BCH? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ In some cases only to the notifier ☐ In some cases only to the BCH ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q49 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

46. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Articles 7-10 in your country, including measures in case of lack of scientific certainty on potential adverse effects of LMOs for intentional introduction to the environment:

Since its accession to the European Union in May 2004, the Czech Republic has applied the EU legislative framework as described in the EU National Report.

Notifications for placing GMOs on the market are processed at EU level. The EU legislation sets requirements for the information to be contained in notification dossiers. The authorisation procedure involves all EU Member States, as authorised products are granted free movement throughout the EU territory. The final decision is adopted by voting of all Member States.

Applications for intentional introduction of GMO into the environment for other purposes than placing on the market (experimental release, field trials) are submitted and processed at the national level. The authorisations are issued by the Czech Competent Authority. These cases have not involved transboundary movements so far.

Re Q37: It is not quite clear whether this question concerns intentional introduction into the environment generally or only the cases regarding intentional transboundary movements (covered by Q35). The answer of corresponding Q40 in the Czech Republic 2nd national report referred to approvals of field trials, that is intentional introduction into the environment not involving transboundary movements. If the Q37 in this report covers only LMOs subjected to transboundary movements, the answer is none.

Data on experimental releases of GMOs are available in the Czech node of BCH

http://www.mzp.cz/Biosafety/decisiones.html

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Article 11 – Procedure for living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (LMOs-FFP)	
47. Has your country adopted specific law(s) or regulation(s) for decision-making regarding domestic use, including placing on the market, of LMOs-FFP? (2) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.1.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
48. Has your country established legal requirements for the accuracy of information to be provided by the applicant? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q52 of the 2nd NR*
49. Has your country established a mechanism to ensure that decisions regarding LMOs-FFP that may be subject to transboundary movement will be communicated to the Parties through the BCH? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q53 of the 2nd NR*
50. Has your country established a mechanism for taking decisions on the import of LMOs-FFP? (2) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.1.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
51. Has your country indicated its needs for financial and technical assistance and capacity-building in respect of LMOs-FFP? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.2.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes ☒ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q56 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

52. Has your country ever taken a decision on LMOs-FFP (either on import or domestic use)? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q57 of the 2nd NR*
If you replied <u>No</u> to question 52 please go to question 58	
53. How many LMOs-FFP has your country approved to date? (1)	☐ None ☐ Less than 5 ☐ Less than 10 ☒ More than 10 ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q58 of the 2nd NR*
54. In the current reporting period, how many decisions has your country taken regarding the import of LMOs-FFP? (1)	☐ None ☐ Less than 5 ☐ Less than 10 ☒ More than 10
55. In the current reporting period, how many decisions has your country taken regarding domestic use, including placing on the market, of LMOs-FFP? (1)	☐ None ☐ Less than 5 ☐ Less than 10 ☒ More than 10
If you replied <u>None</u> to both questions 54 and 55 please go to question 58	
56. Has your country informed the Parties through the BCH of its decision(s) regarding import, of LMOs-FFP? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q61 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

57. Has your country informed the Parties through the BCH of its decision(s) regarding domestic use, including placing on the market, of LMOs-FFP within 15 days? (1)	☒ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ Yes, but with delays (i.e. longer than 15 days) ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q62 of the 2nd NR*
58. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 11 in your country, including measures in case of lack of scientific certainty on potential adverse effects of LMOs-FFP: It has to be noted that the import of GMOs intended for direct use for food or feed or for processing, is covered by the directly applicable EU Regulations. Decisions for placing GMOs-FFP on the market in the European Union are taken at the EU level by all the Member States. The authorisations apply for the whole EU territory, the transport within the Union is not considered as import or export. The Czech Republic as a Member State participates in the assessment and decision-making procedures. All decisions are subsequently published by the European Commission in the European Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) and not in the individual Member States' BCHs.	
Article 12 – Review of decision	
59. Has your country established a mechanism for the review and change of a decision regarding an intentional transboundary movement of LMOs? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q64 of the 2nd NR*
60. Has your country ever received a request for a review of a decision? (1)	☐ Yes ☒ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q65 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

61. Has your country ever reviewed / changed a decision regarding an intentional transboundary movement of LMOs? (1)	☐ Yes, decision reviewed ☐ Yes, decision reviewed and changed ☒ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q66 of the 2nd NR*
62. In the current reporting period, how many decisions were reviewed and/or changed regarding an intentional transboundary movement of an LMO? (1)	☒ None ☐ Less than 5 ☐ More than 5
If you replied <u>None</u> to the question 62 please go to question 66	
63. Has your country informed both the notifier and the BCH of the review and/or changes in the decision? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ In some cases only the notifier ☐ In some cases only the BCH ☐ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q68 of the 2nd NR*
64. Has your country informed both the notifier and the BCH of the review and changes in the decision within thirty days? (1)	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ Yes, but with delays (i.e. longer than 30 days) ☐ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q69 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

65. Has your country provided reasons to both the notifier and the BCH for the review and/or changes in the decision? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ In some cases only the notifier ☐ In some cases only the BCH ☐ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q70 of the 2nd NR*
66. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 12 in your country: [Type your text here]	
Article 13 – Simplified procedure	
67. Has your country established a system for the application of the simplified procedure regarding an intentional transboundary movement of LMOs? (2)	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☒ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q72 of the 2nd NR*
68. Has your country ever applied the simplified procedure? (1)	☐ Yes ☒ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q73 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

69. If you answered *Yes* to question 68, has your country informed the Parties through the BCH of the cases where the simplified procedure applies? (1) *If you answered No to question 68, please select "Not applicable"* *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☒ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q74 of the 2nd NR*
70. In the current reporting period, how many LMOs has your country applied the simplified procedure to? (1)	☒ None ☐ Less than 5 ☐ More than 5
71. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 13 in your country: [Type your text here]	
Article 14 – Bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements and arrangements	
72. Has your country entered into any bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q77 of the 2nd NR*
73. If you answered *Yes* to question 72, how many LMO-related collaborative bilateral/multilateral arrangements has your country established with other Parties/non-Parties? (3) *If you answered No to question 72, please select "Not applicable"* *This question is relevant to indicator 1.2.8 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☒ One or more ☐ 3 or more ☐ 5 or more ☐ 10 or more ☐ Not applicable

