



PRRI statement on unintended transboundary movement

Thank you Madam Chair,

I speak on behalf of Public Research and Regulation Initiative (PRRI).

Madam Chair, while PRRI appreciates efforts to clarify terms, we have concerns about the proposed explanations of the terms “unintentional transboundary movement” and “illegal transboundary movement”, because the explanations are in part confusing and go in part beyond the original articles 17 and 25 of the CPB.

For example, article 17 of the CPB deals with unintentional release and subsequent transboundary movement of “LMOs that are likely to have significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity”. We do not find this crucial qualification in the proposed explanation.

Likewise, the proposed explanation of illegal transboundary movements is broader than the actual text of the Protocol, because it is not only focusing on LMOs as article 25 does, and because it would bring all kinds of unrelated events and activities under the scope of “illegal”.

In short, the proposed broadening of scope goes against carefully negotiated and agreed terms.

The proposed broadening would negatively impact public research, because research planning bodies and funding agencies may be deterred by the possibility that standard research activities may suddenly fall under a regime of article 17 or be branded “illegal”.

PRRI therefore advises the revision of these clarifications, whereby also the role of detection is based in its proper context, and urges the MOP and its bodies to stick to the agreed language of the Protocol.

Thank you Madam chair,