



GenØk - Centre for Biosafety

**Impact assessment of maize hybrid MON 89034 x  
MON 88017 from Monsanto  
(EFSA/GMO/BE/2009/71)**

*With Conclusion in Norwegian*

**WRITTEN BY**

GenØk – Centre for Biosafety:  
David Quist , Thomas Bøhn, Anne I. Myhr, Terje Traavik and Odd-Gunnar Wikmark

**GenØk – Senter for Biosafety  
07.01.10**

## KONKLUSJON

*Genøk – Senter for Biosikkerhet viser til brev fra Direktoratet for naturforvaltning (DN) angående høring relatert til maisplanten MON 89034 x MON88017 for bruksområdene import, prosessering, mat og fôr.*

*Maisplanten MON 89034 x MON88017 er en stablet hybrid ("multistack") med tre ulike pesticid-kodende gener (Bt-toksiner) innebygd. I tillegg er den tolerant for sprøytemiddelet glyfosat.*

*Informasjonen som er tilgjengelig fra søker er ikke tilstrekkelig for uavhengig evaluering av søknaden. Det foreligger ingen resultater fra analyser eller detaljerte forsøksoppsett til oppklaring av DNA sekvens, lokalisering av transgenet i maisgenomet, protein uttrykk. Re-analyser av foringsforsøk med andre genmodifiserte planter med genet (C4-EPSPS) viser til at det er helserelevante og signifikante negative effekter. Dette genet finnes også i hybridene og er introdusert fra morplanten (MON88017). Det er ikke opplyst hvorvidt søker har frigitt frø fra den genetisk modifiserte planten og relevante ikke-GMO kontroll planter. Dette er nødvendig for at fri og uavhengig forskning med denne planten skal være mulig.*

*Det er ikke opplyst hvorvidt søker har frigitt frø fra den genetisk modifiserte planten og relevante ikke-GMO kontroll planter. Dette er nødvendig for at fri og uavhengig forskning med denne planten skal være mulig.*

*Nyere studier indikerer at glyfosat-bruk kan medføre mulig helse og miljørisiko, men dette må vurderes i forhold til dyrkningspraksisen som eventuelt blir erstattet (mer giftige sprøytemidler, ingen sprøytemidler, nydyrking, etc.). Det er etisk sett uakseptabelt å se bort i fra risiko ved dyrking fordi planten skal dyrkes i andre land enn i Norge eller EU. Mat og fôr fra sprøytemiddeltolerante planter vil også kunne inneholde rester av sprøytemidler eller nedbrytningsprodukter fra disse.*

*Stablede hybridplanter har generelt en mer kompleks genetisk sammensetning og derfor større potensial for opp- og nedregulering av plantens egne gener. Derfor burde de gjennomgå grundig testing før eventuell markedsadgang. GenØk mener det ikke er faglig velbegrunnet å godkjenne stablede hybrider basert på at foreldrelinjene, hver for seg, er godkjent.*

*Det kan ikke utelukkes at gruppen av de uttrykte toksinene cry1A.105, cry2Ab2 og cry3Bb1 planten kan gi spesifikke immunogene effekter eller adjuvanseffekter (fremming av immunreaksjoner mot andre stoffer) hos pattedyr og mennesker.*

*Søker gir ikke opplysninger som adresserer vurderingskriteriene bærekraft, samfunnsnytte og etiske aspekter som forutsettes anvendt i den norske genteknologiloven. I denne sammenheng er det viktig å få dokumentert om den omsøkte planten fører til mindre bruk av sprøytemidler, samt erfaringer med hensyn på effekter på miljø, helse og samfunnsaspekter hos bønder som dyrker den. Denne type dokumentasjon er ikke vedlagt søknad om omsetting av MON 89034 x MON88017.*

***Basert på manglende uavhengige studier og data tilgjengelig vi ønsker å påpeke at det er kunnskapshull relatert til risiko for helse og miljø ved MON 89034xMON88017. Disse kunnskapshullene er spesielt relatert til usikkerhet ved effekter som kan oppstå på grunn av kombinasjonen eller synergistiske effekter av de innsatte genene og viser til at en bør bruke føre-var prinsippet og ikke godkjenne bruk i Norge.***

## ABOUT THE PLANT

The parent lines contribute the following transgenes: *cry1A.105*, *cry2Ab2* from MON89034, *cry3Bb1* and C4-EPSPS genes from MON88107. These genes give the plant resistance to insect herbivores and tolerance to glyphosate.

In general the parts of the application made available for comments lack details to support the claims made by the applicant. For example, in sections D2 (c) and (d), the applicant gives not experimental data to support their statements. In this particular case, data regarding transgene location and stability into the host genome are lacking, information which is essential for monitoring and surveillance.

