Vår ref:2015/H_118
Deres ref: 2015/5919

Miljødirektoratet
Postboks 5672 Sluppen
7485 Trondheim
Dato: 17.08.15

Vedlagt er innspill fra GenØk – Senter for Biosikkerhet på høringen av søknad **EFSA/GMO/BE/2013/118** fra Monsanto Company som gjelder mat, fòr, import og prosessering av genmodifisert mais **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122**.

Vennligst ta kontakt hvis det er noen spørsmål.

Med vennlig hilsen,

Idun Merete Grønsberg
Forsker II
GenØk – Senter for Biosikkerhet
idun.gronsberg@genok.no

Bidragsytere:

Frøydis Gillund
Forsker II
GenØk – Senter for Biosikkerhet

Thomas Bøhn
Forsker I
GenØk – Senter for Biosikkerhet

Marianne Iversen
Forsker III
GenØk – Senter for Biosikkerhet

Hermoine Jean Venter
Forsker
GenØk – Senter for Biosikkerhet

Vår ref:2015/H_118
Deres ref: 2015/5919

Assessment of the technical dossier submitted under EFSA/GMO/BE/2013/118 for approval of MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize.

Sent to

Norwegian Environment Agency

by

GenØk- Centre for Biosafety
August 2015

KONKLUSJON PÅ NORSK

Vi trekker frem mangler i dossieret som ikke gir grunnlag for en konklusjon om sikker bruk, samfunnsnytte og bidrag til bærekraft av **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 mais**. Søker har ikke inkludert noe av den informasjonen omkring samfunnsnytte og bærekraft av **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 mais** som kreves i den norske genteknologiloven (Appendix 4) for godkjenning i Norge.

Hovedkonklusjon og anbefalinger:
Genøk–Senter for Biosikkerhet viser til brev fra Miljødirektoratet angående høring som omfatter **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 mais** for bruksområdet import og prosessering og til bruk i fòr og mat eller inneholdende ingredienser produsert fra **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 mais.**

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 erfaringer med hensyn på effekter på miljø, helse og samfunnsaspekter. Denne type dokumentasjon er ikke tilstrekkelig i søknaden om omsetting av **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 mais** til import og prosessering og til bruk i fòr og mat eller inneholdende ingredienser produsert fra **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 mais.**

Vår konklusjon er at norske myndigheter ikke godkjenner bruk av **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 mais** til import og prosessering og til bruk i fòr og mat som det søkes om.

ASSESSMENT OF THE TECHNICAL DOSSIER RELATED TO EFSA/GMO/BE/2013/118 FOR APPROVAL OF MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize.

As a designated National Competence Center for Biosafety, our mission at GenØk in advice giving is to provide independent, holistic and useful analysis of technical and scientific information/reasoning in order to assist authorities in the safety evaluation of biotechnologies proposed for use in the public sphere.

The following information is respectfully submitted for consideration in the evaluation of product safety and corresponding impact assessment of event **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize**, setting out the risk of adverse effects on the environment and health, including other consequences of proposed release under the pertinent Norwegian regulations.

We have previously commented on sub-combinations and single events of **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize** in:

- EFSA/GMO/BE/2009/71 for MON89034 x MON88017 (our previous comments from January 2010: **H_71**)

- EFSA/GMO/BE/2011/90 for MON89034 (our previous comments from July 2012: **H_90**)

We have also commented on other combinations of the events (in other stacks) in this Application previously.

Specific recommendations

Based on our findings, we propose a few specific recommendations, summarized here and detailed in the critique below.
Our previous recommendations/points on sub-combinations and single events of
MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize.

Application: EFSA/GMO/BE/2009/71 for MON89034 x MON88017 (our previous comments from January 2010: **H_71**):

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

Application: EFSA/GMO/BE/2011/90 for MON89034 (our previous comments from July 2012: **H_90**):

- The Applicant should re-perform the analysis using more sensitive methods (greater Escore sensitivities and smaller search sequence lengths) as well all relevant maize databases that maximize the likelihood of finding an accurate nucleotide match.
- The Applicant should report the nucleotide sequences obtained from the endogenous maize DNA regions adjacent to the transgene insertion(s) so that independent analysis can be performed.
- The Applicant should provide information demonstrating the genetic similarity of comparators used in comparative assessments in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 and Directive 2001/18/EC.
- The Applicant should provide a case-specific monitoring plan to monitor potential unintended but anticipated exposure routes and levels, and to verify the assessment of exposure routes and levels into the environment.
- The Applicant should provide more detail on the methods, locations and local considerations that should be identified for the establishment of baseline data.
- The Applicant should describe how the monitoring report would review and evaluate the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, and scientific quality of data derived from monitoring, including the continuity of the monitoring activities as it was described in the monitoring plan. Any unusual observations or identified adverse effects that is identified should be reported in a timely manner so that the appropriate response may be undertaken. These reports should also include a scientifically rigorous analysis of the results and conclusions, also considering site-specific conditions. The report should further highlight results that indicate adaptation of the monitoring plan, further research or review of risk management options or decisions.
- The Applicant should also specify how they're report will provide information on the practical experience from the monitoring and suggest the ways the plan may be revised

as needed, as specified by the Competent Authority, and implemented by the Applicant. These may include adaptation of the monitoring plan, the establishment and/or adaptation of risk management measures, or the initiation of new investigations or more in depth studies (in the case where follow-up studies are needed, how they should be designed and who should be responsible for their implementation should be decided by the Competent Authority, in accordance with the monitoring provisions adopted by the Party of Import).

- The Applicant should indicate how monitoring reports could be made available on a central, openly accessible storage and presentation interface (e.g. a publically available website, housed by the Competent Authority) so that it may be more broadly disseminated (including for public awareness and participation). Raw data should be stored by the Applicant and made available for independent review of the data, its interpretation, and conclusions drawn from the monitoring activities. Reporting should also be disseminated, as determined in the monitoring plan, via GMO registers established by the Competent Authority and other public databases.
- The Applicant should submit required information on the social utility of MON89034 and its contribution to sustainable development, in accordance with the Norwegian Gene Technology Act.

Recommendations from this application:

- The regulator is encouraged to ask the applicant to address the potential of non-target effects of Bt toxins, especially in the context of their combined use in stacked events.
- The regulator is encouraged to ask the Applicant to consider the possibility of cross-resistance development to multiple Cry proteins due to the use of stacked events.
- We find it ethically unacceptable to ban the use of glufosinate-ammonium based herbicides domestically due to health and environmental concerns, while supporting its use in other countries. This represents an unacceptable double standard for Norway, and we ask the regulators to reconsider the practice of separating health and environmental risk by national borders or regions.
- The applicant should include a full evaluation of the co-technology intended to be used with MON87427xMON89034x1507xMON88017x59122, namely glyphosate- and glufosinate-ammonium-based herbicides. Particular focus should be given to the level of accumulation of herbicides in the plants, particularly the parts used in food and feed production, and whether or not these levels of exposure could cause acute and/or chronic health issues. This needs to be tested in animal and feeding studies, separating the effects of the plant and the herbicide(s) by using both sprayed and unsprayed plant samples.
- The toxicological assessment should also include a section on farm worker exposure to the herbicide.
- The Applicant should use herbicide treated, as well as untreated plant material in long-term chronic exposure feeding studies.
- The environmental risk assessment should include a section on the potential environmental effects of the herbicide (i.e. monitoring changes in use, potential drift into surrounding areas and ecosystems, leaching to aquatic environments, potential effects on wildlife).

