



Article (refereed) - postprint

Pollock, Christopher J. ; Hails, Rosemary S.. 2014. **The case for reforming the EU regulatory systems for GMOs.**

© 2014 Elsevier B.V.

This version available <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/503703/>

NERC has developed NORA to enable users to access research outputs wholly or partially funded by NERC. Copyright and other rights for material on this site are retained by the rights owners. Users should read the terms and conditions of use of this material at <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/policies.html#access>

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in *Trends in Biotechnology*. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in *Trends in Biotechnology*, 32 (2). 63-64. [10.1016/j.tibtech.2013.10.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2013.10.007)

www.elsevier.com/

Contact CEH NORA team at
noraceh@ceh.ac.uk

The NERC and CEH trademarks and logos ('the Trademarks') are registered trademarks of NERC in the UK and other countries, and may not be used without the prior written consent of the Trademark owner.

1 **The Case for Reforming the EU Regulatory System for GMOs.**

2 **Christopher J. Pollock* and Rosemary S. Hails**.**

3

4 *Institute of Biological, Environmental and Rural Sciences, Aberystwyth
5 University, Penglais, Aberystwyth SY23 3FG and **NERC Centre for Ecology
6 and Hydrology, Wallingford OX10 8BB, UK.

7

8 *Corresponding Author:* Pollock, C.J (cip@aber.ac.uk)

9

10

1 **Background.** The first iteration of the EU Directive that controls the
2 deliberate release of GMOs into the environment was adopted in 1990, and
3 the first commercial planting of GM crops occurred in 1996 in the USA (or
4 1998 in the EU). Since then, the global cultivated area has risen to exceed
5 170 M ha and the majority of global production of soya and cotton is via GM
6 varieties [1]. Over this period, cultivation within the EU has been restricted to
7 ca 0.1M ha. Although the main barrier to release of GM food crops for
8 cultivation in the EU lies at the political level, the UK Advisory Committee on
9 Releases to the Environment (ACRE) has recently raised concerns both about
10 the regulatory approach adopted by the EU and the implementation of the
11 current current processes for carrying out Environmental Risk assessments
12 (ERA) process and about their future fitness for purpose (ACRE
13 http://www.*wp1-3). This article summarises these concerns and suggests a
14 way forward.

15 **Addressing current challenges.** These include the lack of precision with
16 which the concept of adverse effects (harm) is used within ERA and the
17 challenges of developing a proportionate approach to unanticipated effects

18 *Adverse Effects.* There is no consensus within the EU as to what constitutes an
19 adverse environmental effect. This has led to increasing data requirements and
20 to inappropriate recommendations for risk management options. The, and this
21 leads to difficulties as re illustrated by GM herbicide tolerant crops. These
22 systems allow farmers to practice efficient weed control to enhance crop
23 productivity, potentially at the expense of biodiversity that depends upon weeds
24 at the base of the food chain. This negative impact could be compensated for by

Comment [RSH1]: Actually the example we give, with GMHT crops, is about absence of defined risk management because harm has not been defined. This more general statement is more relevant to GMIR crops.

1 setting aside field margins or other areas for farmland biodiversity, but in the
2 absence of clear guidelines on what does or does not constitute harm,
3 appropriate compensatory measures cannot be usefully defined. Defining harm
4 would also facilitate a more structured approach to ERA [2], thus reducing the
5 inclusion of extraneous information and improving the value of the ERA in
6 decision-making.

7

8 ~~Monitoring and Dealing with the unexpected.~~ In addition to assessing the risks
9 associated with the intended changes made to a GM crop, ERA must also
10 address the possibility that any identified unintended changes could cause
11 harm. In the absence of a plausible link between a characteristic of a GM crop
12 (and its use) and such harm, there is the potential for open-ended evidence-
13 gathering that does not add value to the risk assessment. It is not ~~possible~~
14 ~~practical to test~~ for ~~ERA to identify~~ unintended effects in advance by testing
15 every characteristic of a GM crop and its use under every conceivable scenario.
16 It is important therefore, that the EU adopts a proportionate approach that
17 makes optimal use of existing evidence. There is a significant 'weight of
18 evidence' available from the cultivation of GM crops outside of the EU as well as
19 from existing information requirements. Where this evidence indicates changes
20 to a GM crop, ~~or its use ,are identified and potentially that can be~~ linked to
21 adverse effects, the ERA should follow a structured ~~and proportionate~~ process
22 to characterise the risk to the environment. Where identified but unintended
23 changes cannot be plausibly linked to adverse effects, further data should not
24 be required.

