

Template for comments on the draft Implementation Plan for the Cartagena Protocol and Capacity-Building Action Plan (2021-2030)

Contact information		
Surname:	Melchert Saguas Presas	
Given Name:	Luciana	
Government (if applicable):	Brazil	
Organization/IPLC:	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	
E-mail:	dema1@itamaraty.gov.br	
Comments on the text and Appendix		
Page #	Line in text or Element in Appendix	Comment
5	A.1 CB activity (ii)	Delete item (ii). The national biosafety framework and the mainstreaming of biosafety into national legislation depends on the national circumstances and in this case a standard guide and training modules will not reflect the diversity among countries.
6	Objective A.2.2 A.2. Indicator (b)	Delete item A.2.2. and the indicator (b). The focus should be on the mandatory information required to be published in the BCH.
7	Objective A.5.2	Rephrase in the following manner: “A.5.2. Parties develop, have access to and use appropriate guidance materials based on scientifically sound approaches for carrying out risk assessment and risk management.” As an objective directly linked to articles of the Cartagena Protocol, guidance materials should be based on scientifically sound evidences.
7	A.5.2 Indicator (d)	Delete: “considering also traditional knowledge of IPLCs, as other available scientific evidence” The article 15 does not refers to IPLC.
7	A.5. CB activity (i)	Delete: “develop and update”. There are many training materials developed by countries and other international organizations that can be used in the capacity building activities.
7	A.5. CB activity (iv)	Delete: “including to review and acquire data on biodiversity for specific ecological areas relevant to risk assessment and risk management”. The example of research areas does not need to be defined in the strategic plan.
7	A.5. CB activity (v)	Delete item (v). The target audience for the capacity building activities will be defined by the Parties according with their priorities.
7	A.5. Key Area (4)	Delete item (4). Emergency measures are addressed in Article 17, and not in Article 15.

8	A.6. CB activity (i)	Delete “customs and border control officials and other”. The target audience for the capacity building activities will be defined by the Parties according with their priorities.
8	A.6. CB activity (ii)	Delete item (ii). There is no obligation of such a check list to be developed under the Protocol. Any item to be included in a check list would have first to be agreed by all parties
8	A.6. CB activity (iii)	Delete: “Develop and/or update as necessary”. There are many training materials developed by countries and other international organizations that can be used in the capacity building activities.
10	Goal A.9.	It is necessary to ensure that Parties are not obliged to include socioeconomic considerations in their risk analysis procedures. The parties may choose to do so.
	A.9. Outcome	Parties should consider a balanced range of issues in decision-taking – negative and positive impacts according to local circumstances.
10	Objective A.9.2.	The objectives A.9.2 and A.9.3 presupposes that socioeconomic considerations would be managed using guidance materials that would support/assist Parties in taking voluntary decisions regarding SEC. It is premature, however, to agree on targets in this sense considering that up to now there is not an agreed approach by the Parties considering that the SEC negotiations are still inconclusive.
10	Objective A.9.3.	The language “research and information exchange on any socioeconomic impacts of LMOs, especially on IPLCs” anticipates impacts of LMOs regardless effective damages to biodiversity in line with Article 26 of the Cartagena Protocol. This language implies that LMOs can pose socioeconomic impacts which is not supported by scientific evidences and, therefore, can confuse Parties and give rise to measures that could create unnecessary barriers to trade, against the ultimate goal of Article 26.
10	A.9. Indicator (a)	Delete item (a). It does not seem reasonable to agree on indicators that would measure the number of Parties effectively adopting SEC measures. It seems much more important to consider effective SEC measures arising from impacts caused by specific LMOs to biodiversity that simply agreeing broad indicators.
10	A.9. Indicator (b)	Delete item (b). We do not consider adequate to use as an indicator the use of guidance or research activities for a voluntary article such as article 26. This indicator expands the compromise reached by Parties.
10	A.9. Indicator (c)	Delete item (c). We do not consider adequate to use as an indicator the use of guidance or research activities for a voluntary article such as article 26. This indicator expands the compromise reached by Parties.
10	A.9. CB activity (i)	Delete “including of use of guidance documents”. Plan capacity building activities about an issue that is not even clear in terms of scope and how Parties should address SEC seems premature. (i) Provide training using guidance documents can only be a useful activity if Parties agree on a guidance document that follows the mandate of Article 26.
10	A.9 CB activity (ii)	Delete item (ii). Proposals (ii) and (iii) could be a way forward if Parties adopt a Decision on how to address SEC.
10	A.9. CB activity (iii)	Delete item (iii).

		Proposals (ii) and (iii) could be a way forward if Parties adopt a Decision on how to address SEC.
13	Goal B.2.	Should indicate that activities will be undertaken according to national circumstances.
14	Goal B.3.	Delete “consult the public in decision-making on LMOs”. The goal should be in line with the Article 23 as the public consultation part has a caveat “in accordance with their respective laws and regulations”.
14	B.3. Indicator (c)	Include the term “if required by Party law or regulation”.
14	B.3. Indicator (d)	Include the term “if required by Party law or regulation”.
14	B.3. Indicator (e)	Include the term “if required by Party law or regulation”.
14	B.3 CB activity (i)	Delete “develop”. We understand that a long-term strategic plan should not include a compromise to develop guidance for certain topics. The needed of a guidance can be decided by Parties in the COP-MOP based on specialists’ advice and the priorities according with the current challenges and gaps. Before a decision about the elaboration of any guidance or capacity-building material is necessary to be aware of the current status of knowledge and the availability of information in order to avoid duplication of efforts and the unnecessary use of scarce financial resources.
14	B.3 CB activity (v)	Delete item (v). Specific activities should be defined by the Parties and not established in the Plan.
14	B.3 CB activity (vi)	Include the term “if required by Party law or regulation”.
14	B.3 CB activity (vii)	Delete item (vii). Specific activities should be defined by the Parties and not established in the Plan.