- The regulators are encouraged to ask the Applicant to provide a full ERA of the life cycle of MON87427xMON89034x1507xMON88017x59122, i.e. from being planted in the field and through the cultivation process, harvesting, transportation, processing, and as waste. Specifically, more information on herbicide regime and residues should be included.
- The regulator is encouraged to ask the Applicant to demonstrate the lack of interactive effects between transgenic proteins through proper scientific testing and evidence gathering, rather than justify the lack of testing based on assumptions-based reasoning of no effects.
- We recommend that the Applicant to include Southern blot data of better technical quality to be able to see fragments, verify size of fragments, and also use smaller probes to increase potential for detection of fragments with deletions, insertions etc.
- The Applicant should also provide all primer sequences used for sequencing and include electropherograms for check of quality of sequences.
- Claims of expression levels and relation to safety issues should be elaborated further.
- Potential interaction between copies of PAT and EPSPS proteins are not analysed. We encourage the Applicant to do so based on their expression in another context than their parental lines.
- We also encourage the Applicant to use plant derived proteins for their analysis with bioinformatics regarding homology to known toxins and allergens and also other toxicity and allergenicity data.
- We suggest that the Applicant perform toxicity studies with plant derived proteins from the stack the Applicant applies authorization for here.
- We encourage the Applicant to analyse proteins isolated from the stacked event to investigate proteins as they are expressed in the plant, and not base safety assessments on data from single events and stacks where proteins are expressed in another context.
- In order to meet the requirements for the NGTA, the regulator is encouraged to ask the Applicant to submit information relevant for the assessment of the social utility of MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 and its contribution to sustainable development. The information provided by the Applicant must be relevant for the agricultural context in the producing country/countries. The information should include issues such as: Changes in pesticide use, emergence of herbicide resistant weeds, development of pest resistance in target populations, impacts on non-target organisms, potential for gene flow and possible impacts among poor and/or small-scale farmers in producing countries and share of the benefits among sectors of the society

Overall recommendation

From our analysis, we find that the deficiencies in the dossier do not support claims of safe use, social utility and contribution to sustainable development of MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize**. Critically, the Applicant has not included any of the required information to assess social utility and sustainability as required in Appendix 4 of the Norwegian Gene Technology Act, which would be necessary for consideration of approval in Norway.** A new application or reapplication should only be reconsidered with the delivery

of the information requests recommended here, including any additional information deemed significant by the Norwegian authorities.

Therefore, in our assessment of **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize**, we conclude that based on the available data, the Applicant has not provided the required information under Norwegian law to warrant approval in Norway at this time.

ASSESSMENT OF THE TECHNICAL DOSSIER RELATED TO EFSA/GMO/BE/2013/118

About the event

MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize was produced by crossing parental lines MON87427 and MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 by conventional breeding methods.

Each of the parental lines were developed through genetic modification.

This stacked event of maize produces the proteins Cry1A.105, Cry2Ab2, Cry1F, Cry3Bb1 Cry34Ab1 and Cry35Ab1 to provide insect tolerance. Cry1A.105 contains elements with a high degree of homology to Cry1Ab, Cry1F and Cry1Ac. The proteins provide protection from feeding damage caused by certain lepidopteran and coleopteran pests.

The event also produces PAT to provide tolerance to the herbicide glufosinate ammonium and CP4 EPSPS to provide tolerance to the herbicide glyphosate.

This application is for food, feed, processing and import. Application for full range use have been made Canada, Japan Mexico, Taiwan and U.S and is planned for Argentina. Applications for food and feed have already been submitted to Singapore and Colombia and will be submitted to countries importing high amounts of maize.

Parental lines MON89034, 1507, MON88017 and 59122 are approved for import and application in food, feed and processing in the EU.

MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize has been field tested in the US in 2010 at eight field sites.

Assessment findings

Safety of Cry genes

MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize combines different classes of Bt proteins named Cry toxins, namely Cry1A.105, Cry2Ab2, Cry1F, Cry3Bb1, Cry34Ab1 and Cry35Ab1. These toxins are claimed to be safe, however the potential of non-target effects of Bt toxins, including alternative modes of action for Cry toxins have been addressed previously (Bøhn, et al 2008, Gilliand et al 2002, Crickmore 2005, Hilbeck and Schmidt 2006).

Negative effects of Bt-transgenic plants on non-target organisms are documented. A meta-analysis of published studies on non-target effects of Bt-proteins in natural enemies, (Lövei and Arpaia 2005) documented that 30% of studies on predators and 57% of studies on parasitoids display negative effects to Cry1Ab transgenic insecticidal proteins. Further, Cry toxins and proteinase inhibitors have often non-neutral effects on natural enemies, and more often negative than positive effects (Lövei et al 2009). A review by Hilbeck and Schmidt (2006) on Bt-plants, found 50% of the studies documenting negative effects on tested invertebrates.

A review by van Frankenhuyzen (2013) indicated that several Cry proteins exhibit activity outside of their target orders. This study also found that many Cry proteins only had been tested with a very limited number of organisms: thus, activity outside of the target organisms of many Cry proteins may lack documentation simply because testing has not included sensitive organisms (van Frankenhuyzen, 2013). As not every species can be tested for sensitivity to Bt toxins, it cannot be excluded that sensitive species have been overlooked until now. The issue is complicated further by the number of variables which can affect toxicity testing, e.g. toxin preparation and purification, life stage of the test organism, differences in toxin expression hosts, as well as solubilization (or lack thereof) of the toxin, among other factors (van Frankenhuyzen 2009).

A quantitative review analysis based on 42 field experiments showed that unsprayed fields of Bt-transgenic maize plants have significantly higher abundance of terrestrial non-target invertebrates than sprayed conventional fields (Marvier et al. 2007). Thus, Bt-plants with a single Bt-gene inserted may represent an improvement for non-target organisms in the environment. However, an indication of some negative effects of the Cry1Ab toxin itself, or the Cry1Ab maize plant, on non-target abundance was shown in the same meta-analysis: when conventional (non-GM) fields were not sprayed, the non-target abundance was significantly higher than in the Bt-fields (Marvier et al. 2007).

Research on aquatic environments has sparked intense interest in the impact of Bt-crops on aquatic invertebrates including *Daphnia magna* (Bøhn et al 2008) and caddisflies (Rosi-Marshall et al 2007). Given the potential load of Cry toxins (also in combination with herbicides) that may end up in aquatic environments, further studies are warranted. Douville et al. (2007) presented evidence of the persistence of the *cry1Ab* transgene in aquatic environments: more than 21 days in surface waters, and 40 days in sediments. A follow-up on this study in 2009 indicated possible horizontal gene transfer of transgenic DNA fragments to aquatic bacteria (Douville et al 2009).

Impacts on soil microflora and fauna, including earthworms (Zwahlen et al. 2003), mychorizzal fungi (Castaldini et al. 2005) and microarthropods in response to Cry endotoxins have also been reported (Wandeler et al 2002, Griffiths et al 2006, Cortet et al 2007). The significance of tri-trophic effects of accumulation, particularly of insecticidal Cry toxins (Harwood et al. 2006, Obrist et al. 2006) is not clear. It has been demonstrated that sub-chronic dosages of Cry proteins may affect both foraging behavior and learning ability in non-target bees (Ramirez-Romero et al 2008), with potential indirect effects on recipient populations, Given the key-stone role of bees as pollinators, such effects may have consequences for both primary production and on entire food-webs.

