

Template for information submitted by Parties pursuant to paragraph 8 of decision CP-10/10¹

Part I. Endorsement of submission

Name of Country: South Africa

Name of Cartagena Protocol Focal point endorsing: Ms Thato Mogapi

Signature of the Cartagena Protocol Focal Point: *TMogapi*

Date: 19 January 2024

Part II. Submission of information

(a) Name of Party identifying the issue/priority area taking into account the challenges to risk assessment, particularly for developing country Parties and countries with economies in transition;

South Africa

(b) Indicate how the issue/priority area falls within the scope and objective of the Cartagena Protocol;

Operationalising protection goals into useful assessment endpoints and management endpoints links with Articles 15 and 16 on Risk Assessment and Risk Management and has been covered to some extent in the voluntary guidance document.

(c) Indicate how the issue/priority area pose challenges to existing risk assessment frameworks, guidance and methodologies, for example, if the issue at hand has been assessed with existing risk assessment frameworks but poses specific technical or methodological challenges that require further attention;

Assessment endpoints have not been defined specifically for use in risk assessment and risk management of Living Modified Organisms in many countries. This filters through to the monitoring work as the monitoring plans and frameworks are based on the outcomes of the risk assessment and management priorities. Therefore, suggesting that there may be a need to expand on this section of the voluntary guidance to provide further guidance in terms of what approaches parties are currently taking and what alternative approaches are available that parties can use to come up with specific endpoints taking into account their national circumstance.

(d) The challenges in addressing the specific issue are clearly described; and considering, inter alia:

Given that the protection goals and assessment end points are bound to be different across countries/parties, due to the different Biosafety Frameworks, Legislative instruments and policies, the process of conducting the actual risk assessments in this regard will also differ. However, the use of various case studies would be useful to illustrate different situations and criterions of testing for the developed protection goals and/or assessment end points. In addition, the headline indicators for which each protection goal or assessment endpoint point is measured against would be useful if determined or outlined in the case studies to be used. This can serve as a good baseline matrix and guidance for the future development of such indicators.

(e) The specific issues concerning living modified organisms that:

(i) Have the potential to cause adverse effects on biodiversity, in particular those that are serious or irreversible, taking into account the urgent need to protect specific aspects of biodiversity, such as an

¹ Who can submit information: Parties

endemic/rare species or a unique habitat or ecosystem, taking into account risks to human health and the value of biological diversity to indigenous peoples and local communities;

(ii) May be introduced into the environment either deliberately or accidentally;

(iii) Have the potential to disseminate across national borders;

(iv) Are already, or are likely to be, commercialized or in use somewhere in the world; and consider a stock-taking exercise to determine if resources on similar issues have been developed by national, regional and international bodies and, if so, whether such resources may be revised or adapted to the objective of the Cartagena Protocol, as appropriate.

Operationalising protection goals into useful assessment endpoints and management endpoints is a critical elements for Risk Assessment and Risk Management of all LMOs. Here, the suggestion is also made to include headline indicators as measures for the protection goals, assessment, and management end points.