

Transcript
Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

Benedikt Haerlin:

I would like to ask Mrs. Bruetschy as the Representative of the Commission to start this panel, then being followed by Mr. Baringdorf. So Mrs. Bruetschy, it is your turn. Welcome! Just push the button.

Chantal Bruetschy:

Thank you very much. I am happy to be here and to give you a brief presentation on the different aspects of co-existence in the light of Directive 2001/18 on the deliberate release of GMO's, taking into account the different comments and presentations I have heard this morning, notably on the scientific justification for national bans on cultivation.

In accordance with Article 26a of Directive 2001/18, Member States may take appropriate measures to avoid the unintended presence of GMOs in other products. As highlighted in the preambles of the Commission Recommendation 2003/556EC on co-existence, co-existence has two aspects: effects on human health and the environment, , and what is called the economic aspects.

The economic aspects are the ones dealt with by Member States at national level if they so wish. The economic side of crop production concerns the risk of cross-pollination which would lead to the presence of GMOs in neighbouring conventional or organic crops at a level higher than 0.9% (legal Community labelling threshold). In that case the conventional / organic crops would be labelled as GMOs, and they may be then sold at a lower price –or not be sold at all- due to reduced demand for GM products in their respective markets

Regarding the economic aspect of seed production, it should be noted that there are no labelling thresholds set. That means that under the current status the conventional seed lots must be entirely free of any GMO presence to be sold as conventional products, without any GM labelling. This again is considered as an economic aspect and as you know, we have been repeatedly requested by the seed companies to establish labelling thresholds. This request has also been addressed by the Council conclusions on co-existence, in May 2006.

It is possible to establish such thresholds for conventional seeds, and for this purpose we have launched an impact assessment study to examine whether and to what extent we should act. However, we should take into account that the freedom of choice between GM cultivation and non-GM and organic cultivation is possible, and that the labelling threshold of 0.9% for adventitious presence of GMOs at the final products of the food and feed production chain remains respected in all circumstances. We have repeatedly requested the major seed companies, including of course those that produce GM seeds, to give us the necessary data justifying why the absence of threshold is causing difficulties and additional costs, and which these are. Up to now, we have received very little information.

At the same time, the Joint Research Centre conducted a study to better understand from an economic and scientific point of view what is the possible uptake of GMOs cultivations in Europe both for the seed and crop production. Of course, their uptake depends on the will of

Transcript

Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

certain farmers to grow GMOs or not and also on the usefulness of traits in the GM crops in the various regions of Europe. We understand that parts of the farming community are in favour of GM crops where market demand exists and particular circumstances, such as climatological conditions justify it. At present, the majority of consumers are not in favour of GMO's.

Lastly, but certainly not least, I will mention the environmental and health aspect of co-existence. These are dealt with in the risk assessment carried out during the authorisation procedure and before a GMO is placed on the market, which includes effects on biodiversity of ecosystems and the environment overall. These aspects are covered by the written consent issued for the marketing of each GMO throughout the EU.

In this context I would like to note that my Unit has recently launched a study to get a very good understanding of the scientific information available regarding the long term effects of GMOs on the environment. We should be able to receive the different tenders in a couple of weeks. We hope that this scientific work can start soon and help clarifying the issues which still seem to be at stake regarding cultivation of GMOs in Europe.

Regarding national safeguard measures prohibiting the cultivation and marketing of certain GMOs mentioned earlier by other speakers, I would like to note that EFSA has also assessed the respective information sent by Austria, Hungary & other Member States. Following the College debate of April 2006, EFSA has been invited to cooperate more regularly & more closely with Member States (i), to assess whether these divergences of views are really due to different scientific results, different methodologies and (ii), to have a much better understanding of where the conflict of views is lying.

As far as we are aware, Hungary's study has not been sent to EFSA in its finalized format. EFSA only took a position on the interim results sent by Hungary, and it is essential that Hungary and the other countries send all relevant information to EFSA and conduct an open dialogue, talk to each other more often on the scientific issues at stake. This is absolutely essential. My colleagues, in DG Health and Consumer Protection, and I, are working to this end, together with EFSA. It is important. We should not have, in the European Union, a split in the scientific understandings, which is so wide and so high. We all know that the scientists do not always agree, but clear communication and transparency is absolutely essential. In the Commission, we are committed to continue to encourage EFSA to do this.

Benedikt Haerlin:

Thank you for that.