The use of multiple, related transgenes in a single (stacked) event may accelerate resistance development to both transgene products. This was the experience of Zhao et al (2005) who tested the effect of using broccoli plants containing Cry1Ac, Cry1C or both, on resistance development in a population of diamondback moths (*Plutella xylostella*). They found that the stacked use of similar Cry proteins in close proximity to single gene events led to accelerated resistance development to both traits (Zhao et al 2005). Bravo and Soberón (2008) commented on this effect, acknowledging that gene stacking is not a universal solution to resistance development to Cry proteins. Studies such as these bring up further research questions: is the use of stacked related Cry proteins, such as Cry1Ab and eCry3.1Ab, in the same event, advisable? This question has relevance for the current application, where Cry1A.105, Cry2Ab2, Cry1F, Cry34Ab1 and Cry35Ab1 are combined in a single plant.

In relation to health impacts, a publication by (Dona and Arvanitoyannis 2009) reviewed 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, testing and exposure duration may have not been long enough to uncover important effects.

A recent study in mice showed that exposure to purified Cry1Ab resulted in specific anti-Cry1Ab IgG1 and IgE production, indicating inherent immunogenicity and allergenicity. Further, mice exposed to leaf extracts from both MON810 and unmodified maize demonstrated influx of lymphocytes and eosinophils in the broncho-alveolar lavage,and increased cytokine release in mediastinal lymph node cells (Andreassen et al 2015). Further studies should also include animals with immunodeficiencies and/or animals exposed to other stress agents simultaneously.

The potential adjuvancy of Cry proteins has previously been addressed by the GMO Panel of the Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food Safety. Also scientific studies have shown that the Cry1Ac protein is a potent systemic and mucosal adjuvant (Moreno-Fierros et al, 2003). In the evaluation of another GM maize, MIR604 x GA21, the panel found that it was difficult to evaluate if kernels from this stack would cause more allergenic reactions than kernels from unmodified maize. The Panel continues with: "*As the different Cry proteins are closely related, and in view of the experimental studies in mice, the GMO Panel finds that the likelihood of an increase in allergenic activity due to Cry1Ab and mCry3A proteins in food and feed from maize Bt11 x MIR604 x GA21 cannot be excluded. Thus, the Panel's view is that as long as the putative adjuvant effect of Cry1Ab and mCry3A with reasonable certainty cannot be excluded, the*

applicant must comment upon the mouse studies showing humoral antibody response of Cry1A proteins and relate this to a possible adjuvant effect of the Cry1Ab and mCry3A proteins expressed. Furthermore, although Cry1Ab and mCry3A proteins are rapidly degraded in gastric fluid after oral uptake, there is also the possibility that the protein can enter the respiratory tract after exposure to e.g. mill dust. Finally, rapid degradation is no absolute guarantee against allergenicity or adjuvanticity" (EFSA/GMO/UK/2007/48, Norwegian Scientific comitee for Food Safety, 12/06-08).
We also agree with these concerns.

Recommendations:

- The regulator is encouraged to ask the applicant to address the potential of non-target effects of Bt toxins, especially in the context of their combined use in stacked events.
- The regulator is encouraged to ask the Applicant to consider the possibility of cross-resistance development to multiple Cry proteins due to the use of stacked events.

Herbicide tolerance traits

Herbicide tolerant (HT) plants are specifically designed to be used in combination with herbicides, and will always be sprayed with the intended herbicide. Without spraying the introduction of HT plants would be useless. Surprisingly, these herbicides are often not tested as part of the assessment and risk evaluation of HT plants. In feeding studies with HT GM plants for quality assessment the herbicide is systematically overlooked, which represents a serious flaw in the testing and risk evaluation. Viljoen et al. (2013) found that in 13 out of 16 published feeding studies with HT GM crops the plant material used had not been sprayed with the intended co-technology herbicide. There is also a gap in knowledge regarding herbicide accumulation and residues, including metabolic pathways and metabolites thereof. Bøhn et al. (2014) documented high levels of glyphosate residues in HT GM soybeans grown in the USA, and the same research group have published papers showing that such residues negatively affect the feed quality of HT GM soybeans (Cuhra et al., 2014, Cuhra et al., 2015). Moreover, safety testing (in relation to health and environmental issues) has been focused on the active ingredient in the co-technology herbicides, and not the commercial formulations actually used, providing unrealistic and possibly misleading results (Mesnage et al., 2014, Surgan et al., 2010). Stacked HT GM plants are tolerant to one or more agrochemicals, allowing for combinatory and alternating use of several herbicides. Tolerance to multiple herbicides is also often combined with multiple Cry proteins, that could have additive or even synergistic effects on non-target species and the environment.

The stacked GM maize **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122** is the result of combining the already glyphosate and glufosinate-ammonium tolerant stack MON89034x1507xMON88017x59122 with another glyphosate tolerant GM maize, MON87427.

Although the application in question does not encompass the cultivation of MON87427xMON89034x1507xMON88017x59122, it must be mentioned that we are of the opinion that the environmental effects of the herbicide, as an important co-technology and

essential part of the cultivation of this event, should be discussed in the environmental risk assessment.

Since the purpose of the *cp4 epsps* (infers glyphosate tolerance) and *pat* (infers glufosinate-ammonium tolerance) is to treat the maize crop with glyphosate and glufosinate-ammonium based herbicides, we find it disconcerting that the presence of the herbicide has not been considered in the comparative assessment nor the toxicological assessment. Though the plant material used for the comparative assessment consisted of both herbicide treated and untreated plants the applicant has not tested the plant material for herbicide residues. In the toxicology assessment the applicant only focuses on the resulting proteins from the inserted genes, and do not discuss the potential of herbicide exposure through consumption of herbicide treated maize. A recent study found that glyphosate and AMPA accumulated in soybeans (Bøhn et al., 2014), highlighting the importance of including the herbicides in the comparative and toxicological assessment of GM crops with herbicidal co-technology.

Glyphosate
In both MON87427 and MON89034x1507xMON88017x59122 (where MON88017 was the original event with glyphosate tolerance), the glyphosate tolerance is inferred through the presence of genes coding for the CP4 EPSPS protein. Though the genes are slightly different, the resulting CP4 EPSPS proteins are claimed by the applicant to be structurally and functionally equivalent. The presence of two gene cassettes producing CP4 EPSPS is shown in the dossier to additively increase the presence of the CP4 EPSPS protein (table 12, p.79). One may assume that this increase in CP4 EPSPS levels increases the plants tolerance to glyphosate (i.e. the crop can be sprayed more intensely). However, the dossier contains no information concerning the effect on tolerance. Increasing the plants tolerance level might be an attempt to combat the increasing level of glyphosate tolerance in weeds, meaning that higher doses and more repeated applications during the growing season can be used. Glyphosate has long been promoted as an ideal herbicide with low toxicity and little environmental impact (Duke and Powles, 2008, Giesy et al., 2000). H owever, in recent years glyphosate has received a lot of risk-related attention. This is partly due its increased use since the introduction of glyphosate-tolerant GM-plants (Dill et al., 2010, Cuhra et al., 2013), and reports on negative effects in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems (Blackburn and Boutin, 2003, Solomon and Thompson, 2003). In addition, studies on animals and cell cultures indicate that there might be health implications from exposure to glyphosate (Axelrad et al., 2003, Benachour et al., 2007, Cuhra et al., 2013). Among the health effects observed in animal models are histopathological changes in organs such as the liver, cell-division dysfunction in early embryos, negative impact on nerve-cell differentiation, increased fetal mortality, growth reduction, and skeletal malformation. Additionally, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) recently released a report concluding that glyphosate is “probably carcinogenic to humans” (Fritschi et al., 2015).

