COEXISTENCE OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED AND NON-GENETICALLY MODIFIED MAIZE:

MAKING THE POINT ON SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE AND COMMERCIAL EXPERIENCE

Underwriters

PG Economics - Graham Brookes

IRTA-Estació Experimental Agrícola Mas Badia - Joaquima Messeguer, Enric Méle

Arvalis, Institut du Végétal - Florence Leprince-Bénétrix

Martin-Luther University Halle-Wittenberg - W. Eberhard Weber

Agroscope Reckenholz Tänikon Research Station ART – Olivier Sanvido, Franz Bigler, Michael Winzeler

Università degli Studi di Pisa – Professor Amedeo Alpi

Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Piacenza - Filippo Rossi

University of Rome " Tor Vergata "Rome - Professor Vittorio Santaniello
University of Milan - Professor Chiara Tonelli
Università Politecnica delle Marche, Ancona - Professor Bruno Mezzetti

University of Bologna - Roberto Tuberosa
Università Cattolica S. Cuore, Piacenza – Professor Corrado Fogher
National Research Council, Naples – Professor Roberto Defez

University of Reading, Professor Richard H Phipps

Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Institute of Plant Sciences - Michael Bannert, Peter Stamp

AIM OF THIS DOCUMENT

Coexistence is about how crops intended for different markets can be grown in the same area or locality without becoming mixed, and possibly compromising the economic value of each other. It refers to the ability of farmers to choose the production systems they prefer, whether it is conventional, organic or genetically modified (GM). Coexistence is not a safety issue but **strictly an economic question** that relates to the marketing of approved crops.

Since 2003, coexistence in Europe has been subjected to Regulation (EC) no. 1830/2003 that sets a labeling threshold of 0.9% for unintentional or the technically unavoidable ("adventitious") presence of GM material in harvested material or products from non-GM crops.

In addition, Recommendation 2003/556/EC provides guidelines for the development of national strategies and best practices that, where necessary, can be applied to keep products from non-GM fields below the labeling threshold. This recommendation specifically states that: "*Management measures for coexistence should reflect the best available scientific evidence on the probability and sources of admixture between GM and non-GM crops. They should permit the cultivation of GM and non-GM crops, whilst ensuring that non-GM crops remain below the legal thresholds for labeling and purity standards with respect to genetically modified food and feed and seeds, as defined by Community legislation.* "

Based on this recommendation, national strategies for coexistence are being developed across Europe[1]. However, some national legislation and proposals do not take into account scientific evidence and do not respect key principles for coexistence such as proportionality, fairness and consistency. Where overly restrictive legislation is put in place, the ability of farmers and downstream users to adopt and utilise GM crops is impeded, due to a greatly reduced financial and legal attractiveness.

The aim of this document is to summarize existing scientific evidence and commercial experience with coexistence in maize, the first and presently only GM crop to be planted in the European Union (EU). The paper focuses on adventitious presence in **harvested material**, which is the main product of relevance for farmers.

COEXISTENCE IN MAIZE

A large body of information from research and commercial experience is available on the mixing of neighbouring maize crops. In the field, adventitious presence of genes from one crop in another is mainly due to the wind dispersal of pollen. As maize pollen is fairly heavy, the vast majority is deposited within a short distance (in general within a maximum of 18 – 20 metres) of the emitter plants. This distance varies with time of planting, varietal differences, presence of volunteer maize plants from an earlier crop, temperature and humidity levels, wind, length of border and shape of the fields and the presence or absence of buffer crops and other barriers.

In terms of respecting the EU labelling threshold in harvested material, it is possible to draw on many years of practical experience with the production of specialty crops (e.g. waxy maize), research findings in numerous countries worldwide[2] and commercial experience with GM maize in Spain. All of this research and experience is consistent: adventitious presence levels

[1] Up to September 2006, Denmark, the Czech Republic, Portugal and the Netherlands had legislation or voluntary agreements in place. Some other EU Member States had developed draft proposals for coexistence.

