

[www.defra.gov.uk](http://www.defra.gov.uk)

# Summary of responses to Defra consultation paper on proposals for managing the coexistence of GM, conventional and organic crops

November 2007

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  
Nobel House  
17 Smith Square  
London SW1P 3JR  
Telephone 020 7238 6000  
Website: [www.defra.gov.uk](http://www.defra.gov.uk)

© Crown copyright 2007

Copyright in the typographical arrangement and design rests with the Crown.

This publication (excluding the royal arms and departmental logos) may be re-used free of charge in any format or medium provided that it is re-used accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

Information about this publication and further copies are available from:

GM Team  
Defra  
Area 4D Nobel House  
17 Smith Square  
London SW1P 3JR

Tel: 020 7238 2059

Email: [gm@defra.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:gm@defra.gsi.gov.uk)

This document is available on the Defra website:

<http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/gm/crops/index.htm>

Published by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO DEFRA COEXISTENCE CONSULTATION PAPER

### Introduction

1. In July 2006 Defra issued a consultation paper on proposals for managing the coexistence of GM, conventional and organic crops in England, should approved GM crops be grown here commercially in the future. The proposals aim to minimise unwanted GM presence in conventional and organic crops (which for example might arise through cross-pollination) and thereby allow people to choose between GM and other products. Commercial GM cultivation is not expected in the UK for several years at least, but Defra intends to have coexistence measures in place beforehand so that farmers in particular are clear on the rules that will apply.

2. Defra has proposed that farmers growing GM crops should observe statutory crop separation distances to minimise GM cross-pollination, and be required to notify their intention to sow a GM crop to neighbouring farmers whose land is within the specified distance. Other less significant measures would be included in a non-statutory code of practice. The proposals focus on managing coexistence between farms and on the specific measures needed for maize, beet, potato and oilseed rape crops.

3. In addition to the proposed on-farm measures, Defra's consultation paper also sought views on a number of related issues. These included: whether special coexistence rules should apply in relation to organic production; options for maintaining the economic position of non-GM farmers if they have a crop with an unwanted GM presence above the EU 0.9% labelling threshold; the pros and cons of establishing a public register giving the precise location of all commercial GM crops; and possible guidance to farmers who may be interested in creating voluntary GM-free zones.

4. The consultation paper was sent to over 130 stakeholder groups, posted on the Defra website and hard copies made available on request. Defra publicised the launch of the consultation by holding a press briefing, and there were several articles in the national press the following day. The consultation period lasted for three months, ending on 20 October 2006.

### Overview of consultation responses

5. Approximately 11,676 responses were received in total, counting each signature on a petition as an individual response. The following table gives a breakdown by category of respondent (all figures are approximate):

Category	Number of responses
Members of the public (including 1741 petition signatures on five separate petitions)	11442
Farming organisations	5
Countryside/conservation/wildlife organisations	7
Local authorities	18
Biotechnology companies and their representative body	5
Organic groups, farmers, food producers and retailers	79

Scientific bodies and research providers	9
NGOs, civil society groups and local action groups	42
Women's organisations	15
Other organisations	49
Members of Parliament	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>11676</b>

6. The responses were polarised between those from groups and individuals who take an essentially negative view of GM crops, in terms of their safety and/or potential socio-economic impact, and those who do not share these concerns and acknowledge the possibility that GM crops might be grown safely and beneficially. The former type of respondent generally did not accept Defra's proposals or its thinking on related issues, wanting a much stricter coexistence regime that would seek to prevent any detectable GM presence in conventional and organic crops. The latter type of respondent was generally in favour of the proposals, regarding them broadly as pragmatic and proportionate.