Glufosinate-ammonium
The *pat* gene derived from *Streptomyces viridochromogens* confers tolerance to herbicides containing glufosinate-ammonium. This stacked GM maize contains two gene cassettes containing *pat* genes (achieved by crossing events 1507 and 59122). The dossier reports an increased total expression, i.e. an increase in PAT protein content (table 11, p.78). Glufosinate-ammonium belongs to a class of herbicides that is banned in Norway and in EU (except for a

limited use on apples) due to both acute and chronic effects on mammals including humans. Studies have shown that glufosinate-ammonium is harmful by inhalation, ingestion and skin contact. Serious health risks may result from exposure over time. Observations of patients poisoned by glufosinate-ammonium have found that acute exposure causes convulsions, circulatory and respiratory problems, amnesia and damages to the central nervous system (CNS) (Watanabe 1998). Chronic exposure in mice has been shown to cause spatial memory loss, changes to certain brain regions, and autism-like traits in offspring (Calas et al., 2008, Laugeray et al., 2014). According to EFSA, the use of glufosinate-ammonium will lead to farm workers being exposed to herbicide levels that exceed acceptable exposure levels during application.

Recommendations:

- We find it ethically unacceptable to ban the use of glufosinate-ammonium based herbicides domestically due to health and environmental concerns, while supporting its use in other countries. This represents an unacceptable double standard for Norway, and we ask the regulators to reconsider the practice of separating health and environmental risk by national borders or regions.

- The applicant should include a full evaluation of the co-technology intended to be used with MON87427xMON89034x1507xMON88017x59122, namely glyphosate- and glufosinate-ammonium-based herbicides. Particular focus should be given to the level of accumulation of herbicides in the plants, particularly the parts used in food and feed production, and whether or not these levels of exposure could cause acute and/or chronic health issues. This needs to be tested in animal and feeding studies, separating the effects of the plant and the herbicide(s) by using both sprayed and unsprayed plant samples.

Specific recommendations:
-The Applicant should look into and compare the levels of herbicide residues in the plants in order to provide an improved comparative assessment. The health implications (if any) of the herbicide residue exposure to humans and animals should subsequently be discussed in the toxicological assessment.
-The toxicological assessment should also include a section on farm worker exposure to the herbicide.
-The Applicant should use herbicide treated, as well as untreated plant material in long-term chronic exposure feeding studies.
-The environmental risk assessment should include a section on the potential environmental effects of the herbicide (i.e. monitoring changes in use, potential drift into surrounding areas and ecosystems, leaching to aquatic environments, potential effects on wildlife).

Environmental risk assessment (ERA) and monitoring plan

Though the ERA and monitoring plan in this dossier is mainly concerned with potential exposure of GM plant material to the environment in other ways than cultivation (the application does not encompass cultivation in Europe), we emphasize the crucial role of the agricultural context in which these crops will be grown. There are several risks connected to the cultivation of genetically modified crops, among them gene flow (both to non-modified crops and wild relatives of the crop) and potential impacts on the surrounding ecosystems

through affecting insect and plant life, small mammals and birds and aquatic life (i.e. non-target organisms) (Warwick et al., 2009).

Gene flow could have implications for insect life if cry-genes spread to wild maize relatives, or for herbicide resistance in wild maize relatives if genes such as *pat* or *cp4 epsps* are outcrossed. High doses and continuous use of a few herbicides promotes development of resistance in weed species, creating a snowball effect where doses used accelerate in response to weed resistance evolution. The herbicide will never be confined to the field but will also affect surrounding areas/ecosystems such as forests, meadows and aquatic run-off systems.

The Norwegian Gene Technology Act §1 specifically states that
"*The purpose of this Act is to ensure that the production and use of genetically modified organisms and the production of cloned animals take place in an ethically justifiable and socially acceptable manner, in accordance with the principle of sustainable development and without adverse effects on health and the environment*".
We argue that it would be double standard and poor ethical judgment to condone the import and use of crops, without knowing the agricultural context in which these crops are produced, and what steps that are being taken by producers to minimize risk and ensure a sustainable production with minimal impact on the environment and health of workers and consumers. Information on what measures are being taken to minimize the risk of gene flow to wild relatives, and on the herbicide application regime is essential for evaluating the sustainability and environmental impact of this crop. Thus, we would like the ERA to consider the risks connected also to the cultivation of the crop.

Recommendation:

- The regulators are encouraged to ask the Applicant to provide a full ERA of the life cycle of MON87427xMON89034x1507xMON88017x59122, i.e. from being planted in the field and through the cultivation process, harvesting, transportation, processing, and as waste. Specifically, more information on herbicide regime and residues should be included.

Stacked events

Today there is a clear trend to combine two or more transgenic traits present in single events through traditional breeding. However, information on how these GM stacked events should be assessed is limited and in some cases, assessment data for each single GM events has been used as evidence of safety for the stacked events.

Stacked events are more complex than single gene events. It has been an increased interest for the combinatorial and/or synergistic effects that may produce unintended, and undesirable changes in the plant – e.g. the potential for up- and down regulation of the plants own genes. Interactions within stacked traits cannot be excluded and multiple expressed toxins in a plant may increase immunological effects or adjuvant effects in mammals (Halpin 2005, deSchrijver et al, 2007). 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.

Most of the information submitted in this safety assessment is derived from previous findings with the parental lines MON87427 (EFSA/GMO/BE/2012/110 Monsanto Company) and MON89034x1507xMON88017x59122 (EFSA/GMO/CZ/2008/62, Monsanto Company/ Dow AgroSciences LLC). In general, the applicant describes most of the traits and characteristics of the "stacked event" as being the same as those of the parental GM events used in production of GM maize. The applicant has not demonstrated that interactions among the different transgenic proteins, particularly for allergenic or toxic effects, are not taking place in this event. Assumptions-based reasoning based on parental lines rather than the event in question should not replace scientific testing of hypotheses regarding interactions. GenØk means that stacked events cannot be approved based on the information on the parental lines or single events.

MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize combines several classes of Bt proteins active against insects pest like Lepidoptera and Coleoptera. It is well known that synergistic and additive effects both between Bt toxins and other compounds may occur (Then, 2009). 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 and must be carefully considered in the development and risk assessments of stacked events. Robust data are necessary to identify whether the combined presence of transgenes influences expression levels.

Recommendation:

- The regulator is encouraged to ask the Applicant to demonstrate the lack of interactive effects between transgenic proteins through proper scientific testing and evidence gathering, rather than justify the lack of testing based on assumptions-based reasoning of no effects.

Environmental risk assessment interactions between expressed proteins should be addressed in more detail and experiments should account for the high total amount of Bt protein in **MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122** maize.

Information relating to the genetic modification

Identification and characterization

2. Molecular characterization:

Information on the sequences actually inserted/deleted or altered:

Southern Blotting:

Southern blotting was employed by the applicant to confirm the presence of the inserts within the stacked event, and demonstrate their stability after having undergone cross-breeding to generate this event. A number of issues with the Southern blots have been noted:

- The absence of molecular weight markers on any of the six images (figures 6 – 11). Since the molecular weight marker allows the size of the detected bands to be gauged, it is important for interpreting the results of such an experiment.