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

74. If you answered *Yes* to question 72, has your country informed the Parties through the BCH of the agreements or arrangements? (1) *If you answered No to question 72, please select "Not applicable"* *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q78 of the 2nd NR*
75. If you answered *Yes* to question 72, please provide a brief description of the scope and objective of the agreements or arrangements entered into: The Czech Republic has been a Member State of the European Union since 2004. EU is a regional arrangement with common market rules, including transboundary movements of goods. ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q79 of the 2nd NR*	
76. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 14 in your country: The Czech Republic as a Member State of the European Union implements the EU legislative framework. Transport of goods within the EU is not considered as import or export.	
Articles 15 & 16 – Risk Assessment and Risk Management	
77. Has your country established a national framework for conducting risk assessments prior to taking decisions regarding LMOs? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q81 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

78. If you answered *Yes* to question 77, does this framework include procedures for identifying and/or training national experts to conduct risk assessments? (2) *If you answered No to question 77, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q82 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Capacity building in risk assessment or risk management

79. How many people in your country have been trained in risk assessment, monitoring, management and control of LMOs? (3)

This question is relevant to indicator 2.2.3 of the Strategic Plan

i. Risk assessment:	☐	None
	☐	One or more
	☒	10 or more
	☐	50 or more
	☐	100 or more
ii. Management / Control:	☐	None
	☐	One or more
	☒	10 or more
	☐	50 or more
	☐	100 or more
iii. Monitoring:	☐	None
	☒	One or more
	☐	10 or more
	☐	50 or more
	☐	100 or more

80. Is your country using training material and/or technical guidance for training in risk assessment and risk management of LMOs? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.2.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
81. Is your country using the "Manual on Risk Assessment of LMOs" (developed by CBD Secretariat) for training in risk assessment? (4) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.2.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

82. Is your country using the "Guidance on Risk Assessment of LMOs" (developed by the Online Forum and the AHTEG on Risk Assessment and Risk Management) for training in risk assessment? (4) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.2.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
83. Are the currently available training materials or technical guidance on risk assessment and/or risk management of LMOs sufficient? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.2.6 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not applicable

84. Does your country have the capacity to detect, identify, assess and/or monitor living modified organisms or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking into account risks to human health? (3)

This question is relevant to indicators 1.4.2 and 1.6.3 of the Strategic Plan

i. Detect:	☒ Yes ☐ No
ii. Identify:	☒ Yes ☐ No
iii. Assess:	☒ Yes ☐ No
iv. Monitor:	☒ Yes ☐ No

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Conducting risk assessment or risk management	
85. Has your country adopted or used any guidance documents for the purpose of conducting risk assessment or risk management, or for evaluating risk assessment reports submitted by notifiers? (3) *This question is relevant to indicators 1.3.1 of the Strategic Plan*	
i. Risk assessment:	☒ Yes ☐ No
ii. Risk management:	☒ Yes ☐ No
86. Is your country using the "Guidance on Risk Assessment of LMOs" (developed by the Online Forum and the AHTEG on Risk Assessment and Risk Management) for conducting risk assessment or risk management, or for evaluating risk assessment reports submitted by notifiers? (4) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.2.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
87. Has your country adopted any common approaches to risk assessment with other countries? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.3.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
88. Has your country cooperated with other Parties with a view to identifying LMOs or specific traits that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.4.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q97 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

89. Has your country ever conducted a risk assessment of an LMO including any type of risk assessment of LMOs, e.g. for contained use, field trials, commercial purposes, direct use as food, feed, or for processing? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.3.3 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
If you replied <u>No</u> to question 89 please go to question 94	
90. If you answered *Yes* to question 89, please indicate the scope of the risk assessments (select all that apply): (4)	☒ Contained use (in accordance with article 3) ☒ Intentional introduction into the environment for experimental testing or field trials ☒ Intentional introduction into the environment for commercial purposes ☒ Direct use as food ☒ Direct use as feed ☒ Processing ☐ Not applicable
91. If you answered *Yes* to question 89, were the summary reports of the risk assessments submitted to the BCH? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q89 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

92. If you answered *Yes* to question 89, were risk assessments conducted for all decisions taken on LMOs for intentional introduction into the environment or on domestic use of LMOs for direct use as food, feed, or for processing? (1)	☒ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q88 of the 2nd NR*
93. If you answered *Yes* to question 89, how many risk assessments were conducted in the current reporting period? (1)	☐ None ☐ 5 or less ☐ 10 or less ☒ More than 10 ☐ Not applicable
94. Has your country taken measures to ensure that any LMO, whether imported or locally developed, undergoes an appropriate period of observation that is commensurate with its life-cycle or generation time before it is put to its intended use? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q88 of the 2nd NR*
95. Has your country established a mechanism for monitoring potential effects of LMOs that are released into the environment? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q33 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

96. Does your country have the infrastructure (e.g. laboratory facilities) for monitoring or managing LMOs? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.2.4 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

97. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Articles 15 and 16 in your country:

Risk Assessment

The European Union legal framework, based on a prior risk assessment before authorisation for the use of GMOs is given, and is applicable in the Czech Republic. The overarching aim of the environmental risk assessment is, on a case-by-case basis, to identify and evaluate potential adverse effects of the GMO, direct and indirect, immediate or delayed, on human health and the environment. Notifications for the use of GMOs must include a full assessment of the risks to human and animal health and to the environment, which is than reviewed by EU and/or national Authorities and experts.

In case of placing the GMOs on the market, the review of the risk assessment is conducted at the EU level by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and EU Member States. Special procedure is applied in cases when the notification includes commercial cultivation. The Czech Ministry of Agriculture in close cooperation with its advisory body - the Scientific Committee for Genetically Modified Food and Feed - regularly participates in the European authorization procedure for genetically modified crops intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing, under EU Regulation 1829/2003.

