

Disclaimer: This version is of the document was generated by eTranslation, a machine translation tool provided by the European Commission. The quality and accuracy of machine translation can vary significantly from one text to another and between different language pairs. The European Commission does not guarantee the accuracy and accepts no liability for possible errors.

Carnation IFD-26407-2

Organisation: The European GMO free citizens

Country: The Netherlands

Type: Others...

Comments:

Lelystad, 24-6-24

L.S., Comment on SNIFC/NL/09/01 and SNIFC/NL/09/02 (Renewal).

We – The European GMO-Free Citizens and the Ekopark Foundation in Lelystad (the Netherlands) – do not wish these genetically modified carnations will get a renewal.

If you were to deal with it (which we would regret), we would want to achieve it, to be labelled as a CMO. See also all our comments on GM carnations of an earlier date.
www.gentechvrij.nl

We, the European Gentech-free Citizens, Stichting Natuurwetmothers and Stichting Ekopark in Lelystad, the Netherlands, have previously written. We still support it.

Subject:

Names of the carnations: Florigene ® MoonberryT and Florigene ® MoonvelvetT.

Re-authorisation of two gentech trosangers.

— Original Message From: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Sent: 26 March 2009 15: 33

To: gmoinfo-comments@jrc.it subject: Comment on SNIFC/NL/09/01

L.S., Comment on SNIFC/NL/09/01 and on SNIFC/NL/09/02

Some concerns and objections to this gentech carnation and some questions.

Question 1. Bees, what happens if bees end up on gentech carnations and take gene tech pollen with them? It is known that a German beekeepers were no longer able to sell their organic honey due to the presence of GM ingredients.

And what happens to butterflies who prefer to get on a purple flower? See: Just like people have a favourite colour – what is that of you? — similarly, butterflies prefer certain colours. Vrije Vogels has examined this through the whole of the Netherlands. It also appears that some colours are favourite. Purple has been shown to be a very wild flower colour. university researchers have discovered that insects perceive colours very different from humans.

We know the following: Purple flowers seem to mean that there is a lot of nectar. This is also important for the plant, as butterflies help pollinate the plants: necessary to create new plants. From: Free Vogels.

Question 2. Changed flower colour: do bees, butterflies and other useful insects still recognise the colour? What we know at all about the function of a flower colour, a certain colour undoubtedly stands for a particular characteristic or functionality, which we do not know.

A carnation can be rooted in the water with her stalk, or the side shoots in the oaks of the flower are even better suited to this, if it is torn off. (own observation). It is also possible to insert a cut carnation into the ground, if it is also rooted.

Who say that not someone is going to do so to multiply this costly carnation?

Odoriferous substances

Flowers emit odoriferous substances to attract insects. For example, some flowers smell to rot meat to attract flies and the green night orchis smells to nectar. In addition, plants release odoriferous substances if they are feared by, for example, tracks.

Flavourings

The plant can make certain flavours, such as bitter substances, which prevent the plant from being eaten up. Even if a plant is attacked, these flavours can make or increase their quantity in order to make itself less attractive to the blower.

Toxins

Toxins protect the plant from sealing. See: <http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plantencommunicatie>

Question 3. What happens to the function of odoriferous substances, flavourings and toxins in the event of a modified flower colour?

Question 4. As in the case of GM carnations C/NL/04/01 and C/NL/04/02, are embryo intestinal cells used to check that the flower is not toxic to humans? You should not think that you will get these carnations before Maternity Day!

We would finally ask you to consider the ethical concerns of European consumers, as we have promised.

See 2001/18/EC (9) 'Respect for ethical principles recognised in a Member State is individually important. Member States may take into consideration ethical aspects when GMOs are deliberated or posted on the market as or in products'.

We are protesting against this market authorisation on ethical grounds. We find this genetic manipulation of a cut flower (as well as all other forms of genetic manipulation) an unethical act. The Schepper has not meant this, even though we have been granted stewardship about the Earth, it is not enough to change the blueprint, especially since this is never to be reversed again.