[2] In Europe, research has been conducted for example in Spain, France, Portugal, Italy, Switzerland, Germany and the UK.

below 0.9% can be and have been achieved through the application of good agricultural growing, harvesting and storage practices. These may include measures such as:

- **thorough cleaning of planting and harvesting equipment,**
- **varying the time of planting or using maize varieties with different flowering times,**
- **implementing isolation distances,**
- **and/or planting non-GM maize buffer rows around GM maize fields**.

Where a neighbouring non-GM field is at least 1 ha in size, an isolation distance of **20 - 25 metres** is sufficient to ensure purity levels in harvested material below the EU 0.9% labelling threshold. In certain cases, to take into account particular spatial conditions and agricultural practices (eg, small scale production systems, average field size smaller than half a hectare and/or long and narrow fields), the isolation distance may be extended to 50 metres. These separation distances may be reduced if the GM crop is surrounded by a **buffer consisting of non-GM maize plants**.

These practices have been successfully applied in Spain where, in 8 years of commercial GM maize planting, there have been no cases of litigation amongst farmers linked to adventitious presence in non-GM harvested material[3]. Over this period, the farming community and the downstream user sectors have been able to successfully produce and use both GM and non-GM products. This is especially evident in Aragon, where, despite the high penetration of GM maize[4], a major starch company using locally grown maize is able to satisfactorily provide certified non-GM products to the requirements of its customers. To date, no coexistence laws have been adopted in Spain; farmers rely on Good Agricultural Practices developed by APROSE and described in a brochure attached to each bag of GM maize. The guide referred to 25 metres of isolation distance or 4 buffer rows of non-GM maize in 2004 and 2005[5].

CONCLUSIONS

Evidence from both research and commercial practice shows that growers of GM, conventional and organic maize can coexist and maintain the integrity of their crops through the application of good agricultural growing, harvesting and storage practices.

Where GM maize farmers are located near growers who sell their crops into markets with a requirement for certified non-GM maize, **a separation distance of 20 - 25 metres (50 metres may sometimes be required to take into account particular spatial conditions or agricultural practices) or reduced separation distances if the GM crop is surrounded by buffer rows of non-GM maize plants** provides for effective coexistence. In some regions, delayed planting or the use of varieties with different flowering time represents additional useful coexistence tools at the level of individual fields.

This scientific evidence and commercial experience should be taken into account when developing national strategies for coexistence. These strategies should be

[3] Instances of GM adventitious presence in harvested material from non-GM/organic maize fields have occasionally been reported. These were generally below the 0.9% EU labelling threshold and/or without evidence of using certified conventional or organic seed.

[4] In 2005, approximately 29% of the maize grown in Aragon was GM.

[5] In 2006, the seed industry aligned itself to the draft coexistence legislation published by the Spanish government that refers to 50 m of isolation distance. This proposed increase in the isolation distance was however not driven by new scientific evidence.

proportional, fair and consistent with the Commission Recommendation 2003/556/EC.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APROSE (2004). Evaluation of cross pollination between commercial GM (MON 810) maize and neighbouring conventional maize fields. Analytical survey of 14 commercial Bt fields in 2003 by Monsanto, Nickersons and Pioneer Hi-Bred International, presented to the Spanish Bio-Vigilance Commission, unpublished.

Bannert M. (2006). Simulation of transgenic pollen dispersal by use of different grain colour maize. Dissertation no. 16508. Swiss Federal Institute of Technology of Zürich. http://www.agrisite.de/doc/ge_img/pollen-swiss.pdf.

Bénétrix F. and Bloc D. (2003). Maïs OGM et non OGM, possible coexistence. Perspectives Agricoles No. 294.

Bénétrix F. (2005). Managing the coexistence of conventional and genetically modified maize from field to silo – a French initiative. Proceedings of the 2cnd International conference on coexistence between GM and non-GM based agricultural supply chains, GMCC-05, 14-15 November 2005, Montpellier, France.

Brookes G. and Barfoot P. (2003). Co-existence of GM and non GM crops: case study of maize grown in Spain. Proceedings of the 1st European conference on the coexistence of GM crops with conventional and organic crops, GMCC-O3, Denmark, November 2003.

