Annex

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE TESTING OF THE GUIDANCE ON RISK ASSESSMENT OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE TESTING								
Q1. These results are being submitted on behalf of a:	☐ Party. Please specify: Aarhus University, Institute for Bioscience, Denmark							
	 ☑ Other Government. Please specify: Miljøstyrelsen ☑ Organization: Please specify: Danish EPA 							
Q2. When was the testing of the Guidance conducted?	Please enter date: 14-11-2011							
Q3. Type of event where the testing of the Guidance was conducted?	Group event (e.g., workshop, training course, meeting). Please provide the title of the event and name of organizer: <type here=""></type>							
	Type of meeting:							
	Online							
	\boxtimes	Individual exercise. Please provide your name, occupation and affiliation: Gösta Kjellsson, Senior Advisor, PhD						
	\boxtimes	Other: Ple	ease specify: N	Morten Stran	dberg, Senior A	dvisor, PhD		
Q4. Which sections of the Guidance were tested?	\boxtimes	☐ Part I: The Roadmap for Risk assessment of LMOs						
	Part II: Specific types of LMOs or Traits:							
	Risk assessment of LMOs with stacked genes or traits							
	Risk assessment of LM crops with tolerance to abiotic stress							
		☐ Risk assessment of LM mosquitoes						
OVERALL EVALUATION								
			Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good	
Please indicate the level of agreement you at	tribute	to each of	the questions	in the left col	<u>umn.</u>			
Q5. How do you evaluate the level of consistency of the Guidance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, particularly with its Article 15 and Annex III?						\boxtimes		
Q6. How do you evaluate the usefulness of the Guidance as a tool to assist countries in conducting and reviewing risk assessments of LMOs in a scientifically sound and case-by-case manner?					\boxtimes			
Q7. How do you evaluate the usefulness of the Guidance as a tool to assist countries in conducting and reviewing risk assessments of LMOs introduced into various receiving environments?				\boxtimes	\boxtimes			

PART I: ROADMAP FOR RISK ASSESSMENT OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS

Please answer each of the questions in the left column with "yes" or "no" and add comments if needed.					
Q8. Does the Roadmap provide useful guidance for conducting risk assessments of LMOs in accordance with the Protocol?	⊠ Yes □ No	Comments: <type here=""></type>			
Q9. Is the Roadmap useful to risk assessors who have limited experience with LMO risk assessment?	⊠ Yes □ No	Comments: Ideally yes, if focussed training is supplied			
Q10. Is the Roadmap organized in a logic and structured manner?	⊠ Yes □ No	Comments: <type here=""></type>			
Q11. Is the Roadmap user-friendly taking into account that risk assessment is a complex scientific and multidisciplinary activity?	⊠ Yes □ No	Comments: Could be improved with use of a route-diagram			
Q12. Is the Roadmap applicable to all types of LMOs (e.g. plants, animals, microorganisms)?	⊠ Yes □ No	Comments: It is uncertain how suited the roadmap is for other types of LMO's that plants			
Q13. Is the Roadmap applicable to all types of introductions into the environment (e.g. small- and large-scale releases, placing on the market/commercialisation)?	⊠ Yes	Comments: In principle yes			
Q14. Is there any other issue or concept that you would like to see included in the Roadmap?	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Comments: <type here=""></type>			
Q15. Does the flowchart provide a useful graphic representation of the risk assessment process as described in the Roadmap?	⊠ Yes □ No	Comments: A good presentation of relevant issues			

PART II: SPECIFIC TYPES OF LIVING MODIFIED ORGANISMS OR TRAITS

Risk assessment of living modified organisms with stacked genes or traits Please answer each of the questions in the left column with "yes" or "no" and add comments if needed. Comments: - in the introduction a presentation of the overall structure could be an advantage O16. Does this section provide useful guidance X Yes The concept of choice of comparators induces an when conducting risk assessments of LMOs with uncertainty by use of words like: can and may. This stacked genes or traits in accordance with the ☐ No may be because comparators is not a very good Protocol? concept. Instead an assessment (CASE BY CASE) of the insert in its background could be a suggestion O17. Is this section of the Guidance useful to risk X Yes Comments: Most likely this will require additional assessors who have limited experience with risk training ☐ No assessments of LMOs with stacked genes of traits? X Yes Q18. Is this section of the Guidance organized in a Comments: See Q16 first part of comment logic and structured manner? ☐ No Q19. Is this section of the Guidance user-friendly X Yes Comments: The structure could be improved - a table taking into account that risk assessment is a complex or diagram for selection of choises could be added No No scientific and multidisciplinary activity? Q20. Is there any other issue or concept that you ☐ Yes would like to see included in this section of the Comments: see comments Q16 ☐ No Guidance? Risk assessment of living modified crops with tolerance to abiotic stress Please answer each of the questions in the left column with "yes" or "no" and add comments if needed. Q21. Does this section provide useful guidance Comments: It should be more clear what kinds of X Yes ABIOTIC STRESS are included. Tolerance to when conducting risk assessments of LM crops with herbicide is also tolerance to abiotic stress. Is it tolerance to abiotic stress(es) in accordance with the ☐ No Protocol? included? Comments: Except for experience with herbicide O22. Is this section of the Guidance useful to risk tolerance very few assessors can say that they have ☐ Yes assessors who have limited experience with risk more than limited experience with LM-crops tolerant assessments of LM crops with tolerance to abiotic to abiotic stress. The issue is that assessors of LM No No crops with tolerance to abiotic stress should be stress(es)? experienced plant ecologists. Comments: <could be more user friendly by X Yes Q23. Is this section of the Guidance organized in a providing an overview giving the reader a quick idea logic and structured manner? □ No of the structureand the idea of the structure> Q24. Is this section of the Guidance user-friendly ☐ Yes taking into account that risk assessment is a complex Comments: <see comment Q23> □ No scientific and multidisciplinary activity?

Q25. Is there any other issue or concept that you would like to see included in this section of the Guidance?	☐ Yes ☑ No	Comments: <type here=""></type>					
Risk assessment of living modified mosquitoes							
Please answer each of the questions in the left column with "yes" or "no" and add comments if needed.							
Q26. Does this section provide useful guidance when conducting risk assessments of LM mosquitoes in accordance with the Protocol?	⊠ Yes □ No	Comments: <type here=""></type>					
Q27. Is this section of the Guidance useful to risk assessors who have limited experience with risk assessments of LM mosquitoes?	⊠ Yes	Comments: <type here=""></type>					
Q28. Is this section of the Guidance organized in a logic and structured manner?	⊠ Yes □ No	Comments: <type here=""></type>					
Q29. Is this section of the Guidance user-friendly taking into account that risk assessment is a complex scientific and multidisciplinary activity?	⊠ Yes	Comments: <type here=""></type>					
Q30. Is there any other issue or concept that you would like to see included in this section of the Guidance?	☐ Yes	Comments: <type here=""></type>					
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS							
Please add any additional comment you may have regarding the "Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms" below.							

Q31.

<Please type your comments here>