At the time of writing, the European Commission is poised to issue a crucial decision on whether or not a set of seven genetic engineering techniques should be classified as GM. The decision was due in January (as reported in Thin Ice 38) but is now expected in March.

Environmental charities, campaigners, organic farming representatives and others have been working hard to make the case for regulation, with Brussels briefings and a range of reports, position statements and media articles, which we have pulled together on our website at www.gmfreeze.org/nbt:

- The International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM) EU Group’s position paper, published in December 2015, states clearly that:
  “The IFOAM EU Group considers that the NPBTs (New Plant Breeding Technologies, or NBTs) … should be, without question, considered as techniques of genetic modification leading to GMOs according to the existing EU legal definition and that the Commission should explicitly confirm that they fall within the scope of the GMO legislation (Directive 2001/18/EC and Regulation 1829/2003).”

- The IFOAM EU Group considers that the NPBTs (New Plant Breeding Technologies, or NBTs) … should be, without question, considered as techniques of genetic modification leading to GMOs according to the existing EU legal definition and that the


- Dr Ricarda A Steinbrecher’s EcoNexus briefing focuses on the scientific reasons why these techniques are neither as precise nor as predictable as those promoting them would have us believe (Thin Ice 38).

What’s in a name?

Most organisations, including the European Commission, now refer to the seven genetic engineering techniques under consideration as ‘New [Plant] Breeding Techniques’ but that phrase is the result of a sustained ‘branding’ exercise by the industry promoting their use. As Angelika Hilbeck, senior researcher at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, says: “New breeding techniques is a misleading term, precisely because the users of these techniques aim to avoid any breeding.”

Alongside the ‘natural’ connotations of the word “breeding”, the terms ‘gene editing’ or ‘genome editing’, are being widely used to imply surgical precision and suggest that these new forms of GM offer absolute technological control. Some of the new methods can target specific points in the genome, but, precision is not the same as predictability. “It’s like changing letters in words and words in text in a language one does not understand.”, says Hilbeck. “That can be done with precision and control, yet with complete oblivion to the meaning.”

TAKE ACTION

Two new applications for open air trials of GM crops are currently being considered by Defra. Rothamsted Research has applied for an additional “fish oil” camelina trial at its farm in Hertfordshire, while the Sainsbury’s Laboratory is hoping to plant GM blight-resistant potatoes at the Norwich Research Park. Objections can be made until 19 March for Rothamsted’s camelina and 22 March for Sainsbury’s Lab’s potatoes. GM Freeze is currently considering both applications with a view to responding formally. If you represent a member organisation who might be interested in joining a shared response, or if you would like support in responding on your own behalf, please contact Raoul Bhambral, GM Freeze Co-ordinator on raoul@gmfreeze.org or 0845 217 8992.

1 Application of the EU and Cartagena definitions of a GMO to the classification of plants developed by cisgenesis and gene editing techniques
2 New Breeding Techniques: inherent risks and the need to regulate

… continued on page 2
techniques under consideration must be regulated. They alter the DNA of living organisms in a way that shares many of the problems of more established GM techniques, as well as bringing new concerns of their own. They have no history of safe use and many of them are so new that little is known about how they work or what could go wrong.

However, we face a strong and well-resourced opposition. Following three years of Freedom of Information requests, Corporate Europe Observatory exposed industry attempts to influence the classification of the techniques in a new report3. Published in February 2016, the report highlights the coordinating efforts of the New Breeding Techniques platform whose stated objective is to have “all NBTs – or as many as possible – exempt from GM legislation”.

3 Biotech lobby’s push for new GMOs to escape regulation

Is it just about the science?

The arguments over the classification of the new genetic engineering techniques focus on scientific and legal definitions, but the Nuffield Council on Bioethics recently issued a call for evidence on genome editing with a much wider remit. GM Freeze’s response included the following points:

● Genome editing techniques share many of the same risks as current Genetic Modification (GM) methods and also present a number of additional potential problems. There is much that can go wrong and it is vital that new techniques are subject to proper regulation, traceability and end-product labelling.