(Applause)

Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf:

[from English translation]

Transcript

Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

The first legislation on the authorization of GMOs in the European Union was based on the scientific position that cross-breeding with non-GMO crops was impossible. But this position turned out to be no more than hot air. In 1998, the moratorium in the European Union, which was based on a political decision by governments, forced us to address the issue. Four years later, the concept of coexistence began to emerge - the purpose being to appease the quarrel. The idea was introduced by the genetic engineering industry as a Trojan horse to create a 'fait accompli' and allow GMOs to come in. 60 to 70% of the population is against GMOs, so they have been introduced against their will. The idea was to appease the people and allow the companies to do business as usual.

Concerning the directive on the deliberate release of GMOs, the European Parliament succeeded in introducing a clause (Article 26 a) that says that for the purpose of coexistence, member states can take appropriate measures. So if it's said that there is no framework legislation on coexistence, this is wrong, because this framework is in place. Whether you want to use GMOs or not, of course, is up to you. And you don't have to explain why you take this or that position. If you are against the directive on deliberate release in general, which is what Upper Austria has done, then there are infringement procedures or you may face a trial before the court, and you have to prove that GMOs are dangerous for health or the environment. But we have heard today that Hungary and the Region of Styria in Austria have adopted legislation that prevents the cultivation of GMOs as a measure of coexistence. So Article 26a doesn't just allow voluntary designation of GMO-free zones, but also allows that GMO-free regions be enshrined in law, provided that parties agree. If they don't, it may be possible to decree regional GMO-free areas on a voluntary basis in order to satisfy the demand of the majority of the population.

It is emerging clearly that a contamination with GMOs would have very destructive effects on profitable, regional markets that small farmers were able to create. These effects can not be ameliorated by any kind of liabilities or benefits in the sense of compensation. We want to work GMO-free and produce quality products for the consumers. We don't want money from the GMO industry or insurance companies; we simply don't want their genetically modified plants or pollens. We don't want those organisms either on our fields or on our plates.

It is vital that we foresee voluntary measures and legal measures, which will certainly play an important role in the legal proceedings. We will fight against this; it's certainly not the end of the battle. We can expect this conflict to drag on for decades. Concerning the contamination threshold I would like to say the following: if Styria limits the threshold value to 0.1%, that is wise. This value should also be valid for the European Union, because there can be no contamination threshold that is above the detection threshold. Otherwise it would mean that there is a right to contaminate. NO, there is no right under law for contamination. It's the exact opposite: the right is to be free of contamination. The value 0.1 or 0.9% is a threshold only for labeling requirements. It deals with adventitious and technically unavoidable contamination, but you cannot conclude from that concept that the industry has the right to contaminate up to 0.9%. So, the liability for those using GMOs in cases of contamination starts at the detection threshold

Transcript

Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

and NOT at the labelling threshold of 0.9%. I think we should all be aware of that and do all we can to keep those two different points apart: The 0.1 value also applies for seeds concerning non-contamination. We are asking the European Commission to introduce a labelling threshold for seed at the detection threshold, because, as Benny Haerlin said, if you don't keep your well clean, then you are not going to have clean water in your tap. So, we've got to be more stringent on the labeling.

Concerning the regulation for organic food, it still remains a fact that no GMOs are allowed. The danger there is not so much between 0.1 and 0.9, the danger is that the Council has created a system of exceptional rules, whereby food additives produced by genetically modified substances may under certain circumstances be allowed. That is a backdoor through which GMOs will come into organic farming. That is where we have to act. In the regulation on labeling, any kind of deliberate use of GMOs has to be labeled - except for meat, eggs or milk. If there is a deliberate use, labeling should be obligatory. But if it is labeled, then it is certainly not an organic product anymore.

Anyway, we are hoping to bring the Council to terms and would like to ask for support from the public for this approach. This is the real cause; this is what the debate on GMOs and organic farming is all about. The 0.1 versus 0.9 debate is not unimportant, but it is not the only issue at stake here. And I hope I have made that clear in my references to contamination.

(Applause)

Benedikt Haerlin:

[from English translation]

Thank you. Mr. Koehler, is that a good introduction to what you will say?