Let me say that you are carrying out this profound act because of a different flower colour! I would therefore ask you not to allow these and similar flowers to enter the EU market. It is unnecessary (in the Netherlands there is also a selection of beautiful flowers with scalable colours).

It is undesirable and not completely free of risks, and it is unacceptable to readmit these genotech carnations!

The fight against purple trosanians

On 17-11-2015 Maria Lieve van Stichting Ekopark, Lelystad read the entire pleading relating to our objections to this gentech trosaniers at the Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment.

This concerned an objection to authorisations for market authorisations of: Florigene ® Moonvelvet™ and Florigene ® Moonberry™.

These are gentech trosangers with changed flower colour.

Were present:

-

- Ms L. Mast, Natural mothers,
- Mr W. Braakman, organic bulb breeder,
- Ms Wieteke van Dort, Actrice and artist,
- Ms M. Bos, artist, author and spokesperson of Gentech-free Citizens
- Mr Toine Heijmans, People's newspaper journalist. Read here his document on the hearing.

Were present from the Ministry's side;

- Ms M. D,
- Mr J.G.
- Ms I. de K.

See also:

Press release due to hearing gentech trosangers 2015 – Gotech free

carcer-tros-renewable market gun 2015-pleitnota.pdf (gentechfo.nl)

Gentech carnations with changed flower colour, view – genotech free

Pleading for the authorisation of market authorisations of: Florigene ® MoonvelvetT and Florigene ® MoonberryT.

17-11-2015. Oral note read by Maria Lieve from Stichting Ekopark, Lelystad. It has read the entire pleading note. Were present: Ms L. Mast, Natural Mothers, Mr W. Braakman, organic bulb breeder, Ms Wieteke van Dort, Actrice and artist, Ms M. Bos, artist and spokesperson of Gotech-free Burgers and Mr Toine Heijmans, People's newspaper journalist.

Were present from the Ministry's side; Ms M.D., Mr J.G. and Ms I. de K.

Concerns authorisations for market authorisations of: Florigene ® MoonvelvetT and Florigene ® MoonberryT.

PLEADING NOTE

Ladies and gentlemen, We are Miep Bos, spokesperson of De Gotech-free Burgers from Lelystad (also on behalf of MADGE) and Maria Lieve, Secretary of Foundation Ekopark from Lelystad.

Today, 17 November 2015, we object to two Decisions on Florigene Ltd's applications for authorisation.

I do not read the red text and the 3 annexes, but I would ask the Secretary of State to include the annexes and the red texts in her final assessment.

On 9 July 2015, the Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment (hereinafter: IenM), authorisations granted with reference GGO C/NL/09/01 and GMO C/NL/09/02.

The genetically modified organisms placed on the market for import are cut flowers of carnation (*Dianthus caryophyllus* L.) with modified flower colour, modified with *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* strain AGL0, using the vector pCGP3366 and pCGP2355 respectively, resulting in line 25958 (C/NL/09/01) and line 26407 (C/NL/09/02).

Firstly: As a member of the Board of Directors of Stichting Ekopark, and the importance of the Gotech-free Citizens and the public interest of every citizen, I am interested in creating legal uncertainty and legal inequality by allowing these spray carnations to enter the EU market. This is against Directive 2001/18/EC.

And the Ministry ultimately decides on the authorisation.

We read in Directive 2001/18/EC: (25) GMOs, as or in products, intended for deliberate release, should not be placed on the market without having been adequately tested in the field at the research and development stage in the ecosystems likely to be affected by their use.

https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:303dd4fa-07a8-4d20-86a8-0baaf0518d22.0009.02/DOC_1&format=PDF

No mandatory field trials have been carried out in the EU. However, the Directive has been overruled and you do not need to comply with it (No 25), what is the value of the Directive? It creates legal inequality and legal uncertainty. After all, citizens, who would ultimately have to buy the crushable flowers, are no longer entitled to object to it as the *Actio popularis* has been abolished. The rest is a buyer strike.

