

COMPLETE

Q7: In what language was the Guidance tested?

Collector: BCH website (Website Survey)
Started: Saturday, February 08, 2014 2:46:41 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, February 08, 2014 3:37:49 AM

Time Spent: 00:51:08

PAGE 1

Q1: Type of submission:	Party
GE 2	
Q2: Name of the Party:	Spain
Q3: Person submitting this questionnaire:	
Full Name:	Ana Fresno
Email Address:	afresno@magrama.es
Q4: Institution(s) or organization(s) that participated in the testing:	Government authority(ies)
Q5: Context in which the testing was conducted	Group event(s) (e.g., workshop, training course, meeting)
Q6: Actual case(s) of risk assessment used in the testing: No Records (e.g. http://bch.cbd.int/database/record.shtml?documentid=104905 technical and scientific data of the actual cases of risk assessment used in the testing: No Records i	nentid=104904 and) or other publicly accessible web pages containing the
Risk Assessment 1:	BCH records 104544, 104540, 104538, 104536, 104530, 104524
Risk Assessment 2:	http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/calidad-y-

PAGE 3

Q8: Name of the other Government:	Respondent skipped this question
Q9: Person submitting this questionnaire:	Respondent skipped this question
Q10: Institution(s) or organization(s) that participated in the testing:	Respondent skipped this question
Q11: Context in which the testing was conducted	Respondent skipped this question

evaluacionambiental/temas/biotecnologia/ERMA_B_ES

_12_30_tcm7-217082.pdf

Spanish

Q12: Actual case(s) of risk assessment used in the testing: Note: Please enter the hyperlinks of BCH Risk Assessment Records (e.g. http://bch.cbd.int/database/record.shtml? documentid=104904 and http://bch.cbd.int/database/record.shtml?

documentid=104905) or other publicly accessible web pages containing the technical and scientific data of the actual

 $Respondent\ skipped\ this\ question$

cases of risk assessment used in the testing.

Q13: In what language was the Guidance tested?

Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 4

Q14: Name of the organization:	Respondent skipped this question
Q15: Person submitting this questionnaire:	Respondent skipped this question
Q16: Institution(s) or organization(s) that participated in the testing:	Respondent skipped this question
Q17: Context in which the testing was conducted	Respondent skipped this question
Q18: Actual case(s) of risk assessment used in the testing: Note: Please enter the hyperlinks of BCH Risk Assessment Records (e.g. http://bch.cbd.int/database/record.shtml? documentid=104904 and http://bch.cbd.int/database/record.shtml? documentid=104905) or other publicly accessible web pages containing the technical and scientific data of the actual cases of risk assessment used in the testing.	Respondent skipped this question
Q19: In what language was the Guidance tested?	Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 5

Q20: Would you like to submit an evaluation of the following section of the Guidance: Part I: The Roadmap for Risk Assessment

Yes

Q21: This section of the Guidance is practical.1		
(no label)	Agree	
Q22: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its practicality? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question	
Q23: This section of the Guidance is useful or has utility.2		
Q23: This section of the Guidance is useful or has utility.2 (no label)	Agree	

Q25: This section of the Guidance is consistent with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.3

(no label) Strongly Agree

Q26: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its consistency with the Protocol? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:

Respondent skipped this question

Q27: This section of the Guidance takes into account past and present experiences with LMOs.4

(no label) Agree

Q28: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section in order to better take into account past and present experiences with LMOs? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:

Respondent skipped this question

Q29: Here you may provide further details to explain your answers in evaluating this section of the Guidance:

La Parte I "Hoja de Ruta" es la parte más desarrollada de la Guía. En ella se especifican todos los pasos necesarios para realizar una evaluación de riesgo, incluídas cuestiones globales como la calidad y pertinencia de la información. Permite por tanto realizar la evaluación desde las etapas de planificación de la misma, incidiendo en aspectos que no serán ya necesarios para evaluadores con más experiencia, pero que sí lo serán para aquellosque se planteen por primera vez realizar una evaluación.

En esta parte se enumeran con un elevado nivel de detalle los aspectos a considerar, pero dejando margen para que el grado de exigencia de la información requerida por el evaluador pueda adaptarse a las características de la liberación (escala, tiempo) lo que consideramos positivo. Sin embargo este margen puede significar que evaluadores con poca experiencia encuentren que algunos aspectos puedan requerir más definición. Por eso hemos asignado un valor de "acuerdo" a los criterios de practicidad y utilidad.

Hemos asignado "muy de acuerdo" al criterio de conformidad con el Protocolo de Cartagena porque esta parte de la Guía se adapta completamente a lo exigido en el Anexo III.

PAGE 7

Q30: Would you like to submit an evaluation of the following section of the Guidance: Part II: Specific types of LMOs or Traits - Risk assessment of LMOs with stacked genes or traits

Yes

PAGE 8

Q31: This section of the Guidance is practical.1

(no label) Neutral

Q32: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its practicality? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:

Respondent skipped this question

Q33: This section of the Guidance is useful or has utility.2

(no label) Agree

Q34: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its usefulness/utility? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:

Respondent skipped this question

Q35: This section of the Guidance is consistent with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.3

(no label) Strongly Agree

Q36: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its consistency with the Protocol? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:

Respondent skipped this question

Q37: This section of the Guidance takes into account past and present experiences with LMOs.4

(no label) Neutral

Q38: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section in order to better take into account past and present experiences with LMOs? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:

Respondent skipped this question

Q39: Here you may provide further details to explain your answers in evaluating this section of the Guidance:

Este apartado se centra en la evaluación de plantasque expresan eventos apilados entendiendo como tales los que provengan de la acumulación de eventos individuales por fecundación de dos plantas vivas modificadas. Para esta evaluación es necesario que los eventos simples hayan sido evaluados previamente, y en este sentido hemos calificado la practicidad como neutra, ya que necesariamente se debe referir a la parte 1 "hoja de ruta".

