

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

17 January 2020

Contact information		
Surname:	Lukie	
Given Name:	Sarah	
Government (if applicable):		
Organization/IPLC:	Global Industry Coalition (GIC)	
E-mail:	Sarah.lukie@croplife.org	
Comments on the text and Appendix		
Page #	Line in text or Element in Appendix	Comment
0	0	It is common sense to ask, “who should/will do this?” when looking at the proposed activities. It could be made clearer – perhaps in paragraph 11 (page 2, lines 62-65) that these are the proposed “actors” that can support all proposed activities.
0	0	Throughout the text, the term “biosafety” is used in relation to LMOs and this should be highlighted by specifying whenever possible that the proposed activities are related to “LMO biosafety”. Biosafety is a much broader discipline going far beyond just activities with LMOs.
2	57-58	While the document references that “facilitating donors” is one of the major purposes of the CB Action Plan, this is not emphasized in the document apart from in Goal B.2. Should be edited to reflect this emphasis.
2	63	Non-Parties (other Governments) can also support implementation of the Protocol and should also be listed here.
3	91	There should be more consideration of the need to ensure the CB activities are actually necessary and relevant for implementation (of “continuing relevance” p3 line 91), and an effective use of resources (see p4 lines 136). For example, considering the outstanding significant basic implementation needs of the Parties, ongoing work on (new) guidance documents – which is emphasized in the document – seems to be hard to justify and likely unnecessary. For example, during the recent online discussion and AHTEG discussions on SECs, it is clear that Parties/other govts are taking SECs into account in decision making as appropriate for their national circumstances (per s26 BSP) and do not need a guidance document to tell them how to do it. On this topic and others like risk assessment it would be more effective and efficient for more experienced Parties and other Governments to share information already developed.

3	96	Further emphasis in the document overall needs to be given to the statement that the lists of CB activities are “not prescriptive”. They are a “suggested focus” (p3 line 86), “indicative” (p3 line 96), “illustrative” (p3 line 98) etc., not requirements or obligations.
3	100-101	The document should more significantly emphasize the point that national “needs and circumstances should ultimately determine the design and delivery of CB activities”.
5	Goal A.1 CB activity (ii)	Resources should not be put toward development a new best practice guide and/or training module on development and implementation of national biosafety frameworks. There are already numerous other such resources, as developed and used in the UNEP/GEF Development and Implementation Projects. This activity should be edited to state, “Collect and share existing best practices and training modules...” rather than, “Develop a best practice guide and training module...”.
6	Objective A.2.2	Should be edited for clarity, “Parties publish other LMO <i>biosafety-related</i> information” (italics indicate clarifying language).
6	A.2 Indicator (b)	Should be edited for clarity, “Parties publish other LMO <i>biosafety-related</i> information” (italics indicate clarifying language).
6	A.2 CB activity (iii)	This should be revised to reflect the fact that Parties can elect to use the BCH to share their information and they are not required to have national websites.
6	A.2 CB activity (iv)	This should be deleted. It is redundant with A.2 CB activity (i)
7	Goal A.5	This should be edited to reflect that it applies to LMOs, “that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health.”
7	Objective A.5.2	Delete – this is not an implementation objective. It is not specified/required by the Protocol and is a capacity building activity, not an objective
7	A.5 Indicator (c)	Delete – this is not an indicator of carrying out “scientifically sound risk assessments” or risk management.
7	A.5 Indicator (d)	Edit to remove reference to IPLCs because Article 15 does not restrict such scientific evidence to that generated by IPLCs. Furthermore, Article 15 states that risk assessments should be based on sound scientific evidence A suggested edit is, “(d) Percentage of Parties carrying out scientifically sound risk assessments in accordance with Annex III and Article 15.”
7	A.5 Key Areas (2) and (3)	Question here how these two items could be measured objectively.
7	Goal A.5 CB Activity (i)	Should be edited to indicate, “Update, <i>if necessary</i> ...” as there is an abundance of training materials in this area.
7	Goal A.5 CB Activity (ii)	This should be revised to remove “reviewing” and add “... <i>examples of completed risk assessments.</i> ” As revised, it would read, “Training on conducting risk assessments, and using sources of available guidance including examples of completed risk assessments”
7	Goal A.5 CB Activity (iv)	This should incorporate existing knowledge (rather than implying there is nothing), e.g. "Raise awareness of existing scientific knowledge and research related to LMO biosafety, and where necessary and relevant to risk assessment and risk management, conduct research to address specific ecological areas or questions”.