Stichting Ekopark agrees with the comments made by President Fran Murrell, President of MADGE from Australia, and is burdened with the appeal in:

See [carcer-tros-renewable market focus 2015-pleitnota.pdf \(gentechfo.nl\)](#)

Jessica Harrison, Glenda Lindsay and Fran Murrell co-founded MADGE in 2007, the Victorian Government's ban on growing GM canola was to expire in 2008. What does MADGE stand for? 'Mothers Are Demystifying Genetic Engineering' but also 'Mothers Advocating Deliciously Good Eating' as food should be NOURISHING and DELIGHTFUL. MADGE Australia Inc. Fitzroy, 3065, Australia <http://www.madge.org.au/>

See further Annex 1

http://www.isis.org.uk/Horizontal_Transfer_of_GM_DNA_Widespread.php

See <http://www.pnas.org/content/104/41/16204.abstract>

As anyone who uses a computer knows a tiny change in a programme can have catastrophic and unintended results. Yet we have genetic engineers claiming to be able to alter the genetic code, one they haven't written, don't fully understand and don't test, with complete accuracy and no anticipated consequences. From an email from MADGE dated 14-10-2015.

Six major concerns in this genetically engineered mini carnation:

1 Deception. The GM flowers have completely changed shape. Not just the colour. And there is certainly no substantial equivalence compared to the parent line. This is hidden from our consumers. You must first read the application completely and have a command of the English language before you find it. This change in form was not predicted in advance. It shows how little

scientists know about the functioning of DNA. It is trial-and-error.

Question from Austrian scientists: "The Austrian CA (Competent Authority) commented on the statistically significant morphological differences observed in comparative assessments requesting a scientific rationale should be given by the notifier in order to rule out possible, unintended effects due to the genetic modification (results of additional field trials may provide this missing information). Florigene's reply: Variation in morphological characters measured in the transgenic lines can be attributed to environmental factors. This is illustrated

in the table below which measures multiple characters in three independent block trials carried out with the transgenic line, and its parental control, in Colombia and Australia. Differences between these trials included temperature, radiation, day length and nutrient/irrigation regimes. The fact that, according to Florigene, morphological factors differ due to different environmental factors such as “temperature, radiation, day length and nutrient/irrigation regimes” is highly questionable. (Reply to Austrian scientists, in “60 days response, 24 November 2009”, C/NL/09/01.)

Finally, the German Competent Authority commented: “1.It is required to conduct at least several field surveys..... in each country or region of Europe where the modified carnations are marked. Spray type carnations produce more pollen than standards or MIDIS. Page 214 Florigene application. ‘Spray type carnations produce more pollen than standards or MIDIS.’ Blz 214 application Florigene.

Resp 8 and 9 countries commented on both gentech trosanger lines and finally there was no agreement. Finally, TM flowers were authorised by the EC President, Mr J.C. Juncker.

Jeffrey Smith. Translation: ‘The insertion process plus cloning causes huge additional damage. Hundreds or thousands of mutations can occur throughout the DNA and hundreds or thousands of genes can change their level of expression. This creates unpredictable side effects.’ (from our letter of 5 October 2015).

The marketing of this converted mini carnation is a marketing truc and pure propaganda. The aim is to ensure that genetic engineering is accepted. Genetic engineering is a highly risky, fraudulent, unpredictable, unreliable and dangerous science, which threatens us all, according to Dr. Steven Druker’s book ‘altered Genes, Twisted Truth’, previously mentioned in the objection, which is very well founded.

2 Timentin. We also read the following in the two applications: ‘Agrobacterium was killed during the transformation process using the antibiotic timentin’. Page 15 application reference GMO C/NL/09/01. ‘The transgenic line was transformed with the use of armed strain of Agrobacterium tumefaciens AGLO (Agrobacterium). Agrobacterium was killed during the transformation process using the antibiotic timentin’. Page 15 application reference GMO C/NL/09/01.