Comment [RSH2]: I think its important in this section to distinguish between identified unintended changes and 'unknown unknowns'

Comment [RSH3]: I think this conclusion is required for clarity

1 Finally, some countries, including those in the EU, require post-market
2 monitoring to detect any unanticipated adverse effects from the commercial
3 growing of GM crops. In this context, ~~Where~~ in terms of unintended effects,
4 cannot be defined nor linked to a GMO, ACRE supports the use of effective
5 questionnaires to detect significant changes aimed at users of the product but
6 is doubtful of the value of large-scale environmental monitoring to attribute
7 causality to the cultivation of GM crops |
8 (<http://www.defra.gov.uk/acre/files/pmem-final-report.pdf>; ACRE [http://*](#) WP2).

Comment [RSH4]: And I think this paragraph is needed.

9 **Emerging Challenges For Process-based Regulation.** The current EU
10 Directive lists techniques that can lead to the generation of GMOs and those
11 which are deemed not to. However, these lists are not exhaustive, which leads
12 to confusion ~~in interpretation of the regulations as to whether the legislation~~
13 ~~applies to novel organisms developed by techniques that were not envisaged~~
14 ~~when the legislation was adopted in 1990.~~ This approach to regulating
15 organisms based on how they were produced (so-called “process-based”) ~~was~~
16 ~~adopted in 1990 and at this time, many of the techniques being used and~~
17 ~~developed today were not envisaged. Consequently, it is not clear whether the~~
18 ~~organisms produced by them are captured by the GMO legislation. This results~~
19 in regulatory uncertainty – a major block to innovation and to effective ERA.

Comment [RSH5]: Comment from Louise about this section:

‘ACRE has already been criticised for not understanding how the legislation works so it’s important to get this right.

The original draft talks about a process-based approach then, at the end talks about whether the product occurs naturally without connecting the 2.. I’ve moved the text from the end to the front to make it clear that the definition has 2 parts and there are problems with both parts i.e. process –based bit only categorically deals with transgenics and the genotype element is nonsensical given what we now know about genomes.

I amended the text so that it wasn’t so confusing and added the ‘genotype’ element in the last section.’

20 Adoption of a process-based regulatory system ~~ditionally, basing a regulatory~~
21 ~~system on how organisms are produced has resulted in also results in~~
22 organisms with the same phenotype being dealt with differently (e.g.
23 ~~phenotypically identical~~ herbicide-tolerant plants produced by transgenesis or
24 traditional mutagenesis). This disparity may ~~increase~~ become more evident
25 depending on whether regulators consider organisms produced by a suite of

Comment [RSH6]: Comment from Louise: ‘Why? Once captured we could carry out an effective ERA’.

1 | new techniques as GMOs. ~~Regulation of process-based approaches is both~~
2 | ~~open to interpretation and difficult to future-proof.~~ ~~For example, plants~~
3 | developed using chemical or radiation mutagenesis are exempt from existing
4 | EU regulation. However, the same trait in the same organism caused by the
5 | same sequence alteration but using a different mutagenic process (such as zinc
6 | finger nucleases, TALENS or oligonucleotides) may be covered, depending on
7 | the interpretation of the EU Commission and member-state regulators.

8 | ~~Furthermore, their views are likely to differ as reflected in~~ ~~It is likely that the~~
9 | ~~conclusions will reflect those set out in~~ the EU Commission's working group
10 | report on New Technologies [3]. Other emerging technologies ~~involve~~ GM
11 | techniques ~~that are captured by the definition of a GMO during the~~ ~~as part of the~~
12 | breeding process but ~~that~~ result in ~~an~~ organisms that ~~does~~ not contain any
13 | inserted or recombinant DNA (e.g. reverse breeding). As the process requires
14 | the use of a GM intermediate, some may argue that the resultant organism is
15 | captured by the ~~directive~~ GMO legislation whereas others may ~~consider~~ not.
16 | ~~that it is not because the product could have occurred naturally.~~

Comment [m7]: This concept hasn't been introduced.