The importance of this information in detail should not be understated. Genetic variations have been detected in commercial variants of MON810 (Aguilera et al. 2009; Aguilera et al. 2008). The latter study showed that ARISTIS Bt did not contain the MON810 insert as expected and that CGS4045, even though it expressed the Bt toxin, gave no amplicons in PCRs performed with MON810 event specific primers. MON810 event specific PCR is constructed to span the insertion junctions of the event and plant DNA, therefore this study shows that the event specific detection does not work in the genetic background of CGS4045 due to either SNPs/truncation at the PCR target and/or junction site or that the transgene is inserted elsewhere in the CGS4045 maize genome. According to the applicant, MON 89034 x MON 88017 has been field tested in USA since 2004. The applicant should therefore provide information on the stability of the insert over multiple generations as well as compositional data and expression analyses over all three growing seasons.

The applicant should provide extensive sequence data on both the constructs and flanking sequences in the final hybrid and in subsequent generations of offspring in order to investigate the stability of the insert. The same applies to all other points in the application under section D (Information relating to the GM plant).

Specifically:

- 1) The applicant failed to give information on the second integration cassette (TII) in MON89034, the *ntpII* integration cassette.
- 2) The applicant failed to give requested information on chromosomal location in part 2 section c), and
- 3) The applicant failed to give requested information for the organisation in part 2 section d)

Further, the applicant posits claim of lack of harm, toxicity, and allergenicity based on data carried out on other lines containing the same transgene/event. This violates the case by case approach to GMO risk assessment adopted and recommended by numerous expert bodies on risk assessment.

The same critique is valid for all points under sections C and D.

## **BT PROTEINS AND IMMUNE EFFECTS**

There are no data available from the scientific community on the genetic stability, transgene expression products or immuno-toxicological effects of the MON 89034 x MON88107 stacked event.

With relation to other classes of Cry proteins, published mouse experiments have demonstrated that Cry1Ac raises specific immune reactions, and also possesses adjuvant properties by increasing the immunogenicity of proteins intermixed with feed products (Moreno-Fierros et al. 2003; Vazquez et al. 1999; Vazquez-Padron et al. 1999; Vazquez-Padron et al. 2000;) Rojas-Hernandez et al. 2004). This may result in increased immunological and allergic responses. In other words, the likelihood of immunological and allergic responses increases if Cry1Ac is administered together with a dietary antigen/allergen. Published data also suggest that Cry proteins may inhibit development of mucosally induced suppressive immune mechanisms referred to as "oral tolerance" against innocuous food proteins (Brandtzaeg 2007). In investigations with Cry1Ab protein, (Guimaraes et al. 2008) did not find a similar type of adjuvant effect elicited against peanut proteins as with Cry1Ac, yet instead found evidence of Cry1Ab acting as an adjuvant leading to early phase production of leukotrienes and increased Th2 and Th17-cytokine production in bronchoalveolar lavage fluids after airway exposure. The implication of possible effects of Cry1Ab to produce allergen-induced cytokine responses is an area of investigation warranting further inquiry.

There are a number of difficulties when it comes to studies of food allergies in humans. The frequency of food allergy in the human population is about 2 % in adults and about 5 % in children (EFSA Opinion 2004) and seems to require a genetic predisposition. Whether the possibility/risk of food allergy increases with the presence of intestinal localized Cry proteins is not known. Therefore, one should not expect a high incidence of adverse effects in the general population due to ingestion of food containing adjuvants enhancing the development of allergy. But the use of transgenic feed maize containing multiple Cry proteins, brings up a concern whether there will be a higher incidence rate for food allergy. In addition, since the Cry proteins possess adjuvant activity there may be enhanced inflammatory processes.

Combinatorial or synergistic effects of recombinant proteins acting as adjuvants to immunostimulatory effects, or as potential allergens are areas of important coming scientific inquiry.

## **NON-TARGET EFFECTS AND EFFECTS ON BIODIVERSITY FROM BT-PROTEINS**

In two meta-analyses of published studies on non-target effects of Bt proteins in insects, (Lövei and Arpaia 2005) documented that 30% of studies on predators (natural enemies of pests insects) and 57% of studies on parasitoids display negative effects to Cry1Ab transgenic insecticidal proteins. A review by (Hilbeck and Schmidt 2006) on studies of non-target effects by Bt plants including those containing cry1Ab, they found that in 50% of the studies negative effects on tested invertebrates.

Another quantitative review by (Marvier et al. 2007) suggested a reduction in non-target biodiversity in some classes of invertebrates for GM (Bt) cotton fields vs. non-pesticide controls, yet found little reductions in biodiversity in others.

More recent research on aquatic environments has sparked intense interest in the impact of Bt-crops on aquatic invertebrates *Daphnia magna* (Bøhn et al. 2008; Bøhn et al. 2009), and

caddis flies (Rosi-Marshall et al. 2007). These publications warrant future study, given the potential load of novel target proteins that may end up in agricultural runoff and end up in aquatic environments. Further, (Douville et al. 2007) present evidence of the persistence of the transgenic insecticidal protein Cry1Ab in aquatic environments and suggest that that sustained release of this potentially bioactive compound from Bt maize production could result in negative impact on aquatic biodiversity.