‘Ticarcilline (combined with clavulanoic acid under the name Timentin) should only be used for strict indication.’ Blz 113

The medicinal product and its application – P. Vermeij, A.M. Soeterbook, De Erven van drs. C.W.R. Phaf, L.F. Stapper – Google Boeken
https://books.google.nl/books?id=NtBDITRkJisC&pg=PA113&dq=Het+Geneesmiddel+En+Zijn+Application+timentin-hl=nl+Portuhl=nl+Portusa=X+Based=0CB8Q6AEwAGoVChMI0cr_somuyAIVBrg+aCh2vUgig#v=Unepage,=%20Medicines%20and%20In%20In%20Application%20Introduction%20tim+entif=false
<http://reference.medscape.com/drug/timentin-ticarcillin-clavulanate-342487> ‘Use an antibiotic that is very reluctant to use it is often a last resort. This bacterium is famous in hospitals as hospital bacteria’. Infection with this bacterium is difficult to control because it is opportunistic and resistant to most types of antibiotics. He may also remain alive for a long time under unfavourable conditions.’ https://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pseudomonas_aeruginosa

Ministerie van Economische Zaken (Ministry of Economic Affairs): "Significant steps have already been taken to reduce antibiotic consumption, but we are not yet there. For human and animal health, it is important that we further reduce use," said State Secretary Dijksma.

And not only in the Netherlands, but also in Australia, among others, where the gentech mini carnation is grown. With the use of antibiotics, more and more bacterial species become insensitive to their effects. As a result, diseases that are now easy to cure can once again become life-threatening in the future. Because antibiotics are used to treat infections in both humans and animals, the approach to antibiotic resistance lies in both care and livestock farming.

This comprehensive, integrated approach is the One Health approach. Antibiotic resistance is a cross-border problem and one of the topics during the Dutch EU Presidency in the first half of 2016. "<https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/ministeries/ministerie-van-economischezaken/nieuws/2015/10/06/koninklijk-werkbezoek-bij-universitair-medisch-centrum-utrecht-vleeskalverbedrijf>

However, this cannot be imagined that this antibiotic is being used! And everything before changing a flower colour! Dr. Mae Wan Ho also wrote to us: 'As I have written in many, many articles, there is good evidence that *Agrobacterium* is not killed by the antibiotics and can redominate dormant and undetectable together with the binary vectors. Please read Chapter 3 of *Ban GMOs Now*.' (Fragment see Annex 2.)

The use of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* is highly controversial. According to Dr. Mae Wan Ho, the greatest risk in GM crops is horizontal genes transfer. (HGT). And the possible connection to Morgellons skin fibers *. See Annex 2. Extract: 'A report submitted to MAFF in 1997 had subscribed to the potential that *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* could be a vector for gene escape [16, 17]. The researchers found that it was extremely difficult to get RID of the *Agrobacterium* used in the vector system after transformation. High rates of gene transfer are known to be associated with the plant root system and the propagating seed [18]. There, *Agrobacterium* could multiply and transfer transgenic DNA to other bacteria, as well as to the next crop plant'. Knee <http://www.isis.org.uk/FSAopenmeeting.php>

Mae-Wan Ho, B. Sc. Hon. (First Class) and Ph. D. Hong Kong University, Director of Institute of Science in Society (www.i-sis.org.uk) is best known for pioneering work on the physics of organisations and sustainable systems presented specifically in *The Rainbow and the Worm*, *The Physics of Organisms* (1993, 1998, 2008) and *Living Rainbow H2O* (2012), and for which she was awarded the 2014 Prigogine Medal.

A prominent critic of neo-Darwinism and genetic determination, Mae-Wan was among the first to warn of the dangers of genetic modification in *Genetic Engineering Dream or Nightmare?* (1997, 1998, 1999, REPRINT with extended introduction, 2007. More: <http://www.i-sis.org.uk/MaeWanHo.php> * Morgellons skin fibers A letter publication in *Journal of Investigative Medicine* reported the finding of *Agrobacterium* Genes in two Morgellons patients and the authors including Citovsky explained when Looked for *Agrobacterium* [103]: 'Morgellons skin fibers appear to contain cellulose. This observation indicates indications of possible involvement of pathogenic *Agrobacterium*, which is known to produce cellulose fibers at infection sites within host tissues.' Annex 2.