As regards the contained use and intentional introduction into the environment for experimental testing or field trials, the risk assessment is conducted at national level. Environmental risks are dealt with by the Czech Commission for the Use of GMOs and Genetic Products (expert advisory body to the Ministry of the Environment). Health risks are reviewed by the Ministry of Health.

The risk assessment should be performed in a scientifically-sound and transparent manner, based on up-to-date knowledge. Its results have to be reevaluated if new information on the GMO and its effects is obtained.

For training of experts and for the risk assessment, the Czech Competent Authorities and their advisory bodies use the methodology set by the EU legislation (e.g. Commission Implementing Regulation 503/2013) and EFSA guidelines, as well as manuals and guidance documents developed by the CPB AHTEG on RA/RM.

Re Q83: Technical guidance on specific topics should be further developed, namely as regards organisms resulting from the use of new gene techniques.

Risk Management

The authorisation decisions always set conditions for the use of GMOs, based on the risk assessment results. These conditions include requirements for monitoring - observations of potential effects of GMOs on health and environment. The monitoring is conducted both by the authorisation holder and by the supervision authorities.

The Czech Environmental Inspectorate is the main Competent Authority on state supervision of the use of GMOs (contained use, intentional introduction into environment and unauthorised GMOs). It cooperates with other supervision Authorities responsible for various agendas related to biosafety: Czech Agriculture and Food Inspection Authority in charge of food inspections and control; Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture in charge of seeds, phytosanitary regulations, plant protection products and quality of feed; State Veterinary Administration as to animal related supervision; State Institute for Drug Control as medicinal products are concerned; Customs Administration in charge of export and import supervision.

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Article 17 – Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures	
98. Has your country established and maintained appropriate measures to prevent unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q99 of the 2nd NR*
99. Has your country established a mechanism for addressing emergency measures in case of unintentional transboundary movements of LMOs that are likely to have significant adverse effect on biological diversity? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q101 of the 2nd NR*
100. Does your country have the capacity to take appropriate measures in the event that an LMO is unintentionally released? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.8.3 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
101. In the current reporting period, how many times has your country received information concerning occurrences that led, or may have led, to unintentional transboundary movement(s) of one or more LMOs to or from territories under its jurisdiction? (1)	☒ Never ☐ Less than 5 ☐ Less than 10 ☐ More than 10
If you replied <u>Never</u> to question 101 please go to question 105	

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

102. If you answered *Yes* to question 101, has your country notified affected or potentially affected States, the BCH and, where appropriate, relevant international organizations, of the above release? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes, for every occurrence ☐ Yes, for some occurrences ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
103. If you answered *Yes* to question 101, who did your country notify? *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan* (1)	☐ The affected or potentially affected State ☐ The BCH ☐ Relevant international organizations ☐ Not applicable
104. If you answered *Yes* to question 101, has your country immediately consulted the affected or potentially affected States to enable them to determine appropriate responses and initiate necessary action, including emergency measures? (1)	☐ Yes, always ☐ Yes, in some cases ☐ No, consultation was made but not immediately ☐ No, consultation was never made ☐ Not applicable

105. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 17 in your country:

Article 14 of Regulation (EC) 1946/2003 that is directly applicable in the Czech Republic provides for measures to prevent unintentional transboundary movements of GMOs and appropriate responses, including emergency measures.

However, transfer within the European Union is not considered as a transboundary movement according to the relevant EU legislation - Regulation (EC) 1946/2003 states that "transboundary movement" means the intentional or unintentional movement of a GMO between one Party or non-Party and another Party on non-Party, excluding intentional movements between Parties within the Community. The Czech Republic is an inland country, not on the border of EU, so it does not serve as a point of entry into EU for commodities and seeds.

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Article 18 – Handling, transport, packaging and identification	
106. Has your country taken measures to require that *LMOs that are subject to transboundary movement* are handled, packaged and transported under conditions of safety, taking into account relevant international rules and standards? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q108 of the 2nd NR*
107. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying LMOs-FFP clearly identifies that, in cases *where the identity of the LMOs is not known* through means such as identity preservation systems, they *may contain* living modified organisms and are not intended for intentional introduction into the environment, as well as a contact point for further information? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.6.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q109 of the 2nd NR*
108. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying LMOs-FFP clearly identifies that, in cases *where the identity of the LMOs is known* through means such as identity preservation systems, they *contain* living modified organisms and are not intended for intentional introduction into the environment, as well as a contact point for further information? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.6.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q110 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

109. If you answered *Yes* or *Yes, to some extent* to question(s) 107 and/or 108, what type of documentation does your country require for the identification of LMOs-FFP? (4) *If you answered No to question 107 and 108, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Existing types of documentation ☐ A stand-alone document ☐ Existing or a stand-alone document ☐ Not applicable
110. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying *LMOs 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 LMO are consigned? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.6.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q111 of the 2nd NR*
111. If you answered *Yes* or *Yes, to some extent* to question 110, what type of documentation does your country require for the identification of LMOs that are destined for contained? (4) *If you answered No to question 110, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Existing types of documentation ☐ A stand-alone document ☐ Existing or a stand-alone document ☐ Not applicable

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

112. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying *LMOs that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment of the Party of import*, 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? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.6.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q112 of the 2nd NR*
113. If you answered *Yes* or *Yes, to some extent* to question 112, what type of documentation does your country require for the identification of LMOs that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment? (4) *If you answered No to question 112, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Existing types of documentation ☐ A stand-alone document ☐ Existing or a stand-alone document ☐ Not applicable
114. Does your country have available any guidance for the purpose of ensuring the safe handling, transport, and packaging of living modified organisms? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.6.4 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