Wolfgang Koehler:

[from English translation]

Yes indeed. I'll only say, having listened to that, and having listened to the presentation from the region exterior in Austria, I can also congratulate them. Mr. Baringdorf has already mentioned some things, namely that clear political commitment is lacking somewhat in some member states. It is not as clear as in Styria, Hungary, or Bulgaria. Germany for example, for years now, we've had a heavy struggle in terms of GMOs. And that means that any policies enacted have been subject to more compromises, more or less. And that was the case when we had a socialist and green government in Germany because of the set-up in the German Parliament. We were all concerned that once the German government changed, in other words once the Christian Democrats Union was introduced into Parliament, there would be a total backtracking, because when the Christian Democrats were in opposition, they were much in favor of GMOs. Now in fact, this concern has not entered into practice. But still, having said that, the same political discussions are underway. The camps that we've had in Germany forever still exist. There is no

Transcript

Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

change there. Given the political circumstances, what we are trying to do is set-up the framework under which genetic modification can exist. The existing genetic modification legislation could be cut back on – that is what some people want. I presume that is not going to happen. But still, the framework for coexistence could be flushed out by means of a regulation. It is difficult to know what is going to happen, because we are right at the start of political negotiations here.

But, of course, we are very much attached to the precautionary principle. And we've got the conventional tools; the user of genetic modification needs to reach an agreement with his/her neighbour if he wants to undergo the minimum distance stipulated by the regulation. The minimum distance in the drafted regulation is 150 meters for corn, but that doesn't apply to seed propagation. When it comes to distances for seed propagation, it is almost impossible to fix a minimum distance, because the contamination "threshold" is zero; that is unfortunately the situation. In our view an important element for coexistence is liability, in spite of Mr. Baringdorf saying he doesn't want liability, he wants absolute prevention instead. But the system that we have in Germany and in the EU won't guarantee full prevention unfortunately. We have high hopes politically speaking, but the idea is that coexistence is feasible in principle. So, I think that liability is a very important issue, because the economic risks of the use of GMOs are then stipulated for the user of GMOs. And then we can make sure that a balance is struck and compensation is achieved when there is damage. Liability issues are highly controversial for everybody. People in favor of GMOs say that this is a hindrance to genetic engineering in GMOs. People on the other side say that liability is not going to prevent GMOs – it is true that it hasn't done so up to now and won't do so in the future, but we can shift the economic risk of the use of GMOs to the user instead of the victim. So, whether liability rules in Germany are going to be tightened up, that is something that I cannot yet say from a political point of view. I don't think they'll be relaxed.

We are currently looking at the threshold of 0.9% and whether that is exceeded. Mr. Baringdorf has said that is not binding by EU-law. I think that is true; you could have a lower contamination threshold in the national coexistence regulation. In Germany discussions have not reached their end yet on this point. If you look at European legislation, of course on the one hand, as a member state, you can promulgate coexistence rules aiming at preventing contamination underneath a threshold of 0.9%. But if you fix the contamination threshold too low, e.g. at a value of 0.1%, which might be desirable, but that could be very problematic, if you take into account the principle of proportionality, obviously we are thinking about this. For a large country, such as Germany, it is actually very difficult - when you bear in the mind the European Court of Justice. Smaller countries might not see that as such a hindrance. But in our country, we take it very seriously, the threat of interference of proceedings. But I can't say what other countries feel; but for Germany, that is the case. Perhaps I should just leave it at that for the moment, and then we can answer any individual points when we get to the questions.

(Applause)

Transcript

Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

Benedikt Haerlin:

[from English translation]

Thank you very much for that. In Spain, the problem of coexistence is a real problem. And Mr. Garcia Arriola, who comes from the COAG, the Spanish farmers union, will tell us something about his views on this.

Andoni Garcia Arriola:

[from English translation]

Good morning! First of all, let me make it clear that I am surprised to hear the European Commission telling us that farmers in Spain who are growing GMOs are benefiting from that crop. The actual truth is, at the moment, there is an absolute lack of administrative monitoring or registration of what people are growing in the way of GMOs. The fact is that nobody knows, who is planting this, or where he is planting it, or what is happening with it. And yet, despite the fact that nobody knows that, by being told that the farmers are reaping profits, but how are we supposed to know? And that is a question of the ecological farmers, the organic farmers, who have suffered serious loss, because they have been contaminated. But we are not being told anything about that. There is no such thing as coexistence in Spain.