An even more provocative finding is that biochemist Vitaly Citovsky DISCOVERED that the fibers contain a substance called 'Agrobacterium,' which, according to New Scientist, is 'used commercially to produce genetically-modified plants.' Could GM plants be 'causing a new human disease?' (5) see <http://www.globalresearch.ca/gmo-andmorgellons-disease/8464> or Annex 3 and <http://www.isis.org.uk/agrobacteriumAndMorgellons.php>

We read in Directive 2001/18/EC: Page 19 A general principle for the environmental risk assessment is also that further analysis of the 'cumulative long-term effects' of the release and the placing on the market should be carried out. 'Cumulative long-term effects' refers to the accumulated effects of consents on human health and the environment, including inter alia flora and fauna, soil fertility, soil degradation of organic material, the feed/food chain, biological diversity, animal health and resistance problems in relation to antibiotics.

3 Antibiotic resistance markers are used. Conclusions The transgenic carnation line IFD-25958-3 does not contain an intact TETA gene. Our assumption is that no expression of TETA (the key gene of the tetracycline resistance complex) is possible if the entire coding region (ATG to TGA; the full-length gene as reported in the unified I database, Gene ID: 2716475, Accession number gi: 41056936) is absent. Page 131 of the Application. Authors Dr Mae-Wan Ho Dr Eva Sirinathsinghji, however, say: 'The presence of the armed Agrobacterium in the tissue would not be a problem if the binary vector had resolved, but now its survival and spread are real exposures.' The binary vector contains the foreign Genes as well as antibiotic resistance marker.' Pag. 34, chapter 3, Ban GMOs Now.

See further Annex 2.

We read in Directive 2001/18/EC: • "before making a notification in accordance with Part B or Part C, the notifier shall carry out an environmental risk assessment. The information which may be necessary to carry out the environmental risk assessment is laid down in Annex III. Member States and the Commission shall ensure that GMOs which contain genes expressing resistance to antibiotics in use for medical or veterinary treatment are taken into particular consideration when carrying out an environmental risk assessment, with a view to identifying and phasing out antibiotic resistance markers in GMOs which may have adverse effects on human health and the environment. GMOs placed on the market in accordance with Part C shall be phased out by 31 December 2004 and GMOs authorised in accordance with Part B shall be phased out by 31 December 2008.

4 The genotech flowers have been produced using the cauliflower mosaic virus. Dr Joseph Cummins, Professor Emeritus in genetics at the University of WestOntario warned, among other things, of the widely used cauliflower mosaic virus, which is at least a potentially dangerous gene. It is a pararetrovirus which means that it multiply by making DNA from RNA messages. It is very similar to the Hepatitis B virus and related to HIV.

"To conclude GMOs are once again found to be deleted for health in a feeding trial that last no longer than 90 days. And within that time, the most widespread piece of transgenic DNA found in the GM diet, the CaMV 35S promoter, was found transferred horizontally into the animals' tissues at high frequency. The CaMV 35S promoter is not the only dangerous piece of transgenic DNA, there are similar aggressive promoters designed to make Genes express out of context, as well as as Genes coding for antibiotics and other hazardous functions, together with numerous recombination hotspots that hance horizontal gene transfer; all of which contributors to make all GMOs unsafe. That is the conclusion from research carried

out by scientists independent of the industry up to now, which fully corroborates what farmers have been witnessing in their livestock and doctors in their patients for years' [14].

People need to take immediate action to ban GMOs from their own home and local communities. Governments should recall all GMOs from the market. And companies and regulators should face prosecution for using damages to health and criminal negligence. http://www.i-sis.org.uk/CaMV_35S_Promoter_in_GM_Feed_that_Sickened_Rats.php 5.