17 |
18 | We conclude that a process-based approach to regulation is difficult to interpret
19 | and to future-proof and this will become more apparent as the technology and
20 | its application advances ~~problematic now, and likely to become more so in the~~
21 | ~~future. This is also consistent with current views of genome organisation that do~~
22 | ~~not align with the EU definition of a GMO ("an organism...in which the genetic~~
23 | ~~material has been altered in a way that does not occur naturally by mating~~
24 | ~~and/or natural recombination.")~~ ~~When this was written, genomes were~~
25 | ~~considered to be relatively uniform and stable and the definition was intended to~~

1 capture the range of artificially induced alterations to an organism's genetic
2 material. Now that the extent of natural genetic and epigenetic variation is more
3 fully understood, identifying alterations that do not occur naturally is much more
4 challenging. Within an individual and between individuals of the same species,
5 the genetic material can exist in naturally altered forms whilst the phenotype
6 remains unchanged, through the effects of genetic redundancy between
7 multigene family members [4,5] Equally, a single nucleotide change can result
8 in a significant phenotype change (ACRE <http://www.wp31>).

Comment [m8]: Confuses the story line

9
10 **Options for Change.** A major reason for regulating organisms based on how
11 they were developed is to address the concern that the technologies may cause
12 unintended alterations to the organisms' genetic material that could not have
13 occurred naturally or through conventional breeding. Since the GMO legislation
14 was adopted in 1990 we have learned a great deal from genomic studies. We
15 now understand that this notion that genomes are relatively uniform and stable
16 entities is incorrect. Within an individual and between individuals of the same
17 species, the genetic material can exist in naturally altered forms whilst the
18 phenotype remains unchanged, through the effects of genetic redundancy
19 between multigene family members [4,5] Equally, a single nucleotide change
20 can result in a significant phenotype change (ACRE <http://www.wp31>). We have
21 also gained significant evidence from the widespread use of GMOs. From this
22 we conclude that~~We propose that~~ there is little scientific justification for a
23 regulatory system that is triggered by the process by which new organisms are
24 developed (i.e. recombinant DNA technology) rather than by their novelty or
25 potential for harm (i.e. their phenotype).

1 |
2 | Additionally, we suggest that a regulatory system that takes account of potential
3 | benefits and includes potential compensatory measures (thus encouraging a
4 | more explicit cost-benefit approach) would better align with other regulatory
5 | frameworks and result in greater potential benefits for the environment and
6 | human health than the existing system. This approach would also improve the
7 | efficiency of the process to ensure appropriate ~~risk~~-assessment without stifling
8 | ~~innovation technological. It and~~ would obviate the ~~pressure to develop need for~~
9 | technological approaches ~~that are developed purely to deliver material that lies~~
10 | outside current regulations (~~ACRE http://www.wp2*~~). Shifting to a phenotype-
11 | based system would ~~also~~ permit resolution of the wider issues discussed above
12 | and promote proportionate and effective ~~ERA-assessments~~ backed by
13 | appropriate post-market ~~surveillance-monitoring~~ (~~ACRE http://www.wp3*~~).
14 | Further details of such a system are given in (~~ACRE http://www.wp1*~~)

15 | **Acknowledgements.** The authors are grateful to Les Firbank, University
16 | of Leeds and Keith Lindsey, Durham University, who were lead authors
17 | for two of the ACRE documents that formed the basis for the article; to
18 | the other members of ACRE (Kathy Bamford, Imperial College; Michael
19 | Bonsall, University of Oxford; Rosemary Collier, University of Warwick;
20 | Jim Dunwell, University of Reading; Matthew Heard, NERC Centre for
21 | Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford; David Hopkins, Heriot-Watt
22 | University; Ieuan Joyce, Farmer, Ceredigion and Herefordshire; Simon
23 | Kerr, National Institute of Agricultural Botany and Andrew Peters,
24 | Arpexas Consultancy Ltd) for their involvement in the process and to
25 | the ACRE secretariat headed by Louise Ball for their support.

1 **References**

- 2 1 James, C. (2012) *Global Status of Commercialized Biotech/GM Crops:*
3 *2012*. ISAAA Brief No. 44. ISAAA: Ithaca, NY.
- 4 2 Wolt J.D., Keese P., Raybould A.F., Fitzpatrick J.W., Burachick M., Gray
5 A.J., Schiemann J., Sears M., Wu F. (2010). Problem formulation in the
6 environmental risk assessment of genetically modified plants. *Transgenic*
7 *Research* 19: 425 -436.
- 8 3 European Commission (2011) *EU Commission's New Techniques Working*
9 *Group Final Report*.
- 10 4 Bolle C et al. (2013) GABI-DUPLO: a collection of double mutants to
11 overcome genetic redundancy in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant J.* **75**, 157-171.
- 12 5 Patterson AH et al. (2010) Insights from the comparison of plant genome
13 sequences. *Ann. Rev. Plant Biol.* **61**, 349-372.