From:

Benjamin Robinson < on behalf of Benjamin Robinson

Sent:

Thursday, July 27, 2017 10:09 AM

a.drcrisanti@imperial.ac.uk:

a.drcrisanti@imperial.ac.uk;

l.collyns@imperial.ac.uk; toni.j.piaggio@aphis.usda.gov; bdass@fnih.org; ; a.burt@imperial.ac.uk; cbloss@ucsd.edu;

tompkinsd@landcareresearch.co.nz; dobrocht@umd.edu; d.thizy@imperial.ac.uk; ; ebier@ucsd.edu; fred_gould@ncsu.edu; f.tripet@keele.ac.uk;

fredros@ihi.or.tz; gregg.howald@islandconservation.org; g heath.packard@islandconservation.org; hquemada@danforthcenter.org; jadelbor@ncsu.edu; Jeff.Chertack@gatesfoundation.org; j.mumford@imperial.ac.uk; jkayondo@uvri.go.ug; ; kelogan@imperial.ac.uk;

karl.campbell@islandconservation.org;

lydia.slobodian@iucn.org; doudou@icermali.org; margret.engelhard@bfn.de; michael.bonsall@zoo.ox.ac.uk;

nachee@nd.edu; nbesansk@nd.edu; p.freemont@imperial.ac.uk; andrade@ufpe.br; filipposaris.papathanos@unipg.it; monnat@uw.edu; renee.wegrzyn@darpa.mil; rfriedman@jcvi.org; roberta.spaccapelo@unipg.it; royden.saah@islandconservation.org; r ryan@longnow.org; slwerner@UCSD.EDU; ; sarah.lukie@croplife.org;

; sjames@fnih.org; sr120@hermes.cam.ac.uk;

ssubramani@ucsd.edu; tkuiken@nscu.edu; aajames@uci.edu; t.nolan@imperial.ac.uk;

zachadel@tamu.edu; sentelle@uci.edu

Cc: Isabelle Coche; 'Delphine Thizy (d.thizy@imperial.ac.uk)'

Subject: CBD forum update

Hi all,

The volume of posts continues to be relatively low for topic 2 compared with topic 1, however, as discussions on this topic will close on **Monday July 31**st, there may be an uptick in activity over the last few days.

Points you may wish to address:

- Matthew Legge, Canadian Friends Service Committee: https://bch.cbd.int/synbio/open-ended/discussion/?threadid=8598#8663
 - Questions in general whether the impacts of GMOs/LMOs on biodiversity have been practically and thoroughly studied, then goes on to suggest that if this is not the case, the CBD is in fact only paying lip service to the precautionary approach, while in practice facilitating a proactive approach, which assumes no negative impacts unless significant adverse impacts have been conclusively demonstrated.
 - A brief reply was posted here: https://bch.cbd.int/synbio/open-ended/discussion/?threadid=8598#8665 saying that studies of biodiversity impacts are often elaborated with the general objectives of the CBD in mind.
- Rainer Breitling, University of Manchester: https://bch.cbd.int/synbio/open-ended/discussion/?threadid=8598#8669
 - Suggests that gene drive LMOs introduced into the wild could lead to the propagation of their genetic material throughout an entire species, rather than a localized population or specifically targeted subspecies. Although this may not be beyond the realm of possibility, it might be good for those able, to provide nuance to this argument, with reference to the actual risks and limitations related to gene flow/transfer through populations.

Summary of recent discussions:

- The concept of "reversibility" has been raised as a precondition for vector control activities using gene drives. This may be an issue that garners more attention in the near future. (https://bch.cbd.int/synbio/open-ended/discussion/?threadid=8598#8628)
- Many discussants have raised concerns about the transboundary movement of synthbio materials or organisms, and the challenges that this poses in the framework of the CBD (e.g: https://bch.cbd.int/synbio/open-ended/discussion/?threadid=8598#8657)
- Jurisdiction shopping and its impacts on access and benefit sharing are also recurring concerns (e.g. https://bch.cbd.int/synbio/open-ended/discussion/?threadid=8598#8658)

Regards, Ben



www.emergingag.com
Follow Emerging ag on LinkedIn

CBD Online Forum on Synthetic Biology will take place soon! Experts should <u>register online</u> to participate. Contact us if you require assistance.

Supporter of the Manyinga orphan schools project – find out more at www.manyinga.org