Brookes G., Barfoot P., Melé E., Messeguer E., Bénétrix F., Bloc D., Foueillassar X., Fabié A. and Poeydomenge C. (2004). GM maize: pollen movement and crop co-existence. www.pgeconomics.co.uk/pdf/maizepollennov2004final.pdf.

DEFRA (2003). A review of knowledge of the potential impact of GMOs on organic agriculture (OF0193). http://www2.defra.gov.uk/research/project_data/More.asp?I=OF0193&SCOPE=1&M=CFO&V=JIC&Lvl=0&Cat1=&Cat2=&Cat3=&Cat4=&Cat5=.

Della Porta G., Ederle D., Bucchini L., Prandi M., Pozzi C. And Verderio A. (2006). Gene flow between neighboring fields in the Po Valley. Publication of the Centro di Documentazione Agrobiotecnologie (CEDAB). http://www.cedab.it.

Devos Y., Reuhel D. and De Schrijver A. (2005). The co-existence between transgenic and non-transgenic maize in the European Union: a focus on pollen flow and cross-fertilisation, Environmental Biosafety Research 4: 71-87.

Eastman K. and Sweet J. (2002). Genetically modified organisms (GMOs): the significance of gene flow through pollen transfer. A review and interpretation of published literature and recent/current, European Environment Agency, ISBN 92 9167 4117.

EuropaBio (2006). Understanding coexistence: science, principles and practical experience. http://www.europabio.org.

Foueillassar X. and Fabie A. (2003). Waxy maize production, an experiment evaluating coexistence of GM and conventional maize, ARVALIS, Institut du Végétal, France.

Henry C., Morgan D., Weekes R., Daniels R. and Boffey C. (2003). Farm scale evaluations of GM crops: monitoring gene flow from GM crops to non GM equivalents in the vicinity: Part one forage maize, DEFRA report EPG/1/5/138. http://www.defra.gov.uk/ENVIRONMENT/gm/research/pdf/epg_1-5-138.pdf#search='DEFRA%20report%20EPG%2F1%2F5%2F138'.

Joint Research Centre (2006). New case studies on the coexistence of GM and non GM crops in European agriculture, Eur 22102, JRC, IPTS Technical Report Series.

Ma B.L., Sudebi K.D. and Reid L.M. (2004). Crop ecology, management & quality: extent of cross-fertilisation in maize by pollen from neighbouring transgenic hybrids. Crop Science 44(4): 1273-1282.

Melé E. (2004). First results of co-existence study: European Biotechnology Science & Industry News No 4(3): 8.

Messeguer J., Peñas G., Ballester J., Bas M., Serra J., Salvia J., Palaudelmàs M. and Melé E. (2006). Pollen-mediated gene flow in maize in real situations of coexistence. Plant Biotechnology Journal 4. Available online at http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/action/doSearch?searchText=messe

guer&filter=single&journal=pbi&searchbutton.x=48&searchbutton.y=6.

Ortega Molina J. (2006). The Spanish experience with co-existence after 8 years of cultivation of GM maize. Proceedings of the Co-existence of GM, conventional and organic crops, Freedom of Choice Conference, Vienna, April 2006.

Sanvido O., Widmer F., Winzeler M., Streit B. Szerencsits E. and Bigler F. (2005). Koexistenz verschiedener landwirtschaflicher Anbausysteme mit und ohne Gentechnik. Schriftreihe der FAL 55. English summary available under http://www.reckenholz.ch/cgi-bin/sql/order.pl?lang=de&ref=4&next=detail&key=55

Weber W. E., Bringezu T., Broer, I., Holz F. and Eder J. (2005). Coexistence of genetically modified and conventional maize (Koexistenz von gentechnisch verändertem und konventionellem Mais). Mais 1/2005: 14-17; Mais 2/2005: 62-64.

Weber W. E., Bringezu T., Broer I., Holz F. and Eder, J. (2006). Coexistence between GM and non-GM maize crops – tested in 2004 at the field scale level (Erprobungsanbau 2004). J. Agronomy and Crop Science, in press.