

**Convention on  
Biological Diversity**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/8/Add.2  
14 September 2016

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION  
ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY SERVING AS THE  
MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA  
PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Eighth meeting

Cancun, Mexico, 4-17 December 2016

Item 11 of the provisional agenda\*

**OUTLINE OF GUIDANCE ON RISK ASSESSMENT OF LIVING MODIFIED FISH**

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

1. In its decision BS-VII/12, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP) welcomed the results of the testing of the Guidance on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms, and invited Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to test or use, as appropriate, the Guidance in actual cases of risk assessment and as a tool for capacity-building activities in risk assessment.
2. In the same decision, the Parties extended the mandate of the Open-ended Online Expert Forum on Risk Assessment and Risk Management (Online Forum) and the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on Risk Assessment and Risk Management, and expanded its composition to include one new member from each region.
3. In the terms of reference for the Online Forum and AHTEG, Parties established a mechanism for revising and improving the Guidance on the basis of the feedback provided through the testing process with a view to having an improved version of the Guidance by the eighth meeting. The AHTEG was also requested to make an attempt, while revising and improving the Guidance, to take into account the topics prioritized by the AHTEG, on the basis of the needs indicated by the Parties with a view to moving towards operational objectives 1.3 and 1.4 of the Strategic Plan and its outcomes, for the development of further guidance.
4. The annex to the present document contains an outline of guidance on risk assessment of living modified fish as one of the outcomes of the work of the AHTEG, with input from the Online Forum, in response to decision BS-VII/12 for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol at its eighth meeting. The annex was not edited.

\* UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/8/1.

(This page was intentionally left blank)

*Annex***OUTLINE OF GUIDANCE ON “RISK ASSESSMENT OF LIVING MODIFIED FISH”****INTRODUCTION**

Living modified (LM) fish are produced for a variety of purposes, including growth-enhancement, infection resistance or cold tolerance, human food production in aquaculture, biological control of nuisance species, recreational fishing, monitoring water quality to detect contaminants, as bio-factories to produce commercially valuable compounds such as human pharmaceuticals, cancer models (oncofish), xenotransplantation, identification of potential new drugs and ornamental aquarium market. Several species have been genetically modified, such as Atlantic salmon, channel catfish, goldfish, tilapia, zebrafish, carp and medaka.

There are several issues that are unique or particularly relevant to fish and warrant further consideration during the risk assessment of LM fish. These issues include:

- (a) Fish live in aquatic environments and some are highly mobile;
- (b) Potential to escape from containment facilities and spread to natural environments and across national borders;
- (c) Potential inter-specific and inter-generic hybridization;
- (d) Presence of venom toxins;
- (e) Some species may be protected by national law, for example several countries protect species of wild salmon;
- (f) Phenotypic plasticity;
- (g) High number of species/varieties (around 30.000) and high intraspecific genetic variability.

As for the risk assessment of other LMOs, the case-by case approach must also be applied to the risk assessment of LM fish. It is suggested that any guidance to be developed on risk assessment of LM fish would be applicable to all types of LM fish and not focused on particular modification methods, receiving environments, intended uses or species. Therefore, the risk assessment criteria and requirements will not be equally relevant in all cases.

Gaps in information that are of possible relevance for the risk assessment of LM fish include:

- (a) Lack of empirical evidence of LM fish behavior, invasiveness, fitness (survival and reproduction) and genetic stability in the wild
- (b) Lack of data on Genotype-x-Environment (GxE) interactions
- (c) Limited understanding of the whole genome of fish species
- (d) Pleiotropic effects
- (e) Potential impacts under climate change scenarios
- (f) Migratory and mating behavior of LM fish
- (g) Change in habitat range of LM fish

## **OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE**

This outline was prepared to facilitate considerations of the COP-MOP concerning the need for developing guidance on risk assessment of LM fish to complement the Roadmap for Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms. The outline focuses on aspects that are unique or particularly relevant to LM fish, including freshwater, marine, catadromous and anadromous fish, as well as aquarium species.

## **PLANNING PHASE OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT**

Protection goals, assessment endpoints, as well as theories or models on predicting the environmental fate of transgenes or the transgenic fish, such as spread, establishment, “purging”, and “Trojan gene”, may be included in this section.

In addition to the considerations raised in the Roadmap, this section could also include considerations of the likely potential receiving environments, including unintentional transboundary movements to other countries.

The choice of comparators could also be discussed in the context of:

- (a) Parental line, wild relatives and other relevant species
- (b) Experience and history of fish in cultivation, taking into account its ecological function
- (c) Centers of origin and centers of genetic diversity
- (d) Current distribution areas and habitats where the mon-modified fish and its sexually compatible relatives may persist or proliferate

## **CONDUCTING THE RISK ASSESSMENT**

This section should provide information on issues of particular relevance for conducting risk assessment of LM fish, with reference to the steps in the Roadmap, as appropriate, such as:

- (a) Testing the living modified fish in representative environments (see Roadmap step 1)  
Regional variation and differences in the environment may influence the characteristics and the behavior of LM fish. Experimental trials should be performed in as representative conditions as possible.
- (b) The likely potential receiving environment(s) (see Roadmap step 1, step 2 and step 3)  
The identification and characterization of potential receiving environments may be dependent on several factors including whether natural or artificial barriers are present that could limit the dispersal.
- (c) Vertical and horizontal gene transfer in the potential receiving environment (see Roadmap step 1, step 2 and 3)  
Ecological, evolutionary, and stochastic factors that could affect the transgenes, survival of DNA/RNA from LM fish in water and spread of transgenes are relevant issues.
- (d) Persistence and invasiveness (see Roadmap step 1, step 2 and step 4)  
Of relevance could be to identify if metabolism and/or other biological parameters remain unchanged for LM fish. If they are different, identify how growth, fish health/welfare are affected.

The net fitness trait data on real transgenic individuals and their non-modified counterparts. Relevant fitness components (fecundity, fertility, juvenile viability, age at sexual maturity, mating success, and longevity) should be considered.

- (e) Dispersal mechanisms (see Roadmap step 1 and step 2)  
LM fish have a variety of ways to reproduce and disperse.
- (f) Target/non-target organisms (see Roadmap step 2, 3 and 4)  
Harm to species of special concern, such as endangered species or economically or culturally important species.
- (g) Fish pathogens, infections and diseases (see Roadmap step 3)  
Identify if LM fish that are resistant to fish pathogens, infections and diseases can be carriers of the same diseases and hence by escape spread the same diseases.
- (h) Unintentional transboundary movements (article 17)  
Fish have a broad geographical distribution, although that will vary depending on the species. Confinement will be dependent on the species and the strategy used to develop LM fish.
- (i) Risk management strategies including containment strategies (see Roadmap steps 2 and 5)  
In this section relevant strategies to reduce the identified risks could be included. A short overview of different containments strategies and their efficacy of relevance for risk assessment of LM fish could also be included. For example: physical containment, physicochemical containment and reproductive containment, such as methods to induce sterility. Potential consequences arising from escape and/or incidental exposure of humans and other animals to LM fish under containment conditions could be explored, for example, LM fish intended for biopharming.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES**

References to relevant guidance and scientific papers on risk assessment of LM fish.

---