The gentech flowers are resistant to a herbicide. 'The tobacco ALS gene (sur B; NT ALS), coding for a mutant acetolactate synthase protein (ALS), derived from *Nicotiana tabacum*. Expression of ALS confers resistance to sulfonylurea herbicides. The gene is included to low selection of transgenic shoots in vitro. p. 66 6. The gene tech flowers have been produced using E-coli.' ISIS Report 27/06/11 How Genetic Engineering May Have Created E. Coli Outbreak

Horizontal gene transfer and recombination is a major route to create new pathogens and spreading drug and antibiotic resistance. There is nothing natural about artificial genetic engineering, which has increased the scope and accelerated the rate of horizontal gene transfer and recombination. Furthermore, E. coli is the primary bacterium used in genetic engineering. Many new Genes and combinations of Genes were created and amplified and propagated in E. coli, beside the original bacterium was harmless. In the process, genetic engineers have turned an original harmless bacterium into deadly pathogens. The problem is surely that even when you have killed the bacteria, the recombinant (genetic engineered) DNA survives, and can be transferred into living bacteria in the wage, soil, and water to create new strains." Fragment of http://www.isis.org.uk/Genetic_Engineering_E_coli_Outbreak.php

Almost all of these points pose dangers if the gentech trossangers are discarded, disappear in the environment, such as in a pig stomach, eaten (the flowers and flowers), perfume and potpourri (mainly perfumes for the man), contrary to Florigene's claims *, or a composthoop. As Ms. F. Murrel of MADGE already wrote.

There is a risk of horizontal genes transfer (HGT) with all the consequences, according to the comments of Dr Mae Wan Ho et al. * Florigene: "We do not mention the transgenic flower is likely to be used in the perfume or flavour industries; Carnation is not a traditional source of essential oils for the perfume industry'. Page 31 application C/NL/09/01/00 About carnation in perfumes; <http://www.beautyjournaal.nl/2012/02/13/maxim-test-de-pittige-anjer-geur-in-vitriold%e2%80%99oeillet-%e2%80%93-serge-lutens/#comment-605290>

Some perfumes that have carnation as a fragrance nut are: I Love My Man van Dear Rose, Eternity of Calvin Klein, Pour Femme van Bvlgari and Romance of Ralph Lauren. http://blog.parfumswinkel.nl/wiki/anjer/US_FDA,1999

Carnation: 'Carnation is listed as a poisonous plant. PAG. 31 application C/NL/09/01/00 Daily-Telegraph: 'Franken-carnations on sale in Britain – just don't eat them. Genetically modified carnations are ready to be solvent in Britain but food lovers have been warned not to sprinkle the petals on salad'. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/science/sciencenews/10507112/Franken-carnations-on-sale-in-Britain-just-dont-eat-them.html>

Finally, we have reservations, questions and comments on the two recent opinions of the EFSA (2014). Scientific Opinion on GM carnation IFD-25958-3 and IFD-26407-2 for import of cut flowers in EU EFSA Journal 2014; 12 (12): 3934 9 and EFSA Journal 2014; 12 (12): 393 5

Why are these opinions not included in your database? ‘Moonberry and Moonvelvet: Considering the scope of the notification and focusing on the limited information provided by the notifier, the EFSA GMO Panel is of the opinion that the altered flower colour and the differences Scientific Opinion on GM carnation IFD-26407-2 for import of cut flowers in EU observed for some moral characteristics are not expected to affect the risk scenario of accidental intake of the GM carnation. The relevance of the observed morphological differences for their potential environmental impacts is further assessed in section 3.4.3.1.’ p. 3.

Why the Authority did not request further data. There was 5 years to do so. This observation is also found in the section on Moonvelvet, as well as in earlier gentech carnation applications from Florigene.