115. Does your country have the capacity to enforce the requirements of identification and documentation of LMOs? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q113 of the 2nd NR*
116. How many customs officers in your country have received training in the identification of LMOs? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.3.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☒ One or more ☐ 10 or more ☐ 50 or more ☐ 100 or more
117. Has your country established procedures for the sampling and detection of LMOs? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q114 of the 2nd NR*
118. How many laboratory personnel in your country have received training in detection of LMOs? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.3.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☐ One or more ☒ 10 or more ☐ 50 or more ☐ 100 or more
119. Does your country have reliable access to laboratory facilities for the detection of LMOs? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.3.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

120. How many laboratories in your country are certified for LMO detection? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.3.3 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☐ One or more ☒ 5 or more ☐ 10 or more ☒ 50 or more
121. How many of the certified laboratories in the previous question are currently operating in the detection of LMOs? (3) *If you answered None to question 120, please select "Not applicable"* *This question is relevant to indicator 2.3.4 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☐ One or more ☒ 5 or more ☐ 10 or more ☐ 50 or more ☐ Not Applicable

122. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 18 in your country:

The Czech Republic follows the EU comprehensive legal framework on GMOs, which also addresses the issues of handling, transport, packaging and identification covered by Article 18.

However, transfer within the European Union is not considered as a transboundary movement. The Czech Republic is an inland country, not on the border of EU, so it is not a point of entry into EU for seeds and commodities from third countries. The only GMOs that are imported / exported directly to or from the Czech Republic are GMOs intended for contained use. In these cases, the entry point is the airport.

The Czech Act No 78/2004 Coll., on the Use of GMOs and Genetic Products, sets in Art. 25 the requirements for the import and export of GMOs intended for contained use.

The certified laboratories for the detection of GMOs, serving also for the Competent Authorities, are:

National Reference Laboratory for GMOs Testing and DNA Fingerprinting, Crop Research Institute, Prague

Laboratory of the Centre for Health, Nutrition and Food in Brno, National Institute of Public Health

Laboratory of the Department of Biochemistry and Microbiology, Institute of Chemical Technology, Prague

Laboratory of Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture, Brno

Laboratory of State Veterinary Administration, Jihlava

Article 19 – Competent National Authorities and National Focal Points

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

123. In case your country has designated more than one *competent national authority*, has your country established a mechanism for the coordination of their actions prior to taking decisions regarding LMOs? (2)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q121 of the 2nd NR*
124. Has your country established adequate institutional capacity to enable the *competent national authority(ies)* to perform the administrative functions required by the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q122 of the 2nd NR*

125. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 19 in your country:

State administration:

The Competent Authority for the use of GMOs in the Czech Republic is the Ministry of the Environment. The Ministry of the Environment is the Competent Authority for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and for the EU Regulation 1946/2003 as well.

The Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic is the Competent Authority for genetically modified food and feed.

Detailed information including contacts is available in BCH.

Article 20 – Information Sharing and the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)

126. Please provide an overview of the status of the mandatory information provided by your country to the BCH by specifying for each category of information whether it is available and whether it has been submitted to the BCH. (1)

This question is relevant to indicator 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

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, paragraph 3 (a))	☒ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124a of the 2nd NR*
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, paragraph 5)	☒ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124b of the 2nd NR*
c.	Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Articles 14, paragraph 2 and 20, paragraph 3 (b))	☒ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124c of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

d.	Contact details for competent national authorities (Article 19, paragraphs 2 and 3), national focal points (Article 19, paragraphs 1 and 3), and emergency contacts (Article 17, paragraph 3 (e))	☒ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124d of the 2nd NR*
e.	Reports submitted by the Parties on the operation of the Protocol (Article 20, paragraph 3 (e))	☒ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124e of the 2nd NR*
f.	Decisions by a Party on regulating the transit of specific living modified organisms (LMOs) (Article 6, paragraph 1)	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☒ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124f of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

g.	Occurrence of unintentional transboundary movements that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17, paragraph 1)	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☒ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124g of the 2nd NR*
h.	Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25, paragraph 3)	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☒ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124h of the 2nd NR*
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, paragraph 3 and 20, paragraph 3(d))	☒ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124i of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

j.	Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14, paragraph 4)	☒ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124j of the 2nd NR*
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, paragraph 1)	☒ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124k of the 2nd NR*
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, paragraph 4) or in accordance with annex III (Article 11, paragraph 6) (requirement of Article 20, paragraph 3(d))	☒ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124l of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

m. Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11, paragraph 6)	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☒ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124m of the 2nd NR*
n. Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12, paragraph 1)	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☒ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124n of the 2nd NR*
o. LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13, paragraph 1)	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☒ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124o of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

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, paragraph 1)	☐ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☒ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124p of the 2nd NR*
q. Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information regarding products thereof (Article 20, paragraph 3 (c))	☒ Information available and in the BCH ☐ Information available but not in the BCH ☐ Information available but only partially available in the BCH ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q124q of the 2nd NR*
127. Has your country established a mechanism for strengthening the capacity of the BCH National Focal Point to perform its administrative functions? (1)	☐ Yes ☒ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q125 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

128. Has your country established a mechanism for the coordination among the BCH National Focal Point, the Cartagena Protocol focal point, and the competent national authority(ies) for making information available to the BCH? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q126 of the 2nd NR*
129. Does your country use the information available in the BCH in its decision making processes on LMOs? (2)	☐ Yes, always ☒ Yes, in some cases ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q127 of the 2nd NR*
130. Has your country experienced difficulties accessing or using the BCH? (2) *This question is relevant to indicator 4.1.8 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes: [Here you may provide further details] ☒ No
131. Is the information submitted by your country to the BCH complete and up-to date? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q130 of the 2nd NR*
132. Please indicate the number of regional, national and international events organized in relation to biosafety (e.g. seminars, workshops, press conferences, educational events, etc.,) in the last 2 years: (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 4.3.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☐ One or more ☐ 5 or more ☒ 10 or more ☐ 25 or more

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

133. Please indicate the number of biosafety related publications that has been made available in your country in the last year: (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 4.3.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☒ One or more ☐ 10 or more ☐ 50 or more ☐ 100 or more
134. If biosafety related publications were made available (see question above), please indicate which modalities were preferred: (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 4.3.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ National web site ☐ BCH Central Portal (BIRC) ☐ National Libraries ☒ Other (please specify): Meetings of the Czech Commission on the Use of Genetically Modified Organisms and Genetic Products; workshops for decision-makers, experts or general public. ☐ Not applicable

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

135. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 20 in your country:

Question 126: Part of the information is available at the European Union BCH, including harmonised EU legislation (126 c). The Czech node of BCH provides links to this website.