7. Most of the responses from members of the public (about 80%) were in the form of stock letters, pre-printed forms or petitions drawn up by groups or individuals campaigning against the release of GM crops and/or GM 'contamination'. The general message these responses convey is a basic disagreement with Defra's proposals. A key concern expressed is that the proposals should not have regard to a 0.9% threshold for GM presence (as specified in EU law), but should aim to prevent any detectable GM presence in conventional and organic crops (with 0.1% referred to as the limit of GM detection). Some of the stock responses focused specifically on the coexistence of GM and organic production, stating that GM presence in organic crops should be kept below 0.1%, failing which the GM sector should be liable for the full economic impact. The stock responses did not address directly the questions raised in the Defra consultation paper, and it is not apparent whether the respondents were aware of the questions or considered them.

8. The responses from members of the public that were not stock letters, emails or forms largely fell into two broad categories: those registering a general opposition to GM crops (about 1370 in total), and those whose sole or primary concern was a perceived threat to organic farming (about 390 in total).

## **RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS IN THE CONSULTATION PAPER**

9. There were few responses from individuals that addressed directly the questions highlighted in the consultation paper. Therefore, the summary below mainly reflects the responses made by organisations. Where a stock response submitted by members of the public is relevant to a consultation question, this is noted.

## OVERALL SCOPE

*Q. Do stakeholders have any comments on the proposed scope of the coexistence regime?*

10. Several organisations broadly supported the proposed scope of the regime as set out in the consultation paper. Against this, several organisations disagreed with nearly every aspect. Taken together, these critical responses argued that:

- the aim for the coexistence regime should be to avoid any detectable GM presence in non-GM crops/products (allied to this, some organisations referred to a legal opinion they had commissioned which argues that the 0.9% EU labelling threshold for GM presence is irrelevant to coexistence policy, and that Defra's interpretation of the 0.9% provision is flawed)
- the regime should cover coexistence in relation to gardeners, allotment holders, beekeepers and crops grown for people's own use
- the regime should cover within-farm coexistence (not just farm-to-farm), coexistence in relation to certified seed production, and coexistence arrangements across the whole supply chain (not just at farm level)
- coexistence is not just an economic issue, but should also be considered in terms of safety (some conservation groups said specifically that GM crops should not be grown unless or until evidence shows they would not harm wildlife)
- public attitudes (e.g. as reflected in the Government-sponsored GM debate process in 2003) should shape the coexistence regime, and this would indicate a more precautionary or restrictive approach than that proposed in the consultation paper

11. Several of the stock responses received from members of the public also said that coexistence measures should aim to eliminate all GM contamination (to below the limit of detection - referred to as 0.1%), and that gardeners, allotment holders and beekeepers should be protected from GM contamination.

## POTENTIAL SOURCES OF GM PRESENCE

*Q. Do stakeholders accept the above analysis of the potential sources of GM presence and the assumptions that Defra is proposing should underpin the coexistence regime?*

12. Several organisations broadly accepted Defra's analysis and assumptions, describing them variously as thorough, precautionary and the best possible on current evidence. Other organisations disagreed, raising various questions and concerns. These included the following:

- the approach set out in the consultation paper is flawed, because it envisages levels of GM presence arising which technically could be avoided
- a more comprehensive analysis is needed of potential GM sources
- in relation to possible EU thresholds for GM presence in seeds:
  - it should not be assumed that they will be 0.3%-0.5%
  - they should be 0.1% (as the limit of detection)
  - the implications of different possible thresholds should be considered.
- In relation to the assumption that GM presence from sources other than seed impurity and cross-pollination should not exceed 0.1%:
  - there is evidence to suggest that volunteer and bolter control is not normal practice, and that volunteer presence and machinery transfer could exceed 0.1%
  - the scope for GM transfer through increasing use of shared storage and drying facilities needs to be considered
  - research indicates that weedy beet can be moved off farm
  - no machinery cleaning protocol would be fully effective, especially at busy times.
- not enough allowance has been made for possible GM admixture beyond the farm gate.