- Inconsistencies between the reported size of the detected fragments, and the size indicated on the images. For example, in figure 7 lanes 8 and 9 both contain bands which are recorded to be 8.2 kb and 7.4 kb, although the size indicated on the side of the image (in lieu of a molecular weight marker) indicates these sizes as 7.1 kb and 6.1 kb, respectively. Furthermore, a band in lane 2 which has migrated the same distance as the 8.2 kb bands is reported as 7.2 kb, 1000 bp shorter. The applicant explained the discrepancies in this image and others as likely being the result of differences in salt concentrations between the different DNA samples and the molecular weight marker. It would appear - given the lack of consistency between different bands, and between the molecular weight marker and the bands – that instead of determining the size of the bands from the image, the applicant has based the estimation of the size of the bands on those of previous works (references in Application: Arackal 2010, Wang, 2012 and Beazly, 2002).

- Longer exposure times for some Southern blots, such as those of figure 6 and 7, are recommended since a number of bands reported by the applicant are not visible on the images. While we acknowledge that longer incubation times will render the more prominent bands darker, being able to see the fainter bands is more important. We encourage the applicant to supply both images (i.e. the longer and shorter incubation times) so that all bands are clearly visible.

- The applicant makes use of a number of large probes (figure 9 contains one which is 2.0 kb long, for example), which reduces the ability of the Southern blot to detect small deletions, insertions, rearrangements and point mutations, and could thus give false negative results for such occurrences. We recommend that the applicant use smaller probes in order to reduce this risk.

These recommendations have been made assuming that the applicant continues to make use of Southern blots to detect and characterize inserted, deleted or altered sequences. However, it should be pointed out that more sensitive and informative techniques have become available, and we encourage the applicant to consider using them to supplement or replace Southern blots in their applications. A number of profiling techniques have been suggested (Heinemann, Kurenbach & Quist 2011), but we wish to highlight:

- Southern-by-Sequencing (SbS): Harnessing the sequencing power of next generation sequencing (NGS) with in-solution sequence capture techniques, this method was designed to be used in the screening process during the development of GM crops to weed out unsatisfactory transformants. In addition to being able to confirm copy number and intactness of inserts, the authors report that this technique was able to detect single nucleotide polymorphisms, provide detailed information about the flanking sequences of the insert, and detect fragment insertion which fall outside of the coverage of primers and probes used in PCR and traditional Southern blotting (Zastrow-Hayes et al. 2015).

- Whole genome sequencing: Another application of high-throughput NGS, whole genome sequencing would provide detailed information about the milieu into which the transgenes have been inserted, including information regarding interrupted endogenous

genes, small fragment inserts at other loci, and proximity of transposons (Schnable et al. 2009, Zastrow-Hayes et al. 2015).

Organization and sequence of the inserted genetic material at each insertion site:
The Applicant should provide all the primer sequences that were used for on the sequencing studies; the electropherograms should be provided as well in order to check the quality of the sequences; generational sequencing studies should have been conducted.

2.2.3 Information on the expression of the inserted/modified sequences (p.63)
*"The expression levels of CP4 EPSPS, Cry1A.105, Cry2Ab2, Cry1F, PAT, Cry3Bb1, Cry34Ab1, and Cry35Ab1 proteins were determined by validated enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISAs) in tissues collected from glufosinate and glyphosate treated MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122, glyphosate treated MON 87427 and MON 88017, glufosinate treated 1507 and 59122 and untreated MON 89034(*references in the Application Chinnadurai and Phil, 2012b)."

While we agree that the appropriate co-technology herbicides should be sprayed on the crops before expression levels are determined, unsprayed controls should also be include in order to determine whether there is a difference in expression levels due to herbicide application.

"The across-site mean, standard deviation (SD), and range of the Cry1A.105, Cry2Ab2, Cry1F, Cry3Bb1, Cry34Ab1, Cry35Ab1, PAT and CP4 EPSPS protein levels are reported on a µg/g fresh weight (fwt) and µg/g dry weight (dwt) basis for only forage and grain tissue samples as in terms of food and feed safety assessment, grain and forage are the most relevant tissues."

Although clearly stated as reported by the applicant, fresh weight protein levels are absent for PAT, Cry35Ab1, Cry34Ab1 and Cry1F (tables 7, 9, 10 and 11 respectively). No explanation is offered for the absence of these values.

While differences in expression levels between the herbicide tolerance genes *CP4EPSPS* and *PAT* are noted by the applicant and ascribed to multiple inserts of these genes, differences in expression levels of some of the Cry genes are not commented upon. For example, in MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122, Cry34Ab1 average expression is 99 µ/g dry weight in forage (relative standard deviation of 23%), while in the control tissue from 59122 expression is 73µ/g dry weight (relative standard deviation of 31%). In contrast, Cry35Ab1, which has the same genetic background as Cry34Ab1 does not display such differences between MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 and single 59122. Although such differences in expression level probably do not raise safety issues, the underlying causes are not addressed.

Potential interaction between the two copies of CP4 EPSPS and PAT are claimed not to take place due to the measured expression levels. However, this is not analysed further.

Bioinformatic analysis has been made for each of the single events constituting MON87427 x MON89034 x 1507 x MON88017 x 59122 maize. No similarities to known allergens or toxins

were found with this method. The whole stack was however not analysed (p. 81). We suggest that the Applicant do so in order to verify potential changes in sequence do to the load of new transgenes being combined and expressed.

Recommendation:

- Claims of expression levels and relation to safety issues should be clearified further.
- Potential interaction between the two copies of PAT and CP4 EPSPS in the stack should be analysed by other means than levels of expression. Levels of interaction can be :
- We encourage the Applicant to use the real, plant derived proteins isolated from the stack for bioinformatics analysis of homology to known toxins or allergens.

4. Toxicological assessment

The stacked event produces Cry1A.105, Cry2Ab2, Cry1F, Cry3Bb1, Cry34Ab1, Cry35Ab1, CP4 EPSPS and PAT proteins in the same plant. The potential toxicity of each introduced protein is performed by comparement to known toxins (biochemical characteristics). Toxicity is evaluated based on 1) demonstrated history of safe use, 2) similarity to known toxins or other biologically active proteins, 3) acute toxic effect in mammals and 4) rapidity of digestion in the mammalian gastrointestinal tract.

All proteins are claimed to be non-toxic based on the four points above. It is however not clear if the proteins are isolated and analysed from the stack in this application, or if it is from the previous assessments made from the parental lines made previously. It is important that the proteins from the stack in questions are analysed due to expression in a different background than the parental lines.
A bacterial version of the CP4 EPSPS, PAT and Cry proteins were used for heat treatment analysis (stability). It must be a goal to use plant derived versions of proteins to be analyzed.

Acute oral toxicity studies performed, but it is not clear if these were of bacterial version and if the proteins were analysed in the combination present in the stack.
Repeated toxicity studies were not performed due to the previous demonstrated safety of the single proteins and the claim that this does not change when they are expressed in combination. However, as this is not investigated for this stack, it will not be possible to say something about it.

Recommendation:

- We suggest that the Applicant perform toxicity studies with plant derived proteins from the stack the Applicant applies authorization for here.

5. Allergenicity assessment

Aminoacid sequence homologies of Cry1A.105, Cry2Ab2, Cry3Bb1, Cry34Ab1, Cry35Ab1, CP4 EPSPS and PAT to known allergens: data from the single proteins in previous assessments used and no similarities found.Serum screening not needed based on safety data from previous assessments.