My organization, COAG, is one that defends a particular sort of agriculture. We represent the small and medium-sized farmers. We have a social model of agriculture, covering organic farming but also covering conventional farming, for quality, for food safety, in respect of the environment, and feeding into the local and regional economy - that is what we represent. In other words, we represent an agriculture that is connected to Spanish and European societies' demands. We in COAG clearly reject GMOs. My organization in Spain represents more than 40% of all Spanish farmers. We are the biggest farmers' organization in Spain. But we are very clear about GMOs - they don't solve any of the farmers' problems. On the contrary, they are making or are going to make them worse. GMOs destroy or will destroy our model of social agriculture. They destroy organic farming, and they destroy this model of social-based agriculture. GMOs put in the hands of four multinationals who produce them, the power over farming and food. And we, as farmers, cannot agree that that should happen, that it should happen now or in the future. They put us farmers in a position where we don't know what we are growing. Now, we've been through enough crises to know, to realize that we need to know what we are growing and what is going to be harvested from our fields. So, we say no to GMO contamination.

In Spain, COAG, together with ecological organizations, like Greenpeace or Friends of the Earth, Ecologistas en Acción, and other people working together with organic farmers and seed organizations. We are, in Spain, altogether denouncing the fact that there are no measures of segregation or separation that the administration has taken. And the administration has made mistakes in following up on GMO maize crops. The crop figures are 53,000 hectares. But, we

Transcript

Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

are not at all sure that these are true figures, because we don't know if they are the Ministry of Agriculture's figures or if the figures are handed out by the biotech companies and nobody tells us where these figures come from. The obligation to have a register is in Spanish law, but it is only partially implemented. The only register that you really have to have now is that of the distribution of GMO crops in provinces or autonomous areas, which is not very useful, because it doesn't tell you where they are being grown. But there is another serious problem here - we don't know what happens to these GMO crops. We don't know where and how they are marketed, though contamination through coexistence is clear. There is no coexistence law in Spain at the moment, and I am surprised to hear it said that farmers who grow GMOs are taking steps to control contamination. I was greatly surprised to hear that, because I have never seen any such thing happening. I don't think the Ministry of Agriculture has been brave enough to try to tell us any such a story. We don't frankly believe it and anyway, there is no obligation on these farmers to do this.

There have been a number of debates about drafts of laws for coexistence by the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment Ministry as well. And those drafts are changing; they have changed since the previous government, as well as with the present government. The previous government had a clear plan, the right wing government, to flood Spain with GMOs. At least at the moment, we have a government which is listening to our demands, although not as much as we'd like. So the drafts that have been put forward up to now are still drafts that we reject, because they are talking about 0.9% as the threshold for contamination, and we don't want any contamination. We want 0% contamination of our goods, not 0.1% that is, as the threshold. There is no precautionary principle here, and there is no law to say that the polluter pays. At the moment, the contamination which has happened, and remember that it is being covered up, but thanks to Greenpeace and thanks to other organization, Catalonia Farmers for example, it has been possible to prove contamination. Once more, the organic farmers who were contaminated have had to sell their crops in the conventional market and lost a lot of money. In fact, there has even been a situation, in some cases, where organic farmers who kept their seeds, who historically retained their seeds and part of their crop for that purpose, have been contaminated; and therefore lost the seeds that they kept back. And that is really serious. I say again, there is no law about liability in Spain; therefore, there is nothing to say that the polluter or the contaminator pays.

Our task together with the organizations I mentioned is to try to ensure that at the Spanish national level, we get a ban on the authorized GMO varieties. The fact is that some of the GMO varieties which are banned, which have already been banned, the ban hasn't actually been implemented for more than a year. It has taken more than a year for it to be implemented, for it to be put into force. With the ecological organizations, we are trying to work out GMO-free areas. A lot of work is being done with local authorities, with provinces, with regions, in order to try and ensure that the sustainable family-based agriculture has a future, so that as farmers and as citizens, we have a control of the farming, and we don't always hand it over to four multinational biotech companies.

Transcript
Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

(Applause)

Benedikt Haerlin:

[from English translation]

That was new information there about the state of coexistence in Spain from the Spanish Farmers Union. Now Mrs. Scheele, what is the state of discussion in the European Parliament about coexistence?

Karin Scheele:

Co-existence between different forms of agriculture is a very hot topic in this Parliament. And the majority is not that clear like in Hungary where all political groups seem to agree. It was really a very tough and strong political fight, and the majority of this house is going, from my point of view, in the right direction. When we decided on the regulation of genetically modified food and feed in the Parliament, as rapporteur, I put the topic of co-existence on the table. We were asking and are still asking for a European-wide solution to the problem of co-existence. If we authorize genetically modified organisms at the European level, it is necessary to offer the solution for co-existence at the European level. We had to accept that - at that time - it was not possible to get the European solution. But we wanted to make the role of the member states clear. When we were asking the European Commission at that time, they said, well the member states have the possibility, have the competence to decide on co-existence measures. But there was no clear answer on how the member states could implement co-existence, which measures they could take, from a legal point of view without risking an infringement procedure.