## **STATUTORY AND NON-STATUTORY COEXISTENCE MEASURES**

*Q. Do stakeholders accept Defra's proposed overall basis for the coexistence regime as outlined above [in the consultation paper]?*

13. The consultation paper proposed that farmers growing GM crops should observe statutory crop separation distances and a farmer-to-farmer notification rule, with other coexistence measures being included in a non-statutory code of practice. Several organisations were content with this approach, provided that the proposed measures are open to review. Other organisations took the opposite view, saying all the envisaged measures should be implemented on a statutory basis. Among the comments made to support this line were that:

- voluntary initiatives in agriculture have a poor record
- all the envisaged measures should be seen as essential, and the suggested difficulty in framing and enforcing certain rules is not an acceptable reason for not giving them statutory backing
- voluntary measures are unlikely to be rigorously implemented, GM farmers need a financial or statutory incentive to do so, and statutory control is needed to underpin good practice
- an entirely statutory regime could help to restore confidence in the Government's handling of this issue.

## **REGULATORY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (RIA)**

*Q. Do stakeholders have particular comments on the analysis in the draft Regulatory Impact Assessment, and on what it says about Defra's plans to enforce, monitor and review the coexistence regime?*

14. There were few responses on this question. Some organisations supported the draft RIA and the proposed approach on enforcement, monitoring and review. Other organisations made critical comments, including the following:

- rather than Defra, an independent agency should be responsible for monitoring and enforcing the coexistence regime
- the RIA is based on wrong or biased assumptions (e.g. a 0.9% GM threshold, or that approved GM crops are safe)
- the analysis of costs is too limited and the data used not robust enough
- the analysis should cover the extra costs for those wishing to produce to a threshold below 0.9%

## **STATUTORY SEPARATION DISTANCES**

*Q. Do stakeholders agree with these proposed separation distances [in the consultation paper]? If not, which aspect(s) of the supporting analysis and proposed assumptions made by Defra are thought to need further consideration?*

15. A number of organisations disagreed with the proposed separation distances, stating or implying that they should be longer. Various points were noted in this respect, including:

- the aim should be to minimise GM cross-pollination to 0.1% (as the limit of detection), rather than 0.3%
- the NIAB study used by Defra is too narrow and flawed because it only covers single field-to-field cross-pollination
- other studies indicate cross-pollination over longer distances for maize and oilseed rape
- separation distances should be specified for potatoes and beet, and take account of how far pollen can travel and/or the distances over which cross-pollination has been recorded

16. Other organisations broadly accepted the proposed distances, providing they are kept under review and can be altered as growing patterns and varieties change. A few organisations went further and, while not disagreeing with Defra's analysis as such, suggested that distances should not be fixed until further information is available and/or EU seed thresholds are agreed.

17. Several organisations also commented on the suggestion that barrier rows might be used to minimise GM cross-pollination, as an alternative to separation distances. Some did not think barrier rows should be an option, or

at least not without further evidence on their efficacy. One specific concern was that the environmental impact of barriers must be considered because they might effect biodiversity in field margins. Other groups favoured having barriers rows as a coexistence option, viewing them as part of the necessary flexibility that they believe farmers should have.

*Q. What do stakeholders think of Defra's proposal not to differentiate separation distances by GM Index or field depth?*

18. Some organisations thought it appropriate to have a single separation distance per crop type, commenting variously that it was precautionary and a sensible compromise. One group argued for flexibility to reflect the prevalent types of GM crop on the market, with separation distances being legally established in due course based on the specific characteristics of each GM variety (e.g. differentiating by GM Index).

*Q. Do stakeholders accept how the proposed separation distance requirement would apply? What do stakeholders think of the idea at paragraph 87 that some local discretion might be allowed?*

19. Some organisations said it would be sensible and pragmatic for neighbouring farmers to have the discretion to apply their own coexistence arrangements (subject to this being agreed in writing by both the GM and non-GM farmer involved). Several other organisations disagreed, thinking that local discretion was either inappropriate, could only be acceptable in the context of a much more precautionary approach overall, or should only be considered after the coexistence regime has been in place for some time and confidence had been gained in its operation.