Impacts on soil microflora and fauna, including earthworms (Zwahlen et al. 2003), mychorizal fungi (Castaldini et al. 2005) and microarthropods in response to Cry endotoxins have also been reported (Griffiths et al. 2006; Wandeler et al. 2002).

The significance of tritrophic effects of accumulation, particularly of insecticidal Cry toxins (Harwood et al. 2006; Obrist et al. 2006) is, however, yet to be firmly established. It has been demonstrated that subchronic dosages of Cry proteins may affect both foraging behavior and learning ability in non-target bees (Ramirez-Romero et al. 2008), and may have indirect effects on recipient populations, and, given the key-stone role of bees as pollinators, on both primary production and on entire food-webs.

#### **ANIMAL AND HUMAN HEALTH**

A recent publication by (Dona and Arvanitoyannis 2009) reviews the potential health implications of GM foods for humans and animals, including incidences and effects of increased immunogenicity, amounts of anti-nutrients, possible pleiotropic and epigenetic effects, including possible reproductive and developmental toxicity. They conclude that while there is strong evidence for health concerns on many fronts, exposure duration have not been long enough to uncover important effects. Studies should also include subjects with immunodeficiency or exposed to other stress agents.

#### *Feeding studies*

Spiroux de Vendomois et al. (2009) independently evaluated the methodology and raw data of a comparative NK603 (another variety containing the C4-EPSPs transgene as the one here) and a non GM isogenic maize rat feeding study, conducted by the applicant, Monsanto and used as scientific evidence of safety. The researchers draw 3 broad and scientifically important conclusions:

- 1) The sample sizes used in the trials were insufficient to detect all but very acute differences (small sample sizes make it less likely to detect effects when they exist), and lacked sufficient statistical power to draw relevant conclusions,
- 2) Study design and statistical methods employed would often fail to identify relevant effects,
- 3) Using statistical methods designed to detect different types of effects, the researchers found significant dose and sex dependent (male more susceptible than females) side effects linked with the consumption of the NK603 that was not reported by the producer.

Although the authors call for a repeat of the experiment, and caution that the deficiencies in the study design make it difficult to draw definitive conclusions of toxicity, the authors state

in their conclusion that “[O]ur data presented here strongly recommend that additional long-term (up to 2 years) animal feeding studies be performed...” (Ibid p. 718).

### *Bt Cry toxins*

Once more, no information about the stacked event in question is available, but some studies have been performed on other events.

Immunological effects have largely focused on potential allergenicity of GMOs, rather than broader suites of immunogenic responses. Inhalation studies, rather than oral toxicity are also largely missing from the scientific literature. One study by (Krogsho et al. 2008) found increased antigen-specific antibody response to Bt toxin and PHA-E lectin in a 28 and 90-day feeding study of Wistar rats.

A study by (Schroder et al. 2007) found a significant difference in white blood cell count and reduced kidney weight among male rats in a 90 day feeding trial with Bt rice.

A team of Austrian researchers conducted feeding trials with a stacked Bt maize event (NK603 x Mon810) and found significant effects vs. non-Bt maize. Along with reports of kidney toxicity, the authors concluded that “multi-generation studies, especially based on the [reproductive assessment by continuous breeding (RACB)] design are well suited to reveal differences between feeds. The RACB trial showed time related negative reproductive effects of the GM maize under the given experimental conditions. The RACB trial with its specific design with the repeated use of the parental generation is a demanding biological factor for the maternal organism” (p. 4 (Velimirov et al. 2008).

In a 2008 feeding trial on mice with MON810 Bt maize, (Finamore et al. 2008) concluded: “induced alterations in intestinal and peripheral immune response of weaning and old mice. Although the significance of these data remains to be clarified to establish whether these alterations reflect significant immune dysfunctions, these results suggest the importance of considering the gut and peripheral immune response to the whole GM crop, as well as the age of the test animal, in the GMO safety evaluation” (Ibid, p. 11537).

### **COMBINATORIAL AND/OR SYNERGISTIC INDIRECT EFFECT WITH STACKED TRAITS IN TRANSGENIC PLANTS**

The recent development and commercialization of GMOs with multiple transgenic traits have prompted an interest in the possible combinatorial and/or synergistic effects that may produce unintended and undesirable changes to endogenous or introduced traits and functions. The indirect effects of such changes may impact the sustainable development of future GMOs, and come with high uncertainty with regard to other unintended effects that will need to be monitored in the future.

In the case of simultaneous exposure to different classes of Cry proteins introduced in tandem, despite different modes of insecticidal activity, (Tabashnik et al. 2009) found evidence of cross reactivity among “pyramided” (stacked events) of Cry1Ac and Cry2B endotoxins in transgenic cotton. The cross reactivity led to higher rates of resistance evolution in pink bollworm, *Pectinophora gossypiella*, in a laboratory setting. Their results suggest that in the case of different Cry protein species, cross reactivity between them may confer increased rates of insect resistance that would alter the efficacy and perhaps biological activity of the GMO.