Question 126 i: Only final decisions on contained use and experimental introduction of GMOs into the environment are issued at the national level in the Czech Republic. Final decisions on commercial release are made at the European Union level and are available at the EU BCH.

Questions 126 j: Any information according to Article 14, paragraph 4 published at the European level in the EU BCH would be valid also for the Czech Republic.

Question 126 k, l: Decisions according to the Article 11, paragraph 1 and 4 are taken at the European Union level and are obligatory also for the Czech Republic. All these decisions are made available in the EU BCH.

Questions 126 m: Article 11, paragraph 6 is not relevant for the Czech Republic as it is neither a developing country nor Party with an economy in transition.

Question 128: One person has been appointed both the BCH National Focal Point and Cartagena Protocol National Focal Point in the Czech Republic. This person also works for the Czech competent authority for CPB. Coordination with other authorities involved in biosafety issues has been established.

Question 132: Special workshops were organized for decision-makers at the highest level, for specialists as well as for general public (Ministry of the Environment, Ministry of Agriculture), international and regional events see Capacity-building activities. The Czech Commission for the Use of Genetically Modified Organisms and Genetic Products is an important body for cooperation of specialists and coordination among responsible authorities, it serves for sharing topical information as well and its open meeting once a year aims to inform the public about biosafety activities. Radio broadcasting special programmes are focused on the general public.

Question 133: Numerous publications were prepared and issued within the UNEP/GEF Projects, both in Czech and in English. During the last year, the Ministry of Agriculture re-edited publications distributed during specialized workshops, and Ministry of the Environment prepared topical information for national and international authorities and for the interested public.

Question 134: Besides the national BCH, operated by the Ministry of the Environment, information on the LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed is available at the website focused on food safety, operated by the Ministry of Agriculture.

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Article 21 – Confidential information	
136. Has your country established procedures to protect confidential information received under the Protocol? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q132 of the 2nd NR*
137. Does your country allow the notifier to identify information that is to be treated as confidential? (1)	☐ Yes, always ☒ In some cases only ☐ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q133 of the 2nd NR*
138. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 21 in your country: The Czech Act 78/2004, paragraph 9, as well as the relevant European legislation, listed in the EU report, define which information can be identified and treated as confidential. It has to be noted that the confidentiality provisions make clear what information should never be identified as confidential, namely a general description of the GMO, name and address of the notifier, risk assessment and emergency response plans.	
Article 22 – Capacity-building	
139. Does your country have predictable and reliable funding for building capacity for the effective implementation of the Protocol? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.2.6 and 3.1.8 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

140. Has your country received external support or benefited from collaborative activities with other Parties in the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q135 of the 2nd NR*
141. If you answered *Yes* to question 140, how were these resources made available? (1) *If you answered No to question 140, please select "Not applicable"*	☐ Bilateral channels ☒ Regional channels ☒ Multilateral channels ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q136 of the 2nd NR*
142. Has your country provided support to other Parties in the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q137 of the 2nd NR*
143. If you answered *Yes* to question 142, how were these resources made available? (1) *If you answered No to question 142, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Bilateral channels ☒ Regional channels ☐ Multilateral channels ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q138 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

144. Has your country ever initiated a process to access GEF funds for building capacity in biosafety? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q140 of the 2nd NR*
145. If you answered *Yes* to question 144, how would you characterize the process? (1) *If you answered No to question 144, please select "Not applicable"* *Please add further details about your experience in accessing GEF funds under question 157.*	☐ Very easy ☐ Easy ☒ Average ☐ Difficult ☐ Very difficult ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q141 of the 2nd NR*
146. Has your country ever received funding from the GEF for building capacity in biosafety? (1)	☐ Pilot Biosafety Enabling Activity ☒ Development of National Biosafety Frameworks ☒ Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks ☒ Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH (Phase I) ☐ Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH (Phase II) ☐ Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH (Phase III) ☐ None of the above ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q142 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

147. During the current reporting period, has your country undertaken activities for the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No
148. If you answered *Yes* to question 147, in which of the following areas were these activities undertaken? (1) *If you answered No to question 147, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Institutional capacity ☒ Human resources capacity development and training ☒ Risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise ☐ Risk management ☒ Public awareness, participation and education in biosafety ☒ Information exchange and data management including participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House ☒ Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration at subregional, regional and international levels ☐ Technology transfer ☒ Identification of LMOs, including their detection ☐ Socio-economic considerations ☒ Implementation of the documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol ☒ Handling of confidential information ☐ Measures to address unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs ☒ Scientific biosafety research relating to LMOs ☐ Taking into account risks to human health ☐ Other (please specify): [Enter text here] ☐ Not applicable

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

149. During the current reporting period, has your country carried out a capacity-building needs assessment? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.2.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
150. If you answered *Yes* to question 149, has this information been submitted to the BCH? (4) *If you answered No to question 149, please select "Not applicable"* *This question is relevant to indicator 1.2.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not applicable
151. Does your country still have capacity-building needs? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.2.7 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes ☒ Yes, a few ☐ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q146 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