● Public concern about GM in our food is high1 and increasing2 but opposition to GM is frequently characterised as unscientific, emotional and even superstitious.

● Many people’s concerns are focused on scientific risk. However, as most people in the UK have not benefitted from a scientific education, they express concepts such as ‘off-target’ and ‘unexpected effects’ in less precise language. It is entirely unacceptable to dismiss the views of individuals who do not have the vocabulary to express themselves in scientifically-accurate terms.

● Beyond the narrowly-defined issues of scientific risk, cultural and ethical values are vital considerations in the adoption of any new technology. Food production in particular is closely tied up with our cultural, ethnic and family identities. However, the language used by proponents of genetic engineering frequently dismisses and belittles such a focus on values as weak and inappropriate.

1 Food Standards Agency, May 2015 Biannual Public Attitudes Tracker
2 Food Standards Agency, February 2015 Biannual Public Attitudes Tracker
MEPs object to GM soybean imports

In February the European Parliament objected to the import of three GM soybeans into the EU for use as food and feed. It said the Commission’s proposal to authorise the GM soybeans, resistant to either glyphosate alone or glyphosate combined with other herbicides, was “not consistent with Union law” that aims at a high level of health and environmental protection. Parliament’s objection is not legally binding on the Commission, but it does send it a strong message.

That message is building as this is the third time in a few months that Parliament has clashed with the Commission over its GM policy. In October, MEPs rejected a flawed proposal that would give national governments a fake right to ban GM crops approved for import. They called on the Commission to develop a new proposal (Thin Ice 38).

Last December, Parliament voted to reject the import of a GM maize and called for a moratorium on GM authorisations until new rules are introduced. Like the February vote, this was a largely symbolic vote as MEPs do not have the power to change this decision.

“Importing these GM soybeans could expose consumers and farm animals in the EU to adverse effects from the herbicides they have been sprayed with and, to date, the effects of ‘the herbicide plus GMO combination has not been assessed. Neither have the herbicide cocktails proposed. No herbicide-tolerant GMOs should be authorised until this has been done.”

Eric Gall, IFOAM EU

India

On 2 February the Indian Supreme Court demanded that its central government explain the proposed introduction of three GM herbicide-tolerant crops in the face of a court-imposed ban. The top court has passed a series of orders¹ to restrain small-scale and large-scale field trials in any food crops as well as their commercial introduction in the country. However a ‘contempt petition’ has been filed against members of the Genetic Engineering Approval Committee for flouting court orders by conducting both small- and large-scale field trials of all three crops with a view to commercialisation. The government had two weeks in which to respond to these and other charges.

United States

This 26 January, Monsanto filed a lawsuit against the state of California’s Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to prevent it from adding glyphosate to the state’s list of known carcinogens. California law requires the state to keep a list of cancer-causing chemicals to inform residents of the risks of using such products; guided by the World Health Organisation’s International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). Monsanto has accused IARC of being an ‘unelected, undemocratic, unaccountable and foreign body’ as it is not subject to state or federal oversight. Two days later, a California couple returned fire by suing Monsanto for cancer they believe is caused by exposure to Monsanto’s leading herbicide, RoundUp.

¹ February 2007, April 2008 and August 2008

Still in the States, a new report² claims that people have fundamentally changed the way they shop. Traditional factors like price, taste and convenience are taking a back seat in favour of other influences, like health and wellbeing, social impact and transparency. Consumers define health and wellbeing as going beyond health and nutrition to include organic production and natural ingredients. Social impact includes local sourcing, sustainability and animal welfare. Transparency issues include clear labelling and certification by trusted third parties. Interestingly, large food companies are 3.4 times more likely to be distrusted by consumers than larger companies in other industries.

Brazil

In January, Brazil’s Ministry of Justice imposed fines totalling roughly $3 million on six global food giants, including Nestle and PepsiCo, for failing to disclose GM ingredients in their products. This follows six years on from an inspection by the Consumer Protection Agency that found GM in products from cake mix to snacks which were not labelled with the ‘transgenic’ symbol required by Brazilian law.