Then (2009) reviews and discusses the evidence for changes in activity and specificity of Bt proteins dependent on synergistic interactions with extrinsic features. Such changes may critically influence the bioactivity and hence the potential for unintended effects.

Combinatorial, synergistic effects must be carefully considered in the development and risk assessment of stacked event GMOs with respect to the implications on biodiversity and evolutionary consequences for crop genetic diversity. This will be an important area of investigation for risk research, as multi-trait (stacked) GMOs are poised to replace the current generations of GM crops used in global agriculture. More research in this area is needed.

The issue of combinatorial and/or synergistic effect of transgene proteins either with endogenous host proteins or with other inserted GM traits (e.g. “stacked” events) is an area of nascent scientific inquiry. Several studies point towards extrinsic factors that may modulate Cry (Bt) efficacy and specificity. For example (Broderick et al. 2006; Broderick et al. 2009) found that midgut bacterial presence was required for Cry1Ab insecticidal activity in gypsy moth (*Lymantria dispar*) suggesting the intestinal microflora may modulate toxicity in certain target Lepidopteran insect species. Further, research by Soberon et al (2007) suggests that structural changes to the engineered Cry1Ab protein in cotton may lack important oligomerization features essential to toxin efficacy against *P. gossypiella*.

The deduction that single transgenic products behave independently of other similar transgenic products is therefore not supported by the experimental evidence. Conversely, as required by a case by case approach, investigations into these secondary effects are justified.

In conclusion, the failure of the applicant to account for, or even consider potential combinatorial and/or synergistic effects between transgenic products, despite such occurrences being documented in the scientific literature, leaves open serious doubt towards the veracity of the applicants claims to safety and lack of unintended effects.

## HERBICIDES

MON 89034 x MON88017 tolerates higher doses of the herbicide glyphosate compared to weed plants.

In recent years glyphosate has received more risk-related attention due to negative effects on both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems (Blackburn and Boutin 2003; Ono et al. 2002; Relyea 2005; Solomon and Thompson 2003). Studies in animals and cell cultures indicate possible health effects in rodents, fish and humans. Glyphosate given in the feed to pregnant female rats resulted in higher embryonic mortality and aberrations in the skeleton (Dallegrave et al. 2003). Nile-tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*) fed sublethal concentration of Roundup resulted in a number of different histopathological changes in organs (Jiraungkoorskul et al. 2003). Experiments with sea urchins exposed to Roundup influenced early cell divisions (Marc et al. 2002), effects that have relevance to potential health effects in many eukaryotic organisms, including domestic animals and humans. Exposure to Roundup affected the CDK1/CyclinB regulator which is nearly identical in sea urchins and humans. Glyphosate has also been shown to negatively affect the differentiation of nerve cells (Axelrad et al. 2003). In human placenta cells, Roundup is more toxic than the active ingredient glyphosate (Richard et al. 2005). The authors concluded that additional components of Roundup increase the biological availability and accumulation in organisms. From the US, the use of *epsps*-transgenic plants has led to increased use of glyphosate compared to conventional plants (Benbrook 2009; Benbrook 2003).

## **PRECAUTIONARY APPROACH TO RISK ASSESSMENT**

The Precautionary principle requires commitment to the idea that full scientific proof of a causal link between a potentially damaging operation and a long term environmental impact is not required to take action in order to avoid negative effects on health and the environment. Due to the lack of information available in the scientific literature on genetic stability, expression of inserted proteins or immune effects as well as the stacked event of the MON 89034 x 88017, we find that these uncertainties warrant further research and advice the DN to apply the Precautionary principle and deny the marketing of this plant until more scientific understanding has been published.

## **AVAILABLE INFORMATION FOR RISK ASSESSMENT EVALUATION**

This evaluation is for the most part based on the applicants own submitted information. The directly relevant peer-reviewed literature is very limited but we have tried to extract relevant indirect information from the peer-reviewed literature.

All product-related safety testing should have an independent and unbiased character. This goes both for the production of data for risk assessment, and for the evaluation of those data. If a company would suffer additional costs, reduced incomes or delayed entrance into the market, we claim that they are vulnerable to being biased in their hypothesis, study design, presentation and interpretation of the data.

A recent independent evaluation of GMO producer safety data by Spiroux de Vendomois et al. (2009), along with other studies that have investigated producer safety data (Marvier, 2002; vom Saal and Hughes, 2005) highlights the need for independent evaluation of safety studies. **We therefore request that mechanisms become available that allow access of this data to independent scientists and biostatisticians to verify the scientific soundness of methods and statistics employed**, as such independent evaluation is essential to maintaining rigorous standards expected in scientific practice.