We could at least give the power to the member states, to the regions. And, what I learned here today is that some regions, some member states, use this power to act and other regions and other member states do not. The topic of this conference is "GMO-free regions", and is very closely linked to the question of co-existence. Because in many cases GMO-free regions would be the cheapest way - in many cases the only solution - to implement co-existence.

One important question concerning co-existence is liability. The liability system must be based on the polluter pays principle which means that the person introducing the new technology also has to pay, if there is economic damage. Some days ago I was reading the position of the Council of the European Regions. And in that position I found a rather negative approach towards using the economic damage as the criteria for liability. For me liability has to be based on the economic damage, because this is much stronger than if it would be based on danger for human health and/or environment. Everyone, every producer should have the right to be reimbursed because of economic damage and not only after damage for human health or the environment already happened. If an organic farmer, if someone who doesn't want to use this

Transcript

Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

technology, has an economic burden, then there has to be also compensation for this burden.
Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Benedikt Haerlin:

Helen?

Helen Holder:

Thank you. We've heard a lot about coexistence and I wanted to talk actually briefly about what is the European Union's strategy for biotechnology, because new proposals are being decided now on our research on a major study on the impacts of biotechnology in the European Union. In fact, I'd like to speak in relation to this study and make one point in relation to what Mr. Bianchi from the European Commission was saying earlier about the impacts on Spanish farmers. Mr. Bianchi was saying that there is an increase of 120 Euros per hectare for farmers who are growing GMOs. However, the study he refers to makes the point that the economic benefit is very well buried and actually ranges from seven Euros per hectare to 120 per hectare. Now, this is not the same as saying that every farmer is getting the maximum amount possible. Also, you need to remember that there is a price increase of 30 Euros per hectare, because GMCs are more expensive, and that the raw materials are, at the end of the day, the same price. So the food industry, at the end, does not see any real benefit to farmers growing GM crops. Furthermore, there is no job creation, because the seed industry is actually based in Chile or the US, so not in the EU. And the growth of growing GM crops, the study has found, does not cause any increase in farm laborers on Spanish farms. So I think we need to be very careful when we make statements on the benefits of GM crops.

Indeed, if we continue to look at the competitiveness and job creation aspects of GMOs, because the European Union strategy on biotechnology is completely framed in this area. In fact, in terms of industry competitiveness, we frequently see a very different image to what is frequently promoted in the media and policy statements. In fact, agribusiness revenues in the EU are on the decline and venture capital investment is minimal. And in both the EU and the US, agro-biotech companies have received less than 1% of the venture capital that is being pumped into biotechnology, because the lion's share is actually going into health biotechnology. If you look at freedom of market diversity and innovation, acquisition and mergers have led to six corporations dominating the market. This means that they are squeezing out competitors, neglecting smaller markets, and there is decreasing knowledge production. So, in fact, you are seeing a concentration of the market, which is actually going against competitiveness.

In terms of the impacts of the products, only two of the GM traits have been developed on any commercial scale. People will say that in the EU, this is because people don't want to eat

Transcript

Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

GMOs, which to a certain extent is true; however, if you look at the US, there are seventy distinct GMO events that have been authorized for the market for commercial growing. And still, there are only two that are grown commercially to any extent. So, the market just isn't working. Second of all, when looking at the impact of products, we also need to include cost of contamination. And I heard a few times this morning from the European Commission, using the term outcrossing and seeming hesitant to use the word contamination, but I think we need to emphasize that this is contamination and there is a huge cost. Just looking at what happened in the US this year, GM rice contamination has basically made the market collapse for GM rice farmers. They are not protected, and so they are having to take Bayer to court, and this is a massive impact of GM crops. And finally, under creation, the European Commission says there are 96,500 jobs in the EU; well that is not very much. In addition, 80% of these jobs are in health biotechnology. And so where are the jobs in GM crops?

