



Ref.: SCBD/BS/CG/ps/84239

12 March 2015

## REMINDER NOTIFICATION

### **Request for submissions of views and comments on the “Elements of a Framework for Conceptual Clarity on Socio-Economic Considerations” contained in the annex to the report of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on socio-economic considerations**

Dear Madam/Sir,

Reference is made to notification No. 2015-007, dated 15 January 2015 (<http://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2015/ntf-2015-007-bs-en.pdf?download>), inviting Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and indigenous and local communities to submit views and comments on the “Elements of a Framework for Conceptual Clarity on Socio-Economic Considerations” contained in the annex to the report of the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on socio-economic considerations in the context of Article 26 of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and attached to this notification for ease of reference.

In order to give Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations and indigenous and local communities further opportunity to submit their views and comments, the deadline for submissions is being extended to **31 March 2015**.

Please accept, Madam/Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias  
Executive Secretary

Enclosure

To: Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB) National Focal Points  
CBD National Focal Points (where CPB Focal Points have not yet been designated)  
Relevant organizations  
Indigenous and local communities



Convention on  
Biological Diversity

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity  
United Nations Environment Programme  
413 Saint-Jacques Street, Suite 800, Montreal, QC, H2Y 1N9, Canada  
Tel : +1 514 288 2220 Fax : +1 514 288 6588  
[secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int) [www.cbd.int](http://www.cbd.int)



## **Annex**

*Annex to the Report of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Socioeconomic Considerations  
(UNEP/CBD/BS/COP-MOP/7/11/Rev.1)*

### **ELEMENTS OF A FRAMEWORK FOR CONCEPTUAL CLARITY ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS**

The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group recalled operational objective 1.7 of the Strategic Plan for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety for the Period 2011-2020: “To, on the basis of research and information exchange, provide relevant guidance on socio-economic considerations that may be taken into account in reaching decisions on the import of living modified organisms” as well as the outcomes for this objective, including the development of guidelines regarding socio-economic considerations of living modified organisms. The Group noted the mandate it had been given in decision BS-VI/13, i.e. to review the outcomes of the online discussion forum, the regional online real-time conferences and the global overview of information on socio-economic considerations, and, on this basis, to develop conceptual clarity in the context of paragraph 1 of Article 26.

The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group examined these outcomes as reported by the Secretariat and as contained in the documents prepared for the meeting, and recognized the challenges involved in the development of conceptual clarity on socio-economic considerations. Recognizing that there is no single agreed definition of what is meant by “socio-economic considerations”, the group decided to adopt a descriptive approach to reach conceptual clarity. In this regard, the group suggested the following elements of a framework, adapted as appropriate to national and regional specificities and consistent with international obligations, for addressing socio-economic considerations.

#### ***Objective***

To assist Parties to achieve clarity in taking into account socio-economic considerations in the decision-making process on living modified organisms, by identifying and evaluating their potential socio-economic impacts, in accordance with the objective and scope of the Protocol.

#### ***General principles***

1. Paragraph 1 of Article 26 provides that Parties may take socio-economic considerations into account in decision-making on living modified organisms.
2. Taking socio-economic considerations into account in decision-making on living modified organisms should be consistent with relevant international obligations, which include trade agreements, environmental agreements and human rights agreements.
3. Taking socio-economic considerations into account in decision-making on living modified organisms should be consistent with existing national regulatory frameworks and policies.
4. In taking socio-economic considerations into account, Parties should consider their local, national and regional circumstances, cultural practices, priorities and needs, in particular those related to the value of biological diversity to indigenous and local communities.
5. Taking socio-economic considerations into account in decision-making on living modified organisms should be clear, transparent, and non-discriminatory.
6. Human health-related issues arising from impacts of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity should also form part of socio-economic considerations, provided that they are not already addressed in the risk assessment.
7. A situation of uncertainty or insufficient information on socio-economic impacts should not prevent socio-economic considerations from being taken into account in reaching a decision.
8. Conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity relies on a wide range of elements, including socio-economic ones, which supports the application of sustainability principles.
9. Planning and conducting risk assessments and taking socio-economic considerations into account may be complementary in the decision-making process.

10. Public participation and consultation form part of the process of taking socio-economic considerations into account.

### ***Methodological considerations***

#### *1) Scope*

The scope of methodologies could include the following issues:

- Economic
- Social
- Ecological
- Cultural / traditional / religious / ethical
- Human health-related

#### *2) Methodological approaches*

A wide array of methodological approaches is available to address the complexity of socio-economic considerations, which could include the following:

- Situational analysis and baseline information
- Scenario planning
- Ex-ante and/or Ex-post studies
- Quantitative and/or qualitative studies
- Public consultation and participation modalities
- Multi-criteria analysis
- Socio-economic impact assessments
- Valuation of biological diversity

Any methodology selected should be based on, *inter alia*, the information needs of decision makers.

#### *3) Factors affecting methodological approaches*

- Macro-, micro- or market structure levels of analysis, depending on the organism, trait and intended use
- Context and/or case specific at the level of the organism, trait and intended use
- The different stakeholders involved in the design of the socio-economic assessment
- The variation of socio-economic considerations among States and at the subnational level.

### ***Points to consider***

1. Any list of elements of socio-economic considerations would be indicative and non-exhaustive.
2. Listing elements of socio-economic considerations based on existing experiences and as contained in the document that summarized the online discussions (document UNEP/CBD/BS/REGCONF-SEC/2/INF/1) would contribute to the future development of guidelines on socio-economic considerations.
3. Elements of socio-economic considerations may be classified using the dimensions below.
4. Elements of socio-economic considerations could fall into more than one dimension.

5. Human health-related and ecological dimensions that are not addressed in risk assessment may be addressed when taking socio-economic considerations into account.

Dimensions:

- (a) Economic: e.g. impact on income;
- (b) Social: e.g. impact on food security;
- (c) Ecological: e.g. impact on ecosystem functions;
- (d) Cultural/traditional/religious/ethical: e.g. impact on seed saving and exchange practices;
- (e) Human health-related: e.g. impact on nutritional status.

-----