## **ON CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION**

The documentation accompanying GMO applications may be problematic for four reasons. The first problem regards transparency and confidentiality. Some of this information is available on the Net, through the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), but varying parts of it is confidential. Although some information might be regarded as CBI, we cannot see any reason at all that feeding studies, their methods and all primary data/results can be protected under CBI. In that case CBI becomes a justification for protecting important information that can help assess the risk of products to human health, the environment, or food security.

The problem of confidentiality that is linked to the documentation provided by the GMO applications has several implications. Access to peer-reviewed quality data is essential for a “science-based” risk assessment. In order to gain regulatory approval, commercial developers of GMOs often submit their own test results to document the expected behavior of the GMO and its products in the exposed system, and hence, its safety. In this case, we did not find any experimental data on the safety of MON 89034 x MON 88017 available in the peer-reviewed literature. The available documentation is supplied with references, but a substantial part of these references point back to the research departments of the applicant itself, where the primary data are considered confidential business information and therefore not accessible. Another problem is partly particular to the Norwegian situation, namely that important aspects are lacking. Most apparent is of course the lack of information about sustainable development and societal utility.



## SUSTAINABILITY

In addition to the EU regulatory framework for GMO assessment, impact assessment in Norway follows the Norwegian gene technology act, which states that “in deciding whether or not to grant the application, significant emphasis shall also be placed on whether the deliberate release represent a benefit to the community and a contribution to sustainable development” hence it is obvious that, for the Norwegian authorities, that contribution to sustainable development should be assessed together with an evaluation of the societal utility in applications of use and release of GMOs. With the purpose to guide political decisions concerning GMO and the aim of the gene technology act, Norwegian authorities has with the basis in the Biotechnology Advisory Board’s discussion paper: “Sustainability, benefit to the community and ethics in the assessment of genetically modified organisms” (2003) elaborated in the impact assessment regulations annex 4 several questions (see box 1).

*Box 1. Appendix 4 to the Norwegian Impact assessment regulation*

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Global impacts</li><li>2. Ecological limits</li><li>3. Basic human needs</li><li>4. Distribution between generations</li><li>5. Distribution between rich and poor countries</li><li>6. Economic growth</li></ol> |
|--|

With regard to questions **1: global impacts** and **2: ecological limits** the performed risk assessment by the applicants can be used to consider whether the issues listed in Table 1 have been assessed. However, as illustrated in table 1, these issues do also cover more broad aspects which there are no information about in the application (Rosendal and Myhr 2009). With regard to questions **3: basic human needs**, **4: distribution between generations**, **5: distribution between rich and poor countries**, and **6: economic growth**, there is no information within the documents that follow the application.

Table 1. Information relevant for checklist on sustainability.

| <b>Checklist in appendix 4</b>                 | <b>Relevant information that can be found in applications</b>  | <b>Information lacking in applications</b>  |
|--|--|---|
| Global impacts                                 | Persistence, invasiveness, possible population and fitness changes introduced in the GMP.<br><br>Potential for gene transfer.<br><br>Interaction between GMP and target organisms. | Changes in biogeochemical processes.<br>Changes due to cultivation patterns.<br>Effects on water and energy balance.<br><br>Latency / cumulative effects.<br><br>Impacts on socio-ecological relationships.       |
| Ecological limits                              | Interactions between GMO and non-target organisms.   |   |
| Basic human needs                              | Benefits for health.<br><br>Toxicity and allergenicity.  | Latency / cumulative effects.<br><br>Food security issues.  |
| Distribution between generations               | Not found  | Latency / cumulative effects.<br><br>Influence on scientific developments.<br><br>Trade-off between utility and risk.   |
| Distribution between rich and poorer countries | Not found  | Adequacy for meeting problems in poor countries and especially for small-scale farmers.<br><br>Potential loss of farmer choice of non-transgenic seeds.<br><br>Impact of intellectual property rights to farmers. |
| Economic growth                                | Not found  | Latency/ cumulative effects.<br><br>Trade off between short-term economic growth versus potential long term adverse effects.<br><br>Effects of monopolies for seeds   |

The Norwegian Gene Technology Act, with its clauses on societal utility and sustainable development, comes into play with a perspective also on health and environmental effects in other countries, for example in Third World countries: where are and what type of GMOs are grown, with what kinds of pesticides, in what working environment etc. Also, are the risk assessments performed on one continent transferable to the rest of the world? For instance, most Bt maize has been developed and tested in the US and it is difficult to extrapolate risk assessment results on the toxicity of Bt maize to human and non-target organisms to other countries because there are great differences between; regional growing environments, scales of farm fields, crop management practices, local/ regional target and non-target species considered most important in the agro-ecosystem, interactions between cultivated crops, and surrounding biodiversity, etc.