Pepsin resistance/*in vitro* digestibility tests did not reveal any proteins that were likely to be allergenic.
Assessment of the whole plant not considered necessary as maize not is considered as an allergenic plant.
Adjuvanicity: do not share structural similariy to known adjuvants. The Cry proteins are also claimed not to be toxic to human or animal species. We refer to section about cry toxins to refer to data on cry toxins (p. 8). Especiall Cry1Ac has been found to contribute to adjuvancy (see part om Cry 1Ac and adjuvancy).
Safety previously assessed

Recommendation:

- We encourage the Applicant to analyse proteins isolated from the stacked event to investigate proteins as they are expressed in the plant, and not base safety assessments on data from single events and stacks where proteins are expressed in another context.

Social utility and sustainability aspects

In addition to the EU regulatory framework for GMO assessment, an impact assessment in Norway follows the Norwegian Gene Technology Act (NGTA). In accordance with the aim of the NGTA, production and use of the GMO shall take place in an ethically and socially justifiable way, under the principle of sustainable development. This is further elaborated in section 10 of the Act (approval), where it is stated that: *"significant emphasis shall also be placed on whether the deliberate release represent a benefit to the community and a contribution to sustainable development"*. These issues are further elaborated in the regulations relating to impact assessment pursuant to the NGTA, section 17 and its annex 4. In the following we identify areas that are relevant to consider in order to assess social utility and sustainability aspects, and highlight information that that is missing from the Applicant.

Impacts in producer countries

The NGTA, with its clauses on societal utility and sustainable development, comes into play with a view also to health, environmental and socio-economic effects in other countries, such as where the GMOs are grown. MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 is not yet approved for cultivation in any third country[1].

As already stated, the Applicant does not provide data relevant for an ERA of MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 (as it is not intended to be cultivated in the EU/Norway). This information is necessary in order to assess the sustainability criteria as laid down in the NGTA. Importantly, it is difficult to extrapolate on hazards or risks taken from data generated under different ecological, biological, genetic and socio-economic contexts as regional growing environments, scales of farm fields, crop management practices, genetic background, interactions between cultivated crops, and surrounding biodiversity are all likely to affect the outcomes. It can therefore not be expected that the same effects will apply between

[1] The applicant has applied for the full range of uses for MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 in Canada, Japan, Mexico, Taiwan, U.S. and are planning to do so for Argentina, but the event is not yet approved in any of these countries.

different environments and across continents. Hence, a proper evaluation of potential impacts of relevance to sustainability cannot be completed until this event has been approved for cultivation in a third country, and sufficient information relevant for the ERA and socio economic impacts assessment in these agricultural contexts has been provided. This must include information from an ERA concerning impacts on cultivation, management and harvesting stages, as well as the post-market environmental monitoring in the producing country. With regard to potential socio-economic impacts in the producer country or countries, published reviews on sustainability-relevant aspects (e.g. impacts among poor and/or small-scale farmers in developing countries, share of the benefits among sectors of the society) indicate that these effects have been very complex, mixed and dependent on the agronomic, socio-economic and institutional settings where the technology has been introduced (Glover, 2010). The applicant does not provide any references to the extensive literature concerning the socio-economic aspects related to the cultivation (and to a much lesser extend, the use) of GM maize.

Impacts of the co-technology: glyphosate and glufosinat-ammonium

The evaluation of the co-technology, that is, secondary products that are intended to be used in conjunction with the GMO, is also considered important in the risk assessment of a GMO (Dolezel et al 2009). Therefore, considerations of the co-products also warrant an evaluation of safe use and data required for such an assessment is not provided by the Applicant.

The MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 maize confers tolerance to herbicides containing glufosinate-ammonium and glyphosate. Glufosinate-ammonium is a class of herbicides that are banned in Norway and in the EU (except a limited use on apples) due to both acute and chronic effects on mammals including humans. Recent studies have shown negative effects from glyphosate, both on species present in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and on animals and cell cultures (for further elaboration and references on this issue see section on Cry proteins). Consequently, glyphosate is now increasing recognized as more toxic to the environment and human health than what it was initially considered to be. This is particularly a concern as the introduction of glyphosate tolerant GM plants has led to an increase in the use of glyphosate (Dill et al 2010; Cuhra et al 2012). As MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 is genetically modified to possess two *cp4 epsps* genes (providing glyphosate tolerance) and two *pat* genes (providing glufosinate-ammonium tolerance), it is likely to assume that this GM maize is tolerant to higher doses of glyphosate. This could further increase the use of glyphosate and glufosinate-ammonium. Moreover, studies has shown increased levels of herbicide residues in herbicide tolerant GM crops (Bøhn et al. 2014), which could have health impacts on humans and animals consuming food/feed based on ingredients from this type of GM plants. Finally, weed resistance to glycines in maize cultivation has been vastly documented[2]. The Applicant has not provided information on the contribution of the MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 maize to the emergence of glyphosate and glufosinate-ammonium resistance in weeds, nor if there are already cases of this in the areas intended for cultivation of the variety.

[2] http://www.weedscience.org/Summary/Crop.aspx?SituationID=8

Impacts of the Bt-toxin on target and non-target organisms

MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 maize does also confer resistance to certain lepidopteran and coleopteran pests. A growing number of studies and reviews indicate potential harm to a range of non-target organisms (Lövei et al. 2009; Marvier et al. 2007; Rosi-Marshall et al. 2007; Bøhn et al. 2008). .Both impacts on non-target organisms and resistance development among target pests of Bt maize has been documented (Van den Berg et al., 2013a; Van den Berg, 2013b). Evaluation of resistance development within the target pest population and strategies suggested to halt this development, as well as impacts on non-target organisms is crucial in a sustainability assessment.

Impacts from gene flow and co-existence management

The applicant highlights that the appearance of "volunteer" maize in rotational fields following the maize crop from the previous year is rare under European conditions. Still, an evaluation of the occurrence of volunteer plants in the producing countries and suggested control strategies is important for a sustainability assessment. As stated by the Applicant (part 2.1, page 167): "*Survival of maize is dependent upon temperature, seed moisture, genotype, husk protection and stage of development (….)Volunteers are killed by frost or easily controlled by current agronomic practices, including cultivation and the use of selective herbicides."* Information about the occurrence of volunteers and which herbicides that will potentially be used for killing volunteers is required to evaluate potential health and environmental impacts of these. The Applicant should describe strategies to ensure co-existence with conventional and organic maize crops in the producing countries and minimize the likelihood for gene flow to wild relatives.

Assessment of alternatives

It is also important to evaluate whether alternative options (e.g. the parental non-GM version of this MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 maize) may achieve the same outcomes in a safer and ethically justified way. Furthermore, in order to evaluate whether MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 maize contributes to social utility, it is important to consider current and future demand for this GM-maize product for food, feed and processing purposes in Norway and to what extent this demand is/can be satisfied by existing sources.

Ethical considerations

While it is understood that the Applicant has not applied for deliberate release of MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 maize in Norway, the acceptance of a product in which the intended use involves the use of a product banned in Norway, as the glyphosinate-ammonium, would violate basic ethical and social utility criteria, as laid out in the NGTA. Therefore we find that it would be ethically incongruous to support a double standard of safety for Norway on one hand, and safety for countries from which Norway may import its food and feed on the other. This line of reasoning is consistent with the provisions under the NGTA to assess ethical, social utility and sustainable development criteria not only for Norway, but for countries from which Norway imports food and feed. Specifically, this

issue is relevant particularly in the revised guidelines for impact assessment pursuant to the Act of 2005 Section 17, "*Other consequences of the production and use of genetically modified organisms"* points 2 and 3, "*ethical considerations that may arise in connection with the use of the genetically modified organism(s)*», and "*any favorable or unfavorable social consequences that may arise from the use of the genetically modified organism(s)*", respectively.