## **STATUTORY NOTIFICATION AND LIAISON REQUIREMENT**

*Q. Do stakeholders have any comments on how the proposed notification and liaison requirement would operate? What do stakeholders think about having a single notification deadline for spring-sown crops, rather than separate deadlines for spring rape and maize respectively?*

20. There was some support for the proposed rules on this point, but organisations made a number of contrary suggestions or comments, including the following:

- a single notification date offends the crop-by-crop principle, and crop-specific deadlines would be fairer
- neighbours should have longer to respond to notifications than the proposed 14 days
- gardeners, allotment holders and beekeepers should be notified
- the approach should be similar to planning-permission procedures
- instead of a fixed notification deadline, which is arbitrary, the approach should be based on the GM farmer having to wait a minimum period after informing a neighbour before the intended GM crop can be sown.

(this would allow for differences in sowing patterns between crops and across regions and seasons).

- there could be problems if a notification is not received or the neighbouring non-GM farmer is unable to reply for some reason.

## **OTHER COEXISTENCE ISSUES**

*Q. Do stakeholders think this is a reasonable way forward on farm-saved seed [as set out in the consultation paper]?*

21. Several organisations agreed with the analysis in the consultation paper that existing best practice for saving seed would be enough to ensure effective coexistence, when combined with the proposed statutory separation distance for oilseed rape. However, other organisations disagreed with or questioned the proposed approach. A particular concern was that farmers should not be prevented from saving seed over more than one generation. Other points raised were that:

- best practice could be difficult to follow
- seed savers will have to pay for tests if GM cropping becomes widespread
- the risk of contamination might force farmers to buy certified seed
- it was wrong to put any onus or burden on non-GM seed savers.

22. A specific technical comment was that the consultation paper understated the potential for GM accumulation to occur during the storage, cleaning and dressing of saved seed. Relevant to this, one of the responses noted that guidance would need to be provided for processors of saved seed to ensure that no GM admixture occurs during cleaning and treatment operations.

*Q. Do stakeholders agree that a formal training requirement is unnecessary?*

23. Several organisations agreed with Defra's thinking that it would be disproportionate to require farmers wanting to grow GM crops to undergo statutory coexistence training. In its response, the Skills Council for the environmental and land-based industries, Lantra, noted that it is reviewing the National Occupational Standards for the crops sector, and that they will cover the most up-to-date practices relevant to the growing of GM and non-GM crops. Other organisations said that there should be a statutory training requirement or that one might be necessary. Among the justifications cited for this were that it would promote consistent and rigorous control, that it is essential GM growers understand their obligations, and because the planned coexistence regime depends on the observance of voluntary measures. One organisation suggested that GM growers should have to sign a statement to confirm that they understand and will comply with coexistence rules.

*Q. Do stakeholders accept this conclusion on honey production?*

24. Several organisations supported the analysis in the consultation paper, that given the EU regulatory position and the evidence that any GM presence in honey should be well below the 0.9% labelling threshold, no specific action is necessary in respect of the coexistence of GM crops and honey production. Other organisations disagreed, noting various points for consideration. These included the following:

- a GM presence in honey might not be regarded as adventitious or unavoidable, e.g. if hives are deliberately placed near GM crops
- consumers expect GM-free honey and beekeepers should be able to produce this
- any GM presence in honey would adversely affect its reputation and could threaten the livelihood of beekeepers
- there should be a minimum separation distance between GM crops and bee hives.

25. In its response, the British Beekeepers Association noted that its members are concerned about the potential for GM pollen to arise in honey. Whilst noting the view that coexistence is possible based on the 0.9% GM labelling threshold, it stated that if the threshold were reduced it could result in UK honey being labelled GM, with a potentially serious impact on its public image. The Bee Farmers' Association (BFA) also expressed concern about the possible impact of GM material being present on honey. It said that the public would not accept a 0.9% GM threshold and with the Defra proposals would consider honey to be contaminated, but honey producers would be unable to claim GM-free status. The BFA highlighted the potential for damage to the honey market and consequent effect on commercial bee farmers, and their importance in terms of the pollination services they provide to growers.