8	Goal A.5 CB activity (vi)	This activity should be deleted. This is not a requirement under the Protocol.
8	Objective A.6.1	Delete – this is not an implementation objective. It is not specified/required by the Protocol and is a capacity building activity, not an objective.
8	Objective A.6.2	Should be edited to state, "...the necessary information, including <i>detection methods and certified reference materials...</i> "
8	A.6 Goal	This should be edited to state, "...detect <i>and/or identify...</i> ".
8	A.6 Goal and Objectives	The text should be edited to indicate that these relate to LMOs " <i>that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health.</i> "
8	A.6 Indicator (b)	There is more emphasis on "guidance" rather than the actual necessary tools/methods. Delete "guidance" and replace with "detection methods". Suggest to edit: "...have access to and use detection methods to detect..."
8	A.6 Outcome	This outcome should be used for A.7 and A.8 also.
8	A.6 Key Area 2	Should be changed to "Access to existing guidance materials...". There is no need to develop new guidance materials in this area. The GIC has provided an extensive list of existing guidance materials in the area of sampling, detection and identification of LMOs which we are happy to share again to demonstrate the plethora of valuable existing information in this area.
9	Objective A.7.1	This should be edited to reflect it applies to LMOs " <i>that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health.</i> "
9	A.7 Goal and Objectives	The text should be edited to indicate that these relate to LMOs " <i>that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health.</i> "
9-10	Objective A.8.2	Delete "and other LMOs" at the end of the objective. Not clear what this may include considering the other categories listed under this objective.
10	Objective A.9.2	Delete – this is not an implementation objective. See comment above for page 3, line 91 – it has been demonstrated for SECs that guidance materials are not necessary for Parties to achieve this goal (if they choose to do so). In addition, it is premature to agree on targets such as this considering that the SEC negotiations are still incomplete.
10	A.9 Indicator (b)	Delete – this is not an indicator (see comments above).
10	Goal A.9 CB Activity (i)- (iii)	It is not appropriate to outline possible capacity building activities on an issue that is still being negotiated by Parties. CB Activity (i) can only be a useful activity if Parties agree on a guidance document that follows the mandate of Article 26. Proposals (ii) and (iii) could be a way forward, provided that Parties adopt a decision on how to address socio-economic considerations.
11	A.10 CB Activities (iv), (v), (vi) and (vii)	Delete – these four CB activities go far beyond what is appropriate in the context of SP implementation. Much of these proposed activities are broader and relate to far more than LMOs, and it is not within either the capacity or the resources of the Protocol to address these.
12	Goal B.1 CB Activity (i)	Delete – this is not necessary. There are many other opportunities in the Protocol implementation discussions where Parties can state their CB needs and this diverts valuable resources from actual CB work.
14	Goal B.3	The text should be edited to indicate that these relate to LMOs " <i>that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health.</i> "

14	Goal B.3 Key Area 2	Edit to state, “Development and dissemination of relevant and appropriate resource materials on public participation, education and awareness...”.
14	Objectives B.3.1 and B.3.2	As per our general comment in the beginning of our submission, please add “LMO” to the term biosafety under the two objectives. In addition, objective B.3.1 should be revised to include “...according to national circumstances and regulations” at the end.
14	Goal B.3 Key Area 3	Delete – too vague. Education is included in Goal B.3 Key Area 1 above.
14	Goal B.3 CB Activity (iii)	Delete – already covered in Goal B.3 CB Activity (ii) above.
14	Goal B.3 CB Activity (v)	Delete – this is excessive and far beyond the text of the Protocol. If this is included, it should be edited to read, “Provide training on participation in decision-making, <i>under applicable national legislation,</i> ”.
15	Goal B.4	Add “LMO” to the term biosafety to read: “Parties enhance cooperation on <i>LMO</i> biosafety issues...”.

Please submit your comments to secretariat@cbd.int by **17 January 2020**.