152. If you answered *Yes* to question 151, indicate which of the following areas still need capacity-building. (1) *If you answered No to question 151, please select "Not applicable"*	☐ Institutional capacity ☐ Human resources capacity development and training ☒ Risk assessment and other scientific and technical expertise ☐ Risk management ☒ Public awareness, participation and education in biosafety ☐ Information exchange and data management including participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House ☐ Scientific, technical and institutional collaboration at subregional, regional and international levels ☐ Technology transfer ☒ Identification of LMOs, including their detection ☐ Socio-economic considerations ☒ Implementation of the documentation requirements under Article 18.2 of the Protocol ☐ Handling of confidential information ☐ Measures to address unintentional and/or illegal transboundary movements of LMOs ☒ Scientific biosafety research relating to LMOs ☒ Taking into account risks to human health ☐ Other (please specify): [Enter text here] ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q147 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

153. Has your country developed a capacity-building strategy or action plan? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.2.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q148 of the 2nd NR*
154. Does your country have in place a functional national mechanism for coordinating biosafety capacity-building initiatives? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.2.4 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
155. How many biosafety short-term training programmes and/or academic courses are offered annually in your country? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.2.3 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☐ Less than 1 per year ☐ 1 per year or more ☒ 5 per year or more ☐ 10 per year or more
156. Has your country submitted the details of national biosafety experts to the Roster of Experts in the BCH? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q149 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

157. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 22 in your country, including further details about your experience in accessing GEF funds:

Questions 142-143: Special workshops were held in the Czech Republic for countries demanding support on bilateral basis. Series of regional training workshops were organized in cooperation with FAO and Ministry of Agriculture, with expert support of the Ministry of the Environment. Czech experts assisted in the EU workshops in some EU accession countries.

Questions 144-146: UNEP/GEF Projects contributed greatly to the development of NBF, especially to enhancement of institutional and authorities cooperation, to capacity-building and public awareness.

Questions 147-154: In spite of a number of experienced specialists in the Czech Republic, the country still has need for its own capacity-building, especially due to recent scientific development in biosafety. The need is monitored for inner purposes and therefore it was not submitted to the BCH. Capacity-building strategy is a part of broader national strategies (such as environmental education) and their action plans.

Question 155: Biotechnology and biosafety issues are included in educational programmes of universities. E.g. Charles University Prague organizes a special course on biotechnology in general and its use in various branches with high participation of students, in spite of its optional character. Agricultural University Prague, Faculty of Natural Sciences - Hradec Kralove University, Pharmaceutical Faculty Brno and South Bohemian University Ceske Budejovice have biotechnology and its safe handling included in their compulsory programmes. Other universities range these issues in their broader curricula.

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Article 23 – Public awareness and participation	
158. Has your country established a strategy or put in place legislation for promoting and facilitating public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q151 of the 2nd NR*
159. Has your country designed and/or implemented an outreach/communication strategy on biosafety? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 5.3.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
160. Does your country have any awareness and outreach programmes on biosafety? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 5.3.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No
161. If you answered *Yes* to question 160, please indicate what entity is responsible for carrying out the programmes and/or services and at which level the programmes take place (e.g. local, national, etc.): (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 5.3.1 of the Strategic Plan* Biosafety strategy forms a part of broader national strategies (e.g. Strategy for Sustainable Development, National Biodiversity Strategy, State Programme on Environmental Education and Public Awareness, Food Safety Strategy, Action Plan on Health and the Environment) Biosafety focused programmes are developed through: Czech Commission on the Use of Genetically Modified Organisms and Genetic Products (especially its open meeting for the public once a year), meetings with the public, media, websites of authorities (Ministry of the Environment, Ministry of Agriculture).	

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

162. Has your country established a biosafety website searchable archives, national resource centres or sections in existing national libraries dedicated to biosafety educational materials? (2) *This question is relevant to indicators 2.5.3 and 5.3.3 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q152 of the 2nd NR*
163. How many collaborative initiatives (including joint activities) on the Cartagena Protocol and other Conventions and processes has your government established in the last 4 years? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 5.2.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☐ One or more ☐ 5 or more ☒ 10 or more ☐ 25 or more
164. Has your country established a mechanism to ensure public access to information on living modified organisms that may be imported? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q153 of the 2nd NR*
165. Has your country established a mechanism to consult the public in the decision-making process regarding LMOs? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.5.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q154 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

166. Has your country established a mechanism to make available to the public the results of decisions taken on LMOs? (1) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.5.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q155 of the 2nd NR*
167. Has your country informed the public about existing modalities for public participation in the decision-making process regarding living modified organisms? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.5.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No
168. If you answered *Yes* to question 167, please indicate the modalities used to inform the public: (3) *If you answered No to question 167, please select "Not applicable"* *This question is relevant to indicator 2.5.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ National websites ☐ Newspapers ☐ Forums ☐ Mailing lists ☒ Public hearings ☒ Other (please specify): As to field trials, local boards and media. ☐ Not applicable
169. If you indicated more than one modality for public participation in question 168, which one was most used? (3) *If you did not indicated more than one modality in question 168, please select "Not applicable"* *This question is relevant to indicator 2.5.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ National websites ☐ Newspapers ☐ Forums ☐ Mailing lists ☐ Public hearings ☐ Not applicable

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

170. Has your country taken any initiative to inform its public about the means of public access to the Biosafety Clearing-House? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q156 of the 2nd NR*
171. How many academic institutions in your country are offering biosafety education and training courses and programmes? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.7.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☐ One or more ☐ 3 or more ☒ 5 or more ☐ 10 or more

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

172. Please indicate the number of educational materials and/or online modules on biosafety that are available and accessible to the public in your country: (3) *This question is relevant to indicators 2.7.2 and 5.3.4 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☐ One or more ☐ 5 or more ☐ 10 or more ☒ 25 or more ☐ 100 or more
173. In the current reporting period, has your country promoted and facilitated public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No
174. If you answered *Yes* to question 173, has your country cooperated with other States and international bodies? (1) *If you answered No to question 173, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
175. In the current reporting period, how many times has your country consulted the public in the decision-making process regarding LMOs and made the results of such decisions available to the public? (1)	☐ Never ☐ Less than 5 ☒ More than 5 ☐ Not applicable

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

176. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 23 in your country:

Biosafety issues are included in broader national strategies and legislation, such as those on environmental education. Awareness programmes are developed in cooperation with educational institutions, nature conservation organizations, centres for environmental education, muzea, some NGOs.