Recommendations:
In order to meet the requirements for the NGTA, the regulator is encouraged to ask the Applicant to submit information relevant for the assessment of the social utility of MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 and its contribution to sustainable development. The information provided by the Applicant must be relevant for the agricultural context in the producing country/countries. The information should include issues such as: Changes in pesticide use, emergence of herbicide resistant weeds, development of pest resistance in target populations, impacts on non-target organisms, potential for gene flow and possible impacts among poor and/or small-scale farmers in producing countries and share of the benefits among sectors of the society

Conclusion
MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 is tolerant to glufosinate-ammonium which is banned for use in Norway. Banning the use of glufosinate-ammonium based herbicides domestically due to health and environmental concerns, while supporting its use in other countries would be ethically unacceptable. The applicant does not attempt to identify socio-economic implications, nor demonstrate a benefit to the community and a contribution to sustainable development from the use of the MON 87427 × MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 maize and does therefore not provide sufficient information as required by the NGTA.

References:

Andreassen M., Rocca E., Bøhn T., Wikmark, OG., van Den Berg J., Løvik M., Traavik T and Nygaard UC (2015). Humoral and cellular immune responses in mice airway administration of Bacillus thuringiensis Cry1Ab and MON810 Cry1Ab –transgenic maize. Food and Agricultural Immunology, 26, pp. 521-37.

Axelrad, JC., Howard, C V and MClean, WG. (2003). The effects of acute pesticide exposure on neuroblastoma cells chronically exposed to diazinon. Toxicology, 185**,** pp67-78.

Benachour N., Sipahutar, H., Moslemi, S., Gasnier, C., Travert, C and Seralini, GE. (2007). Time- and dose-dependent effects of roundup on human embryonic and placental cells. Arch Environ Contam Toxicol, 53**,** pp.126-33.

Blackburn, L. and Boutin, C. (2003). Subtle Effects of Herbicide Use in the Context of Genetically Modified Crops: A Case Study with Glyphosate (Roundup®). Ecotoxicology, 12**,** pp. 271-285.

Bravo, A., Soberón, M (2008). How to cope with insect resistance to Bt toxins? Trends in Biotechnology, 26, pp. 573-579.

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, pp.584-592.

Bøhn T., Cuhra M., Traavik T., Sanden M., Fagan J. and Primicerio R (2014). Compositional differences in soybeans on the market: Glyphosate accumulates in Roundup Ready GM soybeans. Food Chemistry, 153**,** pp.207-215.

Calas, AG., Richard, O., Même, S., Beloeil, JC., Doan, BT., Gefflaut, T., Même, W., Crusio, WE., Pichon J and Montecot, C. (2008). Chronic exposure to glufosinate-ammonium induces spatial memory impairments, hippocampal MRI modifications and glutamine synthetase activation in mice. NeuroToxicology, 29**,** pp. 740-747.

Castaldini M, Turrini A, Sbrana C, Benedetti A, Marchionni M, Mocali S, Fabiani A, Landi S, Santomassimo F, Pietrangeli B, Nuti M P, Miclaus N, Giovanetti M (2005). Impact of Bt corn on rhizospheric and soil eubacterial communities and on beneficial mycorrhizal symbiosis in experimental microcosms. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 71, pp.6719-6729.

Cortet J, Griffiths BS, Bohanec M, Demsar D, Andersen M N, Caul S, Birch ANE, Pernin, C, Tabone, E, de Vaufleury A, Ke X, Krogh PH (2007). Evaluation of effects of transgenic Bt maize on microarthropods in a European multi-site experiment. Pedobiologia, 51, pp.207-218

Crickmore N, (2005). Using worms to better understand how Bacillus thuringiensis kills insects. Trends in Microbiology, 13(8), pp.347-350.

Cuhra M., Traavik T. and Bøhn T. (2013). Clone- and age-dependent toxicity of a glyphosate commercial formulation and its active ingredient in Daphnia magna. Ecotoxicology, 22**,** pp. 251-262.

Cuhra M., Traavik T. and Bøhn T (2014). Life cycle fitness differences in Daphnia magna fed Roundup-Ready soybean or conventional soybean or organic soybean. Aquaculture Nutrition doi: 10.1111/anu.12199. pp1-12.

Cuhra M., Traavik T., Dando M L., Primicerio R., Holderbaum D F and Bøhn T (2015). Glyphosate-Residues in Roundup-Ready Soybean Impair Daphnia magna Life-Cycle. Journal of Agricultural Chemistry and Environment, 4 pp. 13.

deSchrivjer A., Devos Y., Van Den Bulcke M., Cadot P., De Loose M., De Reheul D and Sneyers M. (2007). Risk assessment of GM stacked events obtained from crosses between GM events. Trends in Food Science and Tecnology. 18, pp. 101-09.

Dill, GM., Sammons, RD., Feng, PC., Kohn, F., Kretzmer, K., Mehrsheikh, A., Bleeke, M., Honegger, JL., Farmer, D.and Wright, D. (2010). Glyphosate: discovery, development, applications, and properties. Glyphosate Resistance in Crops and Weeds: History, Development, and Management, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., Hoboken, pp.1-33.

Dolezel M, Miklau M, Eckerstorfer M, Hilbeck A, Heissenberger A, Gaugitsch H (2009). Standardising the Environmental Risk Assessment of Genetically Modified Plants in the EU / Standardisierung der Umweltrisikoabschätzung gentechnisch veränderter Pflanzen in der EU. BfN – pp.259

Dona, A. and Arvanitoyannis, IS (2009). Health risks of genetically modified foods. Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition, 49, pp.164-175.

Douville M, Gagne F, Blaise C, Andre C, (2007) Occurence and persistence of Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) and transgenic Bt corn cry1Ab gene from an aquatic environment. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 66, pp.195-203.

Douville M, Gagné F, André C, Blaise C, (2009). Occurrence of the transgenic corn cry1Ab gene in freshwater mussels (Elliptio complanata) near cornfields: Evidence of exposure by bacterial ingestion. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 72, pp.17-25.

Duke SO and Powles SB. (2008). Glyphosate: a once-in-a-century herbicide. Pest Manag Sci, 64**,** pp.319-25.

EFSA/GMO/UK/2007/48

Fritschi, L., MClaughlin, J., Sergi, C., Calaf, G., Le Cureieux, F., Forastiere, F., Kromhout, H and Egephy, P (2015). Carcinogenicity of tetrachlorvinphos, parathion, malathion, diazinon, and glyphosate. Red, pp.114.

Giesy J., Dobson S and SOLOMON K. (2000). Ecotoxicological Risk Assessment for Roundup® Herbicide. *In:* WARE, G. (ed.) Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology. Springer New York.

Griffiths BS, Caul S, Thompson J, Birch A N E, Scrimgeour C, Cortet, J., Foggo A, Hackett CA, Krogh PH, (2006). Soil microbial and faunal community responses to Bt maize and insecticide in two soils. Journal of Environmental Quality, 35, pp.734-741

Gilliand A, Chambers CE, Bone E J, Ellar DJ (2002). Role of *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry1 delta endotoxin binding in determining potency during lepidopteran larval development. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 68, pp.1509-1515.