Our research, because the biotech strategy promotes more and more research into GMOs, we have at the EU level only, and this is not member states, at the EU level only, we have 25 years of research and only two traits have actually come out of that. On average, the EU spends 18 million Euros a year on research, and this does not count member state level research. For 2001 only, we had about 60 million Euros being spent by Germany and 47 million Euros being spent by the UK, and this is just two member states in one year, to which you have to add the 18 million in EU funding. And again, for what? Two traits have come out in 25 years.

So, I'll finish off, but I just wanted to make these points because this week, tomorrow, the Commission is coming out with its new proposals for biotechnology, where we are talking very much today about how to grow GMOs. And this is true that coexistence poses some very complicated problems, and we have big risks to seed, but there is also a why. It is not creating jobs, and it is not being competitive. But if you look at the studies that exist on agro-environmental measures, there you're seeing more jobs, younger jobs, you've got a booming market. The public just wants environmentally friendly food, organic food - it is growing all the time. So why isn't the political will there? And why is it going to a failing, underperforming sector, and that is the biotechnology and GM crops sector?

And just to finish, in the Commission's proposal for the biotechnology strategy, the review of the biotechnology strategy, which came out last week, and is going to be discussed tomorrow as I said, they referred to the latest Eurobarometer study on biotechnology and genetically modified crops. And in it, they quote, "it should be noted that 50% or more of people say that they would buy GM food if they were healthier, if it were to contain less pesticide residues or if it were to be more environmentally friendly." Well, that sounds to me like the public wants organic food.

(Applause)

Benedikt Haerlin:

Transcript
Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development
European Parliament, Room PHS3C50
Panel Discussion
April 19, 2007

You have the last word, which must be very brief unfortunately, but...

Marco Contiero:

Dear all, since I only have two minutes I hope I'll be able to present you the position of Greenpeace on co-existence, one of the most relevant issues of its campaign for a GM-free future. Given the time constraints, I will not be able to give you a presentation, as originally foreseen, but a paper version of the presentation will be available at the end of the meeting.

Greenpeace believes that co-existence is equal to contamination. There is no such thing as a possible co-existence between GM and non-GM crops. The term 'co-existence' neglects the biological reality. Mounting evidence proves that co-existence is impossible in practice. The food supply chain is too complex and practically impossible to control. Sowing, transport, processing and storage are only some of the activities during which contamination happens.

As we heard from Mr. Garcia, from COAG, contamination is a reality in Spain, which is the only country in Europe where GM maize is commercially grown. Contamination is currently happening and will keep happening if strict and serious rules are not implemented.

The main thing I would like to stress is that the approach taken by the European Commission towards this subject is flawed for two main reasons.

On the one hand, the Commission interprets co-existence only as an economic issue. Greenpeace disagrees with this opinion since co-existence concerns the environment, biodiversity and agriculture biodiversity as well as ethical and cultural aspects. Therefore, co-existence is not only an economic issue; it is "also" an economic issue. Co-existence affects the very freedom of consumers and farmers to choose what to eat and what to produce.

On the other hand, the Commission, when drafting co-existence measures, uses the 0.9% labeling threshold, set out in Directive 2001/18/EC, as a target figure. However, from a legal point of view, it is a mistake to use this 0.9% as a target figure when dealing with co-existence, because, as the directive clearly states, the threshold can be applied and, therefore, exempt from labeling requirements only when the presence of GM material is '*adventitious and technically unavoidable*'.

Just to conclude, I would like to briefly stress that if we want to solve the issue of co-existence, the only way forward is to stop the deliberate release of GMOs in the environment and the food chain. In the meantime, as a temporary solution, the EU should set up common strict minimum standards leaving the Member States free to maintain or introduce more stringent protective measures.

Thank you for your attention.

Benedikt Haerlin:

Transcript

Third International Conference of GMO-Free Regions, Biodiversity and Rural Development

European Parliament, Room PHS3C50

Panel Discussion

April 19, 2007

Thank you for being brief and sharp. I would like to apologize that we do not have the chance of a discussion here. It was a really packed morning, and it was certainly a packed morning for the interpreters. First, I think you all learned a lot, I did learn a lot. And if you want to learn more over the lunch break, we would like to invite you to come at 1:30 to Room 1C47, where there will be a special session on the situation of honey bees and GMOs. And we have with us Professor Hinrich Kaatz, who is one of the leading professors who has assessed the impact of Bt-maize on bees. We have Angelika Hilbeck, who has done extensive research on this subject as well, and we have Walter Haefeker, Vice President of the European Beekeepers Association. Mr. Josef Hoppichler will facilitate the discussion. This is in 1C47 at 1:30....