The right to information is based on national legislation, namely the Act 106/1999 on Free Access to Information, ammended in 2006, and the Act 123/1998 on the Right to Environmental Information, ammended through the Act 132/2000 and Act 6/2005. As a Party to the Aarhus Convention and to its Ammendement on Public Participation in Decisions on the Deliberate Release in the Environment and Placing on the Market of Genetically Modified Organisms, the Czech Republic implements the obligations of this Convention.

The public is always consulted during the authorisation process of field trials, by means of the Ministry's website and official boards of relevant regional authorities. In case of objections or negative comments made by the public, a public hearing must be organised by the Ministry of the Environment.

Public consultations regarding the notifications for placing LMOs on the market are organised at the EU level.

Article 24 – Non-Parties

177. Has your country entered into any bilateral, regional, or multilateral agreement with non-Parties regarding transboundary movements of LMOs? (1)	☐ Yes ☒ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q161 of the 2nd NR*
178. Has your country ever imported LMOs from a non-Party? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q162 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

179. Has your country ever exported LMOs to a non-Party? (1)	☐ Yes ☒ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q163 of the 2nd NR*
180. If you answered *Yes* to questions 178 or 179, were the transboundary movements of LMOs consistent with the objective of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety? (1) *If you answered No to both questions 178 and 1179, please select "Not applicable"*	☒ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☐ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q164 of the 2nd NR*
181. If you answered *Yes* to questions 178 or 179, was information about these transboundary movements submitted to the BCH? (1) *If you answered No to both questions 178 and 179, please select "Not applicable"*	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☒ No ☐ Not applicable ☐ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q165 of the 2nd NR*
182. If your country is not a Party to the Cartagena Protocol, has it contributed information to the BCH on LMOs released in, or moved into, or out of, areas within its national jurisdiction? (2) *If your country is a Party, please select "Not applicable"*	☐ Yes, always ☐ In some cases only ☐ No ☒ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q166 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

183. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 24 in your country:

Act 78/2004 Coll., which is in line with the EU legislation on GMOs, applies to all imports / exports of LMOs, whether these originate from parties or non-parties to the Protocol. The LMOs imported from non-party were intended for contained use.

Article 25 – Illegal transboundary movements

184. Has your country adopted domestic measures aimed at preventing and/or penalizing transboundary movements of LMOs carried out in contravention of its domestic measures to implement this Protocol? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q168 of the 2nd NR*
185. Has your country established a strategy for detecting illegal transboundary movements of LMOs? (2)	☒ Yes ☐ Yes, to some extent [Here you may provide further details] ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q169 of the 2nd NR*
186. In the current reporting period, how many times has your country received information concerning cases of illegal transboundary movements of an LMO to or from territories under its jurisdiction? (1)	☒ Never ☐ Less than 5 ☐ Less than 10 ☐ More than 10

If you replied Never to question 186 please go to question 191

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

187. If your country received information concerning cases of illegal transboundary movements of an LMO in the current reporting period, has your country informed the BCH and the other Party(ies) involved? (1) *This question is relevant to indicators 3.1.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes ☐ Only in some cases ☐ Only the other Party(ies) involved ☐ Only the BCH ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
188. If your country received information concerning cases of illegal transboundary movements of an LMO in the current reporting period, has your country established the origin of the LMO(s)? (2)	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, some cases ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
189. If your country received information concerning cases of illegal transboundary movements of an LMO in the current reporting period, has your country established the nature of the LMO(s)? (2)	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, some cases ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
190. If your country received information concerning cases of illegal transboundary movements of an LMO in the current reporting period, has your country established the circumstances of the illegal transboundary movement(s)? (2)	☐ Yes ☐ Yes, some cases ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

191. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 25 in your country:

It has to be noted that transfer within the European Union is not considered as a transboundary movement according to the relevant EU legislation - Regulation (EC) 1946/2003 states that "transboundary movement" means the intentional or unintentional movement of a GMO between one Party or non-Party and another Party on non-Party, excluding intentional movements between Parties within the Community. The Czech Republic is an inland country, not on the border of EU, so it does not serve as a point of entry into EU for commodities and seeds.

No illegal transboundary movements have been recorded during the current reporting period. Besides general surveillance, the Czech Environmental Inspectorate has monitored for possible occurrence of LMOs that have been detected in other countries, e.g. GM ornamental fish.

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Article 26 – Socio-economic considerations	
192. Does your country have any specific approaches or requirements that facilitate how socio-economic considerations should be taken into account in LMO decision making? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.7.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes ☒ No
193. If your country has taken a decision on import, has it ever taken into account socio-economic considerations arising from the impact of the LMO on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity? (1)	☐ Yes ☐ Only in some cases ☐ No ☒ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q176 of the 2nd NR*
194. How many peer-reviewed published materials has your country used for the purpose of elaborating or determining national actions with regard to socio-economic considerations? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.7.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ None ☐ One or more ☒ 5 or more ☐ 10 or more ☐ 50 or more

195. What is your country's experience, if any, in taking socio-economic considerations into account in LMO decision making? Please give details: (3)

This question is relevant to indicator 1.7.3 of the Strategic Plan

Socio-economic considerations are relevant at national level as regards the co-existence between conventional, organic and GM crops. The Czech Republic adopted its rules for co-existence in 2006 by the amendment of the Act 252/1997 on Agriculture. The details are set by the implementing Decree 89/2006, on detailed conditions for growing of genetically modified variety, as amended by Decree 58/2010.

The Czech Republic participated in discussions and information exchange on socio-economic issues at the European Union level.