“It should be noted that the comparative Compositional assessment as defined in the EFSA guidance documents (EFSA, 2006b; EFSA GMO Panel, 2011a) could not be applied to identify possible intended effects of carnation IFD-25958-3. (Page 2, Moonberry). • Why not?

States that relate, for example, to traceability, labelling, Socio-economics, molecular detection methodologies and their validation fall outside the remit of EFSA or its GMO Panel. (p. 6, Moonberry).

These concerns from 8 and 9 EU countries are therefore being ignored. Morphological traits 3.2.2.3. ‘Morphological traits and genetically modified PHENOTYPE In total, 18 morphological characteristics were analysed in carnation IFD-25958-3 and its comparator (CW) grown in a field trial in Australia, during the 2007-2008 season.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) identified eight significant differences between the GM carnation and its comparator. Thus, carnation IFD-25958-3 had a higher number of internodes per node, a reduced length to the fifth node, a thinner node at the fifth node, an increased calyx diameter and length, more filaments, a reduced filament length and an increased number of petals per flower. In addition, the average number of days to Flowering was shorter in carnation IFD-25958-3 than in carnation CW: 138 and 146 days, respectively. In response to a Member State comment, the notifier provided additional data from a field trial in Colombia. In that field trial, the average days to Flowering and petal count per flower did not differ between carnation IFD-25958-3 and its comparator, whatever the other parameters that were statistically different in the Australian field trial were not launched’. Knee (p. 8, Moonberry). EFSA Journal 2014; 12 (12): 3934
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/scientific_output/files/main_documents/3934.pdf

This is quite a difference!

‘Moonvelvet In notification C/NL/09/02, the notifier presented morphological or phenotypic data received from a field trial conducted in Australia during the 2007-2008 season (see

section 3.2.2.3) 14. A total of 18 morphological characteristics were evaluated for the GM carnation, in comparison with the parental line CW. Statistically significant differences were observed between the GM carnation and its parental line for 8 out of the 18 characteristics studied. Carnation IFD-26407-2 had a lower number of internodes per voice, a thinner voice at the fifth node, shorter leaves at the third node, an increased calyx diameter, lung styles, less viable anthers, more filaments and a reduced filament length. The notifier attributed these variations in morphological characters to environmental factors. The notifier also reported from the 2007-2008 Australian field trial a lower average number of days to Flowering for the GM carnation than its parent line.’ (p. 12).

http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/scientific_output/files/main_documents/3935.pdf• Idem.

After hearing all these dates and well-founded objections, only one conclusion seems possible: these genotech trosmiers should not be allowed to enter the EU market!

3 Annexes for information, I do not read them, but I would ask the Secretary of State to include their texts and red texts in the assessment.

This pleading note can also be found at <https://www.gentechvrij.nl/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/anjers-tros-hernieuwde-markttoel-2015-pleitnota.pdf>.

Our websites: www.gentechvrij.nl www.stichtingekopark.nl

European Commission – Statement commissioner Andriukaitis on the occasion of European Antibiotic Awareness Day Brussels, 17 November 2015.

—

How did the Appeal Committee vote in the EU: on 2 June 2016:

3 Draft Commission Implementing Decision as regards the placing on the market of a genetically modified carnation (*Dianthus caryophyllus* L., line SHD-27531-4)

SANTE/10338/2016 the draft Decision as regards the placing on the market of a genetically modified carnation (*Dianthus caryophyllus* L., line SHD-27531-4) was presented and submitted to the Committee for an opinion.

Vote tasks: no opinion

Assurances for the negative vote or abstention:

– Political statements – Negative public opinion – No agreed national position – Human-aided propagation cannot be excluded – Potential spread of pollen and cross-pollination cannot be excluded – Social utility of these GMOs is Unclear – Ethical groups – Plant-to-plant gene transfer can not be excluded – Political adults – Negative public opinion, political statements – Assessment no sufficient – Precautionary principle

The chair informed the members of the Committee that, in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011, it is now for the Commission to decide on the two authorisations. Source https://food.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2017-03/app-comm_gmffer_20160602_sum.pdf