For the MON 89034 x MON 88017, toxicity and environmental impact data on regionally appropriate non target insects (including other non-domesticated herbivores) and regional environments (local growing regions) would be needed to accurately determine toxicity and environmental impacts to local fauna of the three different Bt toxins and their degradation products. Even for target pest species from different countries or regions, sensitivities to expressed Bt toxins vary widely. Hence it cannot be expected that the same species-specific and even population-specific sensitivity to Bt toxins will apply between different environments and across continents. Local non target species like butterflies of conservation concern and heritage value may therefore be at risk.

Hence, Norwegian authorities should contact the applicant directly and require the required information in accordance with the Norwegian Gene Technology Act.

#### **SOCIETAL UTILITY**

The concept of societal utility is found in the Gene Technology Act §10. Societal utility is a complicated concept that may have multiple meanings. The assessment of societal utility can be assessed with regard to a) the products properties, and b) the development and use of the product.

##### ***The products properties;***

- Is there a need for this product?
- May the product solve or contribute to solve a societal problem?
- Is the product better than equivalent products on the market?
- Are there any alternative products that may solve or contribute to solve the societal problem in questions?

##### ***The development and use of the product;***

- Does it help to create new opportunities?
- Does it help to create new opportunities in urban areas?
- Does it help to create new opportunities in other countries?
- Does it entail problems for existing production that need to be conserved?
- Does it entail problems for existing production in other countries?

Maize is not very important in Norway as food, but is of high relevance to the feed industry. Although it at present is not as difficult for Norwegian importers to get maize that is free of GM, this may change in the future. The applicant of MON 89034 x MON 88017 argues that consumption is safe and refers to the proven safety of Bt maize varieties already tested and in use. We emphasize that there are uncertainties as described in the beginning of this document. In parts of the world where target pests of Bt-toxins are a major problem, the use of MON 89034 x MON 88017 may hold promises for production benefits to agriculture by increasing yield. Given the use of pesticides in conventional, but not in organic agriculture, a reduction of inputs of pesticides is also possible. However, the issue is complex and includes employment of resistance management and potential resistance development among pests. The cultivation of GM plants in general is also causing problems with regard to co-existence to non-GM plants. For instance Binimelis et al. (2008) have investigated consequences on co-existence of Bt-maize in Spain among small-scale farmer and has found that co-existence is troublesome. Farmers in some areas have given up growing non-GM maize. In this context it is important to acknowledge that cultural concerns may be more significant than the functional utility, which has been highlighted in the debate concerning effects on Monarch butterflies (Prasifka et al. 2007; Stanley-Horn et al. 2001) and landrace corn in Mexico (add latest 2009 development ref).

## Conclusion

**Based on the above, and with special attention on the independent evaluation of safety data with another C4-EPSPS maize plant, confidence in the safety of this maize variety under application is scientifically unjustified at this time. Further evidence of lack of harm, including follow up feeding studies of longer duration and higher statistical power are needed.**

**Therefore, in our assessment of MON 89034 x MON88017 we conclude that based on the available data, including the safety data supplied by the producer, is insufficient and equivocal in its proof of lack of toxicological affects on mammalian health. We find that these effects may be biologically significant and warrant future study before claims of lack of harm can be scientifically established.**

## References

Aguilera, M, Querci, M, Balla, B, Prospero, A, Ermolli, M, Van den Eede, G, (2008). A Qualitative Approach for the Assessment of the Genetic Stability of the MON 810 Trait in Commercial Seed Maize Varieties. *Food Analytical Methods* 1:252-258.

Aguilera, M, Querci, M, Pastor, S, Bellocchi, G, Milcamps, A, Eede, G, (2009). Assessing Copy Number of MON 810 Integrations in Commercial Seed Maize Varieties by 5' Event-Specific Real-Time PCR Validated Method Coupled to 2(-Delta Delta CT) Analysis. *Food Analytical Methods* 2:73-79.

Axelrad, J C, Howard, C V, Mclean, W G, (2003). The effects of acute pesticide exposure on neuroblastoma cells chronically exposed to diazinon. *Toxicology* 185:67-78.

Benbrook, C. M., 2003. Impacts of Genetically Engineered Crops on Pesticide Use in the United States: The First Eight Years. pp. 1-42.

Benbrook, C. M., 2009. Impacts of Genetically Engineered Crops on Pesticide Use: The First Thirteen Years. pp. 1-62. The Organic Center.

Blackburn, L G, Boutin, C, (2003). Subtle effects of herbicide use in the context of genetically modified crops: A case study with glyphosate (Roundup (R)). *Ecotoxicology* 12:271-285.

Bøhn, T, Primicerio, R, Hessen, D O, Traavik, T, (2008). Reduced fitness of *Daphnia magna* fed a Bt-transgenic maize variety. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology* 55:584-592.