En cuanto al criterio de experiencia, a nuestro parecer la Guía trata los eventos apilados como una generación de OMG por desarrollar, cuando de hecho en la actualidad son los eventos más ampliamente utilizados. Por eso hemos asignado una calificación de "neutral".

PAGE 9

Q40: Would you like to submit an evaluation of the following section of the Guidance: Part II: Specific types of LMOs or Traits - Risk assessment of LM crops with tolerance to abiotic stress

No

Q41: This section of the Guidance is practical.1	Respondent skipped this question
Q42: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its practicality? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q43: This section of the Guidance is useful or has utility.2	Respondent skipped this question
Q44: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its usefulness/utility? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q45: This section of the Guidance is consistent with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.3	Respondent skipped this question
Q46: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its consistency with the Protocol? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question

Q47: This section of the Guidance takes into account past and present experiences with LMOs.4	Respondent skipped this question
Q48: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section in order to better take into account past and present experiences with LMOs? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q49: Here you may provide further details to explain your answers in evaluating this section of the Guidance:	Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 11

Q50: Would you like to submit an evaluation of the following section of the Guidance: Part II: Specific types of LMOs or Traits - Risk assessment of LM mosquitoes	No
--	----

PAGE 12

Q51: This section of the Guidance is practical.1	Respondent skipped this question
Q52: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its practicality? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q53: This section of the Guidance is useful or has utility.2	Respondent skipped this question
Q54: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its usefulness/utility? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q55: This section of the Guidance is consistent with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.3	Respondent skipped this question
Q56: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its consistency with the Protocol? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q57: This section of the Guidance takes into account past and present experiences with LMOs.4	Respondent skipped this question
Q58: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section in order to better take into account past and present experiences with LMOs? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q59: Here you may provide further details to explain your answers in evaluating this section of the Guidance:	Respondent skipped this question

PAGE 13

Q60: Would you like to submit an evaluation of the following section of the Guidance: Part II: Specific types of LMOs or Traits - Risk assessment of LM trees

Q61: This section of the Guidance is practical.1	
(no label)	Agree
Q62: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its practicality? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q63: This section of the Guidance is useful or has utility.2	
(no label)	Agree
Q64: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its usefulness/utility? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q65: This section of the Guidance is consistent with the Carta	gena Protocol on Biosafety.3
(no label)	Strongly Agree
Q66: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its consistency with the Protocol? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q67: This section of the Guidance takes into account past and	present experiences with LMOs.4
(no label)	Agree
Q68: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section in order to better take into account past and present experiences with LMOs? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:	Respondent skipped this question
Q69: Here you may provide further details to explain your answ	vers in evaluating this section of the Guidance:
En este apartado, al igual que en la "hoja de ruta"se enumeran detallada considerar en la evaluación, por lo que hemos asignado valores elevad criterios de practicidad y utilidad.	
En cuanto al criterio experiencia, consideramos quese han tenido en cuadquiridos en la evaluación de árboles vivos hasta el momento, pero es	importante destacar que estos
conocimientos son más reducidos que en plantas herbáceas, de menor	
conocimientos son mas reducidos que en plantas herbaceas, de menoi	

Q71: This section of the Guidance is	ractical.1	
(no label)	Neutral	

Q72: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section Respondent skipped this question to increase its practicality? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:

Q73: This section of the Guidance is useful or has utility.2

(no label)

Neutral

Q74: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its usefulness/utility? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:

Respondent skipped this question

Q75: This section of the Guidance is consistent with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.3

(no label)

Strongly Agree

Q76: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section to increase its consistency with the Protocol? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:

Respondent skipped this question

Q77: This section of the Guidance takes into account past and present experiences with LMOs.4

(no label)

Neutral

Q78: Would you like to suggest improvements to this section in order to better take into account past and present experiences with LMOs? If so, please indicate the line numbers and explain which improvements could be made:

Respondent skipped this question

Q79: Here you may provide further details to explain your answers in evaluating this section of the Guidance:

Este apartado es el que encontramos menos concreto a la hora de aplicarlo a una situación real. Al no referirse a situaciones concretas, ni presentarse ejemplos, su practicidad y utilidad es más limitada que los anteriores, en que se especificaban los requerimientos de distintas tipos de OMG. ⊟ objetivo y ámbito están en nuestra opinión correctamente descritos, pero el desarrollo de un plan de vigilancia establece unas pautas tan generales que no facilitan su aplicación.

En este sentido, el Protocolo es mucho menos específico de los requisitos de este tipo de programas de vigilancia, por lo que hemos asignado al criterio de conformidad un valor de "muy de acuerdo".

PAGE 17

Q80: Would you like to submit an evaluation of the following section of the Guidance: Background Documents

No

Q81: This section of the Guidance is practical.1	Respondent skipped this question
Q82: This section of the Guidance is useful or has utility.2	Respondent skipped this question
Q83: This section of the Guidance is consistent with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.3	Respondent skipped this question
Q84: This section of the Guidance takes into account past and present experiences with LMOs.4	Respondent skipped this question

Q85: Please use the space below if you wish to provide additional feedback regarding the testing of the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms:

Respondent skipped this question