Halpin, C (2005). Gene stacking in transgenic plants – the challenge for the 21st century plant biotechnology. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 3, pp. 141-55.

Harwood JD, Samson R.A, Obrycki, JJ (2006). No evidence for the uptake of Cry1Ab Btendotoxins by the generalist predator Scarites subterraneus (Coleoptera:Carabidae) in laboratory and field experiments. Biocontrol Science and Technology, 16, pp.377-388.

Heinemann, J.A., Kurenbach, B. & Quist, D. 2011, "Molecular profiling—a tool for addressing emerging gaps in the comparative risk assessment of GMOs", Environment international, vol. 37, no. 7, pp. 1285-1293.

Hilbeck, A. & Schmidt, J. E. U., (2006). Another view on Bt proteins - how specific are they and what else might they do? Biopesticides International, 2, pp.1-50.

Laugeray, A., Herzine, A., Perche, O., Hebert, B., Aguillon-Naury, M., Richard, O., Menuet, A., Mazaud-Guittot, S., Lesne, L., Briault, S., Jegou, B., Pichon, J., Montecot-Duborg, C and Mortaud, S. (2014). Pre- and Postnatal Exposure to Low Dose Glufosinate Ammonium Induces Autism-Like Phenotypes in Mice. Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience, 8**,** pp.390.

Lövei GL & Arpaia S (2005). The impact of transgenic plants on natural enemies: a critical review of laboratory studies. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata, 114, pp.1-14.

Lövei G L., Andow DA and Arpaia S (2009). Transgenic Insecticidal Crops and Natural Enemies: A Detailed Review of Laboratory Studies. Environmental Entomology, 38, pp. 293-306.

Marvier M., McCreedy C., Regetz J. and Kareiva P (2007). A Meta-analysis of effects of BT cotton and maize on non-target invertebrates. Science, 316, pp. 1475-77.

Mesnage R., Defarge N., Spiroux deVendemois J and Seralini GE (2014). Major Pesticides Are More Toxic to Human Cells Than Their Declared Active Principles. BioMed Research International, 2014, 8.

Moreno-Fierros L., Ruiz-Medina EJ., Esquivel R., Lopez-Revilla R. and Pina-Cruz, S (2003). Intranasal Cry1Ac protoxin is an effective mucosal and systemic carrier and adjuvant of

Streptococcus pneumonia polysaccharides in mice. Scandinavian Journal of Immunology, 57, pp. 45-55.

Norwegian Scientific comitee for Food Safety, 12/06-08

Obrist LB, 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, pp.31-48.

Ramirez-Romero R., Desneux N, Decourtye A, Chaffiol A, Pham-Delegu, MH (2008). Does CrylAb protein affect learning performances of the honey bee *Apis mellifera* L. (Hymenoptera, Apidae)? Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 70, pp.327-333.

Rosi-Marshall, E.J., Tank JL, Royer TV, Whiles MR, Evans-White M., Chambers, C., Griffiths NA., Pokelsek J. and Stephen ML (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, pp. 16204-16208.

Schnable, P.S., Ware, D., Fulton, R.S., Stein, J.C., Wei, F., Pasternak, S., Liang, C., Zhang, J., Fulton, L., Graves, T.A., Minx, P., Reily, A.D., Courtney, L., Kruchowski, S.S., Tomlinson, C., Strong, C., Delehaunty, K., Fronick, C., Courtney, B., Rock, S.M., Belter, E., Du, F., Kim, K., Abbott, R.M., Cotton, M., Levy, A., Marchetto, P., Ochoa, K., Jackson, S.M., Gillam, B., Chen, W., Yan, L., Higginbotham, J., Cardenas, M., Waligorski, J., Applebaum, E., Phelps, L., Falcone, J., Kanchi, K., Thane, T., Scimone, A., Thane, N., Henke, J., Wang, T., Ruppert, J., Shah, N., Rotter, K., Hodges, J., Ingenthron, E., Cordes, M., Kohlberg, S., Sgro, J., Delgado, B., Mead, K., Chinwalla, A., Leonard, S., Crouse, K., Collura, K., Kudrna, D., Currie, J., He, R., Angelova, A., Rajasekar, S., Mueller, T., Lomeli, R., Scara, G., Ko, A., Delaney, K., Wissotski, M., Lopez, G., Campos, D., Braidotti, M., Ashley, E., Golser, W., Kim, H., Lee, S., Lin, J., Dujmic, Z., Kim, W., Talag, J., Zuccolo, A., Fan, C., Sebastian, A., Kramer, M., Spiegel, L., Nascimento, L., Zutavern, T., Miller, B., Ambroise, C., Muller, S., Spooner, W., Narechania, A., Ren, L., Wei, S., Kumari, S., Faga, B., Levy, M.J., McMahan, L., Van Buren, P., Vaughn, M.W., Ying, K., Yeh, C.T., Emrich, S.J., Jia, Y., Kalyanaraman, A., Hsia, A.P., Barbazuk, W.B., Baucom, R.S., Brutnell, T.P., Carpita, N.C., Chaparro, C., Chia, J.M., Deragon, J.M., Estill, J.C., Fu, Y., Jeddeloh, J.A., Han, Y., Lee, H., Li, P., Lisch, D.R., Liu, S., Liu, Z., Nagel, D.H., McCann, M.C., SanMiguel, P., Myers, A.M., Nettleton, D., Nguyen, J., Penning, B.W., Ponnala, L., Schneider, K.L., Schwartz, D.C., Sharma, A., Soderlund, C., Springer, N.M., Sun, Q., Wang, H., Waterman, M., Westerman, R., Wolfgruber, T.K., Yang, L., Yu, Y., Zhang, L., Zhou, S., Zhu, Q., Bennetzen, J.L., Dawe, R.K., Jiang, J., Jiang, N., Presting, G.G., Wessler, S.R., Aluru, S., Martienssen, R.A., Clifton, S.W., McCombie, W.R., Wing, R.A. & Wilson, R.K. (2009) The B73 maize genome: complexity, diversity, and dynamics , Science,. 326, pp. 1112-1115.

Solomon K. and Thompson D. (2003). Ecological Risk Assessment for Aquatic Organisms from Over-Water Uses of Glyphosate. Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health, Part B, 6**,** pp. 289-324.

Surgan M., Condon M and Cox C. (2010). Pesticide Risk Indicators: Unidentified Inert Ingredients Compromise Their Integrity and Utility. *Environmental Management,* 45**,** pp 834-841.

Then C (2009). Risk assessment of toxins derived from Bacillus thuringiensis – synergism, efficacy and selectivity. Environ Sci Pollut Res,17, pp. 791-7.

Van den Berg J, Hilbeck A and Bøhn T (2013a). Pest resistance to Cry1Ab Bt maize: Field resistance, contributing factors and lessons from South Africa. - Crop Protection, 54, pp. 154-160.

Van den Berg J, (2013b). Evolution in action: field-evolved resistance of African stem borer to Bt maize. - Outlooks on Pest Management, 24, pp.236-239

van Frankenhuyzen K (2009) Insecticidal activity of Bacillus thuringiensis crystal proteins. Journal of Invertebrate Pathology, 101, pp. 1-16.

van Frankenhuyzen K (2013). Cross-order and cross-phylum activity of *Bacillus thuringiensis* pesticidal proteins. Journal of Invertebrate Pathology, 114, pp. 76-85.

Viljoen, C. (2013). Letter to the editor. Food Chem Toxicol, 59**,** pp.809-10.

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, pp