26. One of the main stock responses received from members of the public stated that beekeepers must be protected from GM contamination, and informed about potential GM crops nearby.

## **COEXISTENCE BETWEEN GM AND ORGANIC PRODUCTION – POSSIBLE SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS**

*Q. Should responsibility for any threshold below 0.9% rest with GM or organic growers? How would organic producers cope with a threshold lower than 0.9% if the onus for meeting it rested with them? Are there important points that are not covered in the arguments outlined above [in the consultation paper]?*

27. There was a clear difference of view on this question, with some organisations believing that GM growers should be responsible, while others stated that the onus should fall on organic producers.

*Q. What do stakeholders think of this analysis [on the feasibility of operating a 0.1% threshold] – is there any firm evidence that would call this into doubt or*

*support a different conclusion? Is there an alternative analysis that should be considered?*

28. Several organisations questioned or disagreed with Defra's conclusion that it would not be feasible to operate a 0.1% threshold for GM presence in organic products. Amongst the comments made were that consumers expect organic food to be GM-free, that imposing a GM threshold above 0.1% would harm the reputation of the organic sector, that a 0.1% standard is already operating for organic imports, and that 0.1% is feasible with effective controls on GM growers, who should have to ensure no detectable contamination. Other organisations supported the Defra analysis, noting that any GM threshold needs to be realistic and achievable, and that real-world production systems normally work on the basis of pragmatic tolerances for perceived impurities.

*Q. What do stakeholders think about this [a possible GM threshold between 0.1% and 0.9%]? Is the expectation that demand from the organic sector will generate production of enough seed which is below EU labelling thresholds to enable a threshold for organic produce lower than 0.9% to be met? Will consumer demand for organic products distinguish between a GM threshold of 0.9% and, say, 0.5%?*

29. There were relatively few responses on this point, and none that favoured a threshold between 0.1% and 0.9%. One organisation said the issue was irrelevant as the aim should be a 0.1% (limit of detection) threshold, and that the selling point for organic food is that it is GM-free, not that it contains 'a bit less' GM. Other organisations felt that a threshold below 0.9% would offer few advantages, or that consumers would not distinguish between 0.9% and 0.5%, which Defra had suggested might in practice be the lowest possible threshold. One organisation thought it was important to consider how consumers view or understand the existing derogations that allow organic producers to use non-organic seeds, inputs and ingredients.

*Q. Do stakeholders accept this analysis [of the limitations of sampling and testing for GM presence]? Are there technical points that need to be clarified or points not covered above that should be considered?*

30. Several organisations agreed with Defra's analysis, which concluded that it would be difficult and costly to operate a GM threshold for organic production below 0.5% at best, because of sampling and testing constraints. Specific comments were that a threshold below 0.9% could not be an option because it would be impossible to monitor and enforce, or that a lower threshold would mean extra costs and uncertainties.

31. Other organisations disagreed. They commented variously that all sampling and testing methods have some margin of error, that 0.1% is generally accepted as the reliable limit of GM detection, that major retailers and food producers are comfortable with 0.1%, that testing to 0.1% is likely to become cheaper and more reliable, and that the coexistence regime shouldn't

be designed around testing capability, but should simply seek to prevent unwanted GM presence.

*Q. Is a process-based standard an alternative way forward? How practical is it?*

32. Some organisations expressed doubts about a process-based approach, where organic farmers would take additional steps to minimise GM presence, beyond the coexistence measures to be applied by GM growers, but there would not be a specific compositional standard, to be confirmed by testing, for GM presence in organic products. A particular concern was that this would put organic farmers at an unnecessary or unfair disadvantage, making them incur extra costs and effort. Other organisations stated that a process-based standard would be pragmatic and consistent with the approach normally followed in organic production. Other comments were that aiming to minimise GM presence to a level below 0.9% would be difficult and costly regardless of whether or not it is done through a process-based standard, and that a process-standard would not be practical to achieve a very low or zero GM presence.