The European Commission has written to Testbiotech and GeneWatch UK admitting that there are currently no methods for testing for the effects of multiple pesticide residues, yet it is considering approval of a GM soya bean that is resistant to multiple pesticides.

Commissioner Vytenis Andriukaitis wrote, “It is true that the legislation requires cumulative and synergistic effects of pesticide residues to be considered… but only when the methods for assessment will be available. This is not yet the case.”

This was in response to calls from the two campaign groups to halt the authorisation process. The Soil Association has already found glyphosate residues in UK bread (Thin Ice 37) and the same residues were found in the urine of 40% of a test group of participants in Germany.

1 Capitalizing on the shifting consumer food value equation, 25 Jan 2016

2 February 2007, April 2008 and August 2008
**Feed: The Facts**

Most people in the UK don’t eat food made from GM ingredients. However, the vast majority of non-organic farm animals are fed GM soya and/or maize, which does not need to be listed on the label of the food it goes to produce.

We recognise there are logistical and supply problems with GM-free animal feed but they will be overcome if the supermarkets, manufacturers and wholesalers believe that doing so will sell more finished products.

GM Freeze is gearing up to launch a new campaign to highlight this issue of ‘hidden’ GM in the supply chain. We will be focusing on a small number of target companies, getting customers to let them know that they want GM-free feed for their animal products like eggs, poultry, meat, dairy and fish. We are hoping to get at least one target to change their policy but are also looking to raise broader public awareness of the issue.

### TAKE ACTION

We will need your help. There will be lots of action requests for this campaign so please make sure you are signed up for email alerts, by going to www.gmfreeze.org/emails or ticking the box on your renewal form. In the meantime, though, please tell us if you have a favourite brand, product, retailer or food company that you think should be completely GM-free by emailing raoul@gmfreeze.org.

---

**GM Freeze in the spotlight**

Our local media volunteers had some notable success in December, with stories about the pending European Commission decision on new breeding techniques appearing in the Western Mail, WalesOnline and Isle of Man Today. If you would like help getting more media coverage for GM issues in your local press, please contact Raoul@gmfreeze.org or 0845 217 8992.

GM Freeze Director Liz O’Neill contributed to an article in The Observer (7 February) about the pending European Commission decision on the status of gene editing techniques and her long awaited appearance on Tomorrow’s Food hit the airwaves on 24 February. If you missed it, watch it on the BBC One website until 24 March. Also on 24 February, as we were going to press, the issue of hidden GM in animal feed made headlines and Liz gave interviews to LBC Radio and the Daily Mail.

No scheduling problems beset the hugely successful Oxford Real Farming Conference in January, where GM Freeze hosted a lively discussion on the topic How can we win the war of words on GM? Our aim was to help people explain the core problems with GM in very simple phrases such as these examples:

- GM crops make farming and food production irresponsible, unfair and unsustainable.
- You may not eat GM but the animals that make your meat, milk and eggs do and it isn’t on the label.
- There’s enough food for double the world population but people go hungry due to power, politics and poverty. People need food sovereignty, not GM crops.

Keep informed – sign up to our email alerts at www.gmfreeze.org/emails, follow us on twitter @gmfreeze and find our press releases, comments and GM Freeze press coverage at www.gmfreeze.org/press.

---

**NEWS JUST IN**

A new paper by Charles Benbrook shows how glyphosate use has risen almost 15-fold since ‘Roundup Ready’ GM crops were introduced in 1996. Published in Environmental Sciences Europe, 2 February 2016

---

GM Freeze is working to help create a world in which our food is produced responsibly, fairly and sustainably. We consider and raise the profile of concerns about the impact of genetic modification. We inform, inspire, represent and support those who share our concerns. We campaign for a moratorium on GM food and farming in the UK. We oppose the patenting of genetic resources.

A referenced version of this newsletter is available online - http://www.gmfreeze.org/thinice

GM Freeze, c/o 80 Cyprus Street, Stretford, Manchester, M32 8BE. info@gmfreeze.org 0845 217 8992

We use an 0845 phone number to protect the privacy of our staff, who work from home. Calls to this number will cost 3p per minute plus your telephone company’s Access Charge.
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