Sub-category: Concrete examples

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comments | Identified issues | Possible way forward |
| R188, R165, R314, R10R8R63R297, R194, R143, R232, R201, R195, R234, R196, R293, R452, R235, R145, R397, R473, R292, R199, R356R200R9R32, R406R273R476R246S2, S19Mn54, Mn55 | Dealing with uncertaintyProtection goals, assessment and measurement endpointsComparatorsMethodologies for evaluating exposure, likelihood, consequences and overall riskRisk pathways/causal linkCharacterization of the LMOTypes of effects"Technology package" associated with the LMOCriteria for acceptability, thresholds, insect resistance managementChecklistMethodology regarding LMOs with stacked genesCumulative effects | Consider a process (“who”, “how”, “what” and “when”) to collect examples of how countries deal with these matters with a view to adding relevant examples to the Guidance. |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comments | Identified issues | Possible way forward |
| R490, R71, R34, R222, R288, R475, R101, R433, R29 | Concepts are repeated, contradictory and/or misplaced. | Consider individual comments and revise as needed, taking into account that some concepts are deliberately repeated in different parts of the Guidance.  |

Sub-category: Relevancy of points to consider

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comments | Identified issues | Possible way forward |
| S18 | Additional point: megadiverse countries with multiple isogenic lines, supported by baseline studies | Consider if this additional point to consider would be relevant |

Sub-category: Consistency with the Cartagena Protocol & policy issues

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comments | Identified issues | Possible way forward |
| R102 | Step 5 ‘Rationale’ vs. decision making process | Consider if it is necessary to provide clearer distinction on what is part of the RA and what is in the realm of decision making |

Sub-category: Experience with LMO, non-LMOs & conventional practices

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comments | Identified issues | Possible way forward |
| R413S69 | Non-modified counterpart not being sufficient to assess the risk of a stress tolerant plantInformation requirements in the case of stacked events | Attempt to reconcile this comment with the last para of the section on comparators.Consider adding text and/or example to address the issue raised in the comment |

Sub-category: Language & structure

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Comments | Identified issues | Possible way forward |
| R214, R475, R292, R334, R258, S40, S27, S17, G36R254, R270, R190, R252, R255, R257, R78, R77, R256, R263, R251, R267, R89, R228, R396R74, R170, R125, R76R315, R176, R41, R163, R177R116, R57, R264, R427 | More clarity is neededThe language of the preface, introduction, rationales and points to consider is difficult to follow. The text lacks practical guidanceFlowchartRisk scenarios *versus* risk hypothesisUse of terms | Analyze individual comments and attempt to clarify issues that are not properly explainedAttempt to revise, shorten sentences and avoid complex language, add more practical explanation on “how to”Consider ways to reconcile the two comments (ones asks for simplification, another asks for more detail)At the AHTEG meeting it was agreed that “scenario” and “hypothesis” refer to two different concepts. So, no changes needed to the way these terms are being used throughout the Guidance. Consider adding “scenario” to the use of terms section, see definition in Suter IIConsider if the specific terms noted in the comments need to be added to the “Use of terms” section |