*Q. Overall, what do stakeholders think is the appropriate legal threshold for adventitious GM presence in organic products, bearing in mind the various factors considered above? With the general objective being to minimise GM presence as far as possible, but allowing for the practical constraints, what should be the specific aim in relation to organic production? Should the Government support the Commission's proposal to fix the threshold at 0.9% or argue for a lower figure?*

33. There was no consensus on this issue. As with the responses to the preceding questions in this section, some organisations argued that organic producers should be protected against having any detectable GM presence in their crops/products (a 0.1% target threshold), while other organisations supported a 0.9% threshold. Other comments from organisations were that:

- the legal labelling threshold should be 0.9%, but the organic sector should work to 0.1%; or that apart from the general 0.9% threshold in GM labelling legislation, no specific legal threshold for GM presence in organic products should be established, because it is important for organic production to remain a process-based system
- the Government should ensure that GM-free seed is available (i.e. by negotiating a 0.1% EU threshold for GM presence in seeds)

34. Based on material published by the Soil Association, a standard form of response from members of the public and a petition both made the following points in relation to organic farming:

- there should be much larger separation distances and other measures to keep GM contamination of organic crops below 0.1%
- protective measures to prevent all contamination of organic crops should be undertaken by the GM sector

- the GM sector should be liable for the full economic impact of GM contamination of organic crops

## **REDRESS FOR ECONOMIC LOSSES**

*Q. Have we correctly identified the range of losses that might occur in crop values? What are your views on the proposed approach for dealing with the corn-on-the-cob scenario?*

35. Several organisations broadly supported the analysis in the consultation paper on how potential losses in crop value might be treated under a redress scheme. Other groups stated that any losses from a GM presence at any level should be compensated (i.e. losses should not be restricted to those relating to a GM presence above 0.9%), and that gardeners, allotment holders and others should be able to claim for losses they may incur, in addition to farmers.

36. There were relatively few responses on the specific question about how losses might be assessed in relation to sweetcorn intended for sale as individual corn-on-the-cob (which might need different treatment from crops where the harvest from the field is homogenised). Some responses questioned the need for separate coexistence and redress arrangements for sweetcorn, given that producers already take special measures to minimise cross-pollination from forage maize crops because it affects sweetcorn quality. Other responses noted that assessing the extent of a potential loss in a field of corn-on-the-cob could be done in different ways. One response suggested that if a GM presence were detected at any point in the field it should mean that the whole crop has to be classed as GM.

*Q. Should consequential or additional losses [beyond crop value] be covered by any redress mechanism? If so, which should be covered and why? How likely are these to occur? Are there any other types of loss that should be considered?*

37. Some organisations accepted that extra costs related to handling a crop with an unwanted GM presence above 0.9% (e.g. for storage or transport) might be treated as a recoverable loss, but questioned the idea that indirect losses or those arising from voluntary standards or market-led decisions might be included in a redress scheme. Conversely, a number of organisations made the general point that all types of loss should be covered, not limited to those arising as a result of a breach of the 0.9% GM labelling threshold. Between them, these responses cited the following as losses that should be recoverable: extra costs for crop storage, transport, legal work and GM testing, and loss of business, reputation, organic status and property value.

38. Although they did not address this question directly, several of the stock responses submitted by members of the public implied that liability or redress arrangements should cover all types of loss, and not be confined to instances where a GM presence exceeds 0.9%.

*Q. What should the eligibility requirements be for non-GM farmers to seek redress? Are there particular criteria that have not been highlighted [in the consultation paper]?*

39. Some organisations expressed concern that the eligibility criteria for making a redress claim should not be too burdensome or put too much onus on non-GM farmers to prove their case. Other organisations gave broad support to the analysis and suggested criteria set out in the consultation paper. A couple of responses referred to the need for sampling and testing for GM presence to be undertaken on a standardised or representative basis.