- Bøhn, T, Traavik, T, Primicerio, R, (2009). Demographic responses of *Daphnia magna* fed transgenic *Bt*-maize. *Ecotoxicology* DOI 10.1007/s10646-009-0427-x. (Open Access)..
- Brandtzaeg, P, (2007). Why we develop food allergy. *Am.Sci.* 95:28-35.
- Broderick, N A, Raffa, K F, Handelsman, J, (2006). Midgut bacteria required for *Bacillus thuringiensis* insecticidal activity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 103:15196-15199.
- Broderick, N A, Robinson, C J, McMahon, M D, Holt, J, Handelsman, J, Raffa, K F, (2009). Contributions of gut bacteria to *Bacillus thuringiensis*-induced mortality vary across a range of Lepidoptera. *Bmc Biology* 7.
- Dallegrave, E, Mantese, F D, Coelho, R S, Pereira, J D, Dalsenter, P R, Langeloh, A, (2003). The teratogenic potential of the herbicide glyphosate-Roundup (R) in Wistar rats. *Toxicology Letters* 142:45-52.
- Dona, A, Arvanitoyannis, I S, (2009). Health risks of genetically modified foods. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* 49:164-175.
- Douville, M, Gagne, F, Blaise, C, Andre, C, (2007). Occurrence and persistence of *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) and transgenic Bt corn *cry1Ab* gene from an aquatic environment. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety* 66:195-203.
- Finamore, A, Roselli, M, Britti, S, Monastra, G, Ambra, R, Turrini, A, Mengheri, E, (2008). Intestinal and Peripheral Immune Response to MON810 Maize Ingestion in Weaning and Old Mice. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 56:11533-11539.
- Griffiths, B S, Caul, S, Thompson, J, Birch, A N E, Scrimgeour, C, Cortet, J, Foggo, A, Hackett, C A, Krogh, P H, (2006). Soil microbial and faunal community responses to Bt maize and insecticide in two soils. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 35:734-741.
- Guimaraes, V D, Drumare, M F, Ah-Leung, S, Lereclus, D, Bernard, H, Creminon, C, Wal, J M, del-Patient, K, (2008). Comparative study of the adjuvanticity of *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry1Ab protein and cholera toxin on allergic sensitisation and elicitation to peanut. *Food and Agricultural Immunology* 19:325-337.
- Harwood, J D, Samson, R A, Obrycki, J J, (2006). No evidence for the uptake of Cry1Ab Bt-endotoxins by the generalist predator *Scarites subterraneus* (Coleoptera : Carabidae) in laboratory and field experiments. *Biocontrol Science and Technology* 16:377-388.
- Hilbeck, A, Schmidt, J E U, (2006). Another view on Bt proteins - how specific are they and what else might they do? *Biopestic.Int.* 2:1-50.
- Jiraungkoorskul, W, Upatham, E S, Kruatrachue, M, Sahaphong, S, Vichasri-Grams, S, Pokethitiyook, P, (2003). Biochemical and histopathological effects of glyphosate herbicide on Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*). *Environmental Toxicology* 18:260-267.
- Kroghsbo, S, Madsen, C, Poulsen, M, Schroder, M, Kvist, P H, Taylor, M, Gatehouse, A, Shu, Q, Knudsen, L, (2008). Immunotoxicological studies of genetically modified rice expressing PHA-E lectin or Bt toxin in Wistar rats. *Toxicology* 245:24-34.

- Lövei, G L, Arpaia, S, (2005). The impact of transgenic plants on natural enemies: a critical review of laboratory studies. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* 114:1-14.
- Marc, J, Mulner-Lorillon, O, Boulben, S, Hureau, D, Durand, G, Belle, R, (2002). Pesticide roundup provokes cell division dysfunction at the level of CDK1/cyclin B activation. *Chemical Research in Toxicology* 15:326-331.
- Marvier, M, McCreedy, C, Regetz, J, Kareiva, P, (2007). A Meta-Analysis of Effects of Bt Cotton and Maize on Nontarget Invertebrates. *Science* 316:1475-1477.
- Moreno-Fierros, L, Ruiz-Medina, E J, Esquivel, R, Lopez-Revilla, R, Pina-Cruz, S, (2003). Intranasal Cry1Ac protoxin is an effective mucosal and systemic carrier and adjuvant of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* polysaccharides in mice. *Scandinavian Journal of Immunology* 57:45-55.
- Morisset, D, Demsar, T, Gruden, K, Vojvoda, J, Stebih, D, Zel, J, (2009). Detection of genetically modified organisms-closing the gaps. *Nature Biotechnology* 27:700-701.
- Obrist, L B, Dutton, A, Romeis, J, Bigler, F, (2006). Biological activity of Cry1Ab toxin expressed by Bt maize following ingestion by herbivorous arthropods and exposure of the predator *Chrysoperla carnea*. *Biocontrol* 51:31-48.
- Ono, M A, Itano, E N, Mizuno, L T, Mizuno, E H F, Camargo, Z P, (2002). Inhibition of *Paracoccidioides brasiliensis* by pesticides: Is this a partial explanation for the difficulty in isolating this fungus from the soil? *Medical Mycology* 40:493-499.
- Prasifka, P L, Hellmich, R L, Prasifka, J R, Lewis, L C, (2007). Effects of Cry1Ab-expressing corn anthers on the movement of monarch butterfly larvae. *Environmental Entomology* 36:228-233.
- Ramirez-Romero, R, Desneux, N, Decourtye, A, Chaffiol, A, Pham-Delegue, M H, (2008). Does Cry1Ab protein affect learning performances of the honey bee *Apis mellifera* L. (Hymenoptera, Apidae)? *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety* 70:327-333.
- Relyea, R A, (2005). The lethal impact of roundup on aquatic and terrestrial amphibians. *Ecological Applications* 15:1118-1124.
- Richard, S, Moslemi, S, Sipahutar, H, Benachour, N, Seralini, G E, (2005). Differential effects of glyphosate and roundup on human placental cells and aromatase. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 113:716-720.
- Rojas-Hernandez, S, Rodriguez-Monroy, M A, Lopez-Revilla, R, Resendiz-Albor, A A, Moreno-Fierros, L, (2004). Intranasal coadministration of the Cry1Ac protoxin with amoebal lysates increases protection against *Naegleria fowleri* meningoencephalitis. *Infection and Immunity* 72:4368-4375.
- Rosendal, K. and Myhr, A. I. (2009) GMO Assessment in Norway as Compared to EU Procedures: Societal Utility and Sustainable Development, report to the Norwegian Directorate of Nature Management, 46 pages.

