Sub-category: Audience

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
| ID 197 + 39 +17 + 49 (RM)They all suggest somehow that the targeted audience is not clearly stated and/or that the guidance must be for X or Y audience in a prevalent manner. | Looking at and rereading the roadmap, it is clear to me that this is not necessary. The section on “objective and scope” as well as “Part I/ background” make it very clear what the roadmap is meant to accomplish/ the roadmap´s function. No further clarification is really needed.My suggestion is to explain this as clearly as possible, maybe reiterate what the roadmap clearly states. |  |

Sub-category: Scope

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
| ID 185 (RM) + 219 + 300 + 341 + 483 + 487 Need to emphasize scale issues in the roadmap (time and space) through the steps when conducting a RA so it is sufficiently comprehensive, and correct context in relation to needed info for the risk assessment processID 390 (RM) + 391 mostly plants although roadmap should be universal for all LMO | ID 185+ 219 + 300 + 341 + 483 + 487 must take this into accountID 390 + 391 this problem and limitation is already mentioned in Part I “Background” recognizing that it is with LM plants where most experience exists ….revisit Part II |  |

Sub-category: Relevancy of points to consider

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
| ID 105 (RM) does not sustain for itselfID 126 (RM) need to better structure part II relative to part I; also explain that the guidance is not by itself a standalone methodology, but a “guidance”ID 137 (RM) difficulty in understanding the relevance of the points to considerID 191 (RM) no challengeID 217 + 309 (RM) “problem formulation” is suggested to be added…the guidance does mention the concept although does not explicitly develop it (see para 2 step 1).ID 236 (RM) not well sustainedID237 (RM) what I find relevant is the need for examples, rest is not well sustainedID 309 (RM) suggest clarifying what info is actually needed in the process ID 392 (RM) does not sustain for itselfID 8 (S) does not sustain for itselfID 15 (S) look at interactionsID 24 (S) questions the scientific grounds of the whole sectionID 28 (S) does not sustain for itselfID 32 (A)  | ID 105 DismissID 126 Reevaluate order part II in relation to part IID 137 DismissID 191 yes this is OKID 217 + 309 This para could be clearer, it is a bit confusing. Adding some clearness might help those proposing problem formulation to be explicitly dealt with.ID 236 DismissID 237 I find the roadmap an easy document to read on the whole, It might be useful to bring to the front of the document the flow chart and highlight the part of the flow chart for each sectionID 309 take into consideration to try to make this clearer through elaborating a bit more perhaps?ID 392 DismissID 8 DismissID 15 Revisit the sectionID 24 Revisit the sectionID 28 Dissmiss | See “conducting the risk assessment”….it explicitly mentions that “relevance” depends on the case being assessed |

Sub-category: Link between steps or sections of the Guidance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
| (RM) ID 22+126 + 309 + 391 +483 ? + 484 | ID 22+126+309 + 391 + 483? + 484 + Need to elaborate on the relationship between the points to consider in the different sections of the roadmap (conducting a …….) as well as assuring same logical steps/sections between Parts I and II of the Guidance |  |

Sub-category: Experience with LMO & conventional practices

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
| (RM) ID 22+ ID 24 + 300 + 401 (?) + 412 + 459 + 481 The roadmap repeatedly mentions framing the risk assessment steps in previous knowledge and known context, see in planning phase, in consucting the risk assessment step 1 (h) and footnote 19, also (l), step 2 also considers past experience as well as step 5 (a)ID 49 (RM) gives good examples to think of related to “real life case studies”ID 414 (RM) does not sustain for itselfID 485 (?) | (RM) ID 22+ ID 24 + 300 + 401 (?) + 412 + 459 + 481 revisit and see if an extra mention is neededID 49 Try to get a grip on some of these possible examplesID 414 (RM) Dismiss |  |

Sub-category: Language

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
|  |  |  |

Sub-category: Consistency with the Cartagena Protocol

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
| ID 52 + 65 + 91 (M) Question if general monitoring should be includedID 35 (?) | ID 52 + 65 + 91 (M) revisit and consider |  |

Sub-category: Actors and communication mechanisms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
| ID 94 (M) usefulness of monitoring networks | ID 94 (M) consider introducing usefulness of monitoring networks |  |

Sub-category: Concrete examples

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
| All comments call for concrete examples, for example ID 40 (GC) is very constructive | Examples are needed |  |

Sub-category: Human health

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
| ID 34 (GC) specify scope of HH issues under ERA | ID 34 not sure how |  |

Sub-category: Others

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified challenges | Possible way forward | Notes (if needed) |
| ID 90 (M) + 43 (GC) + 46 (GC) + 50 (GC) Need to check and update ref´s | ID 90 (M) + 43 (GC) + 46 (GC) + 50 (GC) it is correct to need to check and update ref´s |  |