*Q. Are there any alternative ways of distributing the burden [of paying compensation] on the GM sector? Are there any strong arguments or pros/cons to each approach [set out in the consultation paper] that have not been covered?*

40. Several organisations said that GM companies should be strictly liable for a redress or compensation scheme. Others made the point that if GM growers are negligent they should be held liable. Some responses noted that if GM companies were made to fund a redress scheme they could decide for themselves how to do this and recover their costs, or that it would be a commercial matter as to how the financial burden was allocated along the supply chain. Two organisations said that in practice the GM companies would pass on their costs to farmers.

*Q. Which redress mechanism do you favour and why? If a compulsory redress mechanism is your preferred option, which of the models at paragraph 166 should it employ?*

41. Several organisations said that a voluntary, industry-led redress scheme is the best option, in terms of simplicity, flexibility and keeping burdens to a minimum. Some noted specifically that they favoured the scheme being developed by the industry group SCIMAC.

42. Other organisations said that a statutory mechanism is needed which makes GM companies strictly liable. Several of these responses questioned the efficacy or appropriateness of an industry-led scheme, and noted that there should be a specific, independent body to administer and adjudicate on redress claims.

43. In its response, the Association of British Insurers agreed with the view given in the consultation paper, that insurance is unlikely to be an option in the short to medium term. It noted that insurers must be able to quantify the likely number and cost of claims before they will make insurance products available.

44. Various of the stock responses submitted by members of the public, including the two received in the greatest volume, stated that there should be strict liability on GM companies for economic losses and any damage to the

environment. A stock response and a petition focusing on the impact on organic farming both stated that the GM sector should be liable for the full economic impact of any contamination of organic crops, not just for that above 0.9%.

## **A PUBLIC REGISTER OF GM CROPS**

*Q. How could a crop register aid coexistence? Are there other reasons [than those given in the consultation paper] to justify the establishment of a register? If a register is established should the information be available to everyone? How would a register be funded?*

45. Opinions on this issue were sharply polarised. The two stock responses received in the greatest volume from members of the public stated that a detailed, fully-accessible register is necessary, giving prior notice of intended GM crop locations. This view was shared by several organisations who commented. Common reasons given for favouring a detailed register were public confidence, transparency and openness, the idea that the public has a right or need to know where GM crops are being grown, including gardeners and allotment holders, and that a register is essential to help those wanting to be GM-free or avoid GM contamination. However, several organisations were against a detailed register, on the basis that it would be unnecessary, burdensome, costly, open to abuse, and unjustified for crops approved as safe.

46. Two NGOs questioned Defra's interpretation of the EU legislation in relation to a GM crop register, arguing that it was flawed. Some respondents said there were advantages to a register that were not mentioned in the consultation paper. For example, that it would:

- facilitate research (e.g. on gene flow)
- act as a policing mechanism, encouraging farmers to comply with the notification rule because it would be possible for others to know if they had not
- help to understand how any unexplained environmental effects had arisen, and with remediation claims under the EU environmental liability directive

## **VOLUNTARY GM-FREE ZONES**

*Q. Do stakeholders have particular comments on the guidance that Defra could make available on GM-free zones? Are there relevant points that have not been covered in [the consultation paper]?*

47. One of the two main stock responses received from members of the public stated that voluntary zones are unlikely to work, and that EU law should be changed to allow local authorities to decide whether GM crops could be grown in their area. The point about local decision-making was also made in the stock response that was received in the greatest volume. Several organisations made the same or broadly similar points, including local

councils. Some organisations stressed that zones should be voluntary and not impinge on a choice to grow approved GM crops. One organisation noted that the attitude of the food sector could be a key factor in determining the possible use of zones, if non-GM supply policies are maintained. One conservation group suggested that zones might be necessary in areas where habitats or wildlife could be affected by genetic traits.