Rosi-Marshall, E J, Tank, J L, Royer, T V, Whiles, M R, Evans-White, M, Chambers, C, Griffiths, N A, Pokelsek, J, Stephen, M L, (2007). Toxins in transgenic crop byproducts may affect headwater stream ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 104:16204-16208.

Schroder, M, Poulsen, M, Wilcks, A, Kroghsbo, S, Miller, A, Frenzel, T, Danier, J, Rychlik, M, Emami, K, Gatehouse, A, Shu, Q Y, Engel, K H, Altosaar, I, Knudsen, I, (2007). A 90-day safety study of genetically modified rice expressing Cry1Ab protein (*Bacillus thuringiensis* toxin) in Wistar rats. *Food and Chemical Toxicology* 45:339-349.

Solomon, K R, Thompson, D G, (2003). Ecological risk assessment for aquatic organisms from over-water uses of glyphosate. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health-Part B-Critical Reviews* 6:289-324.

Stanley-Horn, D E, Dively, G P, Hellmich, R L, Mattila, H R, Sears, M K, Rose, R, Jesse, L C H, Losey, J E, Obrycki, J J, Lewis, L, (2001). Assessing the impact of Cry1Ab-expressing corn pollen on monarch butterfly larvae in field studies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 98:11931-11936.

Tabashnik, B E, Unnithan, G C, Masson, L, Crowder, D W, Li, X C, Carriere, Y, (2009). Asymmetrical cross-resistance between *Bacillus thuringiensis* toxins Cry1Ac and Cry2Ab in pink bollworm. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 106:11889-11894.

Then, C, (2009). Risk assessment of toxins derived from *Bacillus thuringiensis* – synergism, efficacy, and selectivity. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* DOI 10.1007/s11356-009-0208-3.

Vazquez, R I, Moreno-Fierros, L, Neri-Bazan, L, De La Riva, G A, Lopez-Revilla, R, (1999). *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry1Ac protoxin is a potent systemic and mucosal adjuvant. *Scand J Immunol.* 49:578-584.

Vazquez-Padron, R I, Gonzales-Cabrera, J, Garcia-Toyar, C, Neri-Bazan, L, Lopez-Revilla, R, Hernandez, M, Moreno-Fierro, L, De La Riva, G A, (2000). Cry1Ac protoxin from *Bacillus thuringiensis* sp. kurstaki HD73 binds to surface proteins in the mouse small intestine. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 271:54-58.

Vazquez-Padron, R I, Moreno-Fierros, L, Neri-Bazan, L, De La Riva, G A, Lopez-Revilla, R, (1999). Intragastric and intraperitoneal administration of Cry1Ac protoxin from *Bacillus Thuringiensis* induces systemic and mucosal antibody responses in mice. *Life Sciences* 64:1897-1912.

Velimirov, A., Binter, C., Zentek, J., 2008. Biological effects of transgenic maize NK603xMON810 fed in long term reproduction studies in mice. BUNTESMINISTERIUM FÜR GESUNDHEIT, FAMILIE OG JUGEND, SEKTION IV.

Wandeler, H, Bahylova, J, Nentwig, W, (2002). Consumption of two Bt and six non-Bt corn varieties by the woodlouse *Porcellio scaber*. *Basic and Applied Ecology* 3:357-365.

Zwahlen, C, Hilbeck, A, Howald, R, Nentwig, W, (2003). Effects of transgenic Bt corn litter on the earthworm *Lumbricus terrestris*. (vol 12, pg 1077, 2003). *Molecular Ecology* 12:2279.