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

196. Has your country cooperated with other Parties on research and information exchange on any socio-economic impacts of LMOs? (1)	☐ Yes ☒ Yes, to some extent Regarding co-existence of GM and conventional crops ☐ No ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q177 of the 2nd NR*

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

197. Here you may provide further details on the implementation of Article 26 in your country:

The Czech Republic as a Member State of the European Union follows EU guidelines and recommendations related to GM crops cultivation and possible impacts of this activity on various areas, including socio-economic aspects. Based on the 2010 European Commission Recommendations on guidelines for the development of national strategies and best practices to ensure the co-existence of genetically modified crops with conventional and organic farming, the Czech Republic has developed its national legislation on co-existence measures for GM maize, soybean and potato. Already from the first GM crop cultivation in 2005 (Bt-maize MON810), the co-existence rules have been applied. Since 2006 the general co-existence rules for GM crops cultivation became part of the Czech Act 252/1997, on Agriculture, as amended. For selected crops (potato, maize, soybean) details are further specified by Decree 89/2006, on Detailed Conditions for GM Crop Cultivation, as amended.

In spite of the fact that there is ten years experience with GM maize cultivation in the Czech Republic, data on socio-economic implications of GMO cultivation are rather scarce to become statistically significant and assessable. It is due to a low cultivation area of Bt-maize, which did not exceed 9 000 hectares even in the best year 2008. Since 2010 the cultivation area of MON 810 has gradually decreased, falling to less than 1 000 ha in 2015. Behind this data are numerous aspects, beginning from the generally negative attitude of the EU public to GM crops, higher administration requirements for GMO growers, problems with selling the harvest, high GM seed cost, up to a limited interest of leading seed distributors to import GM seed into EU nowadays. The situation with GM crops cultivation may get even worse following the recent Directive 2015/412, which gives the possibility to the Member States to restrict or prohibit the cultivation of GMOs in their territory. Under this new Directive, Member States may adopt opt-out decisions on GMO cultivation based on compelling grounds distinct from the environmental risk assessment undertaken in the context of the authorisation procedure at EU level.

On the other hand the European Commission in 2013 established a technical working group named the "European GMO Socio-Economics Bureau - ESEB" to organise and facilitate the exchange of technical and scientific information regarding the socio-economic implications of the cultivation and use of GMOs between Member States and the Commission. This team is composed of experts from the Member States (the Czech Republic did nominate its own bureau member but Czech experts take part in the working groups activities) and the Commission. The ESEB has compiled topics, indicators, methodological guidelines and potential data sources to carry out analyses of socio-economic effects in the Member States and across the EU. Thus, detailed guidelines to perform analyses of socio-economic effects of relevant crops will be useful soon also for the Czech Republic.

Article 27 – Liability and Redress

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

198. Is your country a Party to the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress? (4)	☒ Yes ☐ No
199. If you answered *No* to question 198, is there any national process in place towards becoming a Party? (4) *If you answered Yes to question 198, please select "Not applicable"*	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable
200. Has your country received any financial and/or technical assistance for capacity-building in the area of liability and redress relating to living modified organisms? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 2.4.1 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Yes ☒ No
201. Does your country have administrative or legal instrument that provide for response measures for damage to biodiversity resulting from living modified organisms? (3) *This question is relevant to indicators 1.5.2 and 2.4.2 of the Strategic Plan*	☒ Yes ☐ No

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

202. Here you may provide further details on any activities undertaken in your country towards the implementation of the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress:

The Czech Republic ratified the Nagoya - Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the CPB in February 2012.

The Czech Republic as a member of the EU has already relevant legislation in place:

At the EU level:

Directive 2004/35/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage

At the national level:

Act 167/2008, on prevention of ecological damage and its remedies and on amendments of some acts, that transposes the Directive 2004/35/EC into the domestic legislation

Regulation of the Government 295/2011 on the way of risk assessment of environmental damage and detailed conditions of financial security – provides further details on financial aspects in relation to environmental liability

Act 89/2012, Civil Code

Article 28 – Financial Mechanism and Resources

203. How much additional funding (in the equivalent of US dollars) has your country mobilized in the last four years to support implementation of the Biosafety Protocol, beyond the regular national budgetary allocation? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 1.2.5 of the Strategic Plan*	☐ Less than 5,000 USD ☒ 5,000 USD or more ☐ 50,000 USD or more ☐ 100,000 USD or more ☐ 500,000 USD or more ☐ 1,000,000 USD or more ☐ 5,000,000 USD or more ☐ Not applicable

Article 33 – Monitoring and reporting

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

204. Does your country have in place a monitoring and/or an enforcement system for the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol? (3) *This question is relevant to indicator 3.1.6 of the Strategic Plan* i. Monitoring system:	☒ Yes ☐ No
ii. Enforcement system:	☒ Yes ☐ No
205. Has your country submitted all the previous due National Reports? (1)	☒ Yes ☐ No
206. If you answered *No* to question 205, indicate the main challenges that hindered the submission: (1) *If you answered Yes to question 205, please select "Not applicable"*	☐ Lack of financial resources to gather the necessary information ☐ Lack of relevant information at the national level ☐ Difficulty in compiling the information from various sectors ☐ No obligation to submit (e.g. country was not a Party at the time) ☐ Other (please specify): [Enter text here] ☒ Not applicable ☒ *No changes since the previous report; apply same answer as in Q183 of the 2nd NR*
Other information	
207. Please use this field to provide any other information on issues related to national implementation of the Protocol, including any obstacles or impediments encountered. (1) It has to be noted that as far as the EU and its Member States are concerned, there are two levels of implementation of the Protocol, the EU level and national level. Therefore this national report refers to the EU report where relevant.	

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.

Comments on reporting format
208. Please use this field to provide any other information on difficulties that you have encountered in filling in this report. (1) Some questions concern different reporting periods: At the very beginning of this report, it is written that the reporting period is 2011 - 2015. In spite of that, Q132 requires data for two last years and Q133 for the last year.

(1) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was mandatory;
(2) This question originates from the 2nd National Report where it was optional;
(3) This question originates from the survey to gather information corresponding to indicators in the Strategic Plan;
(4) This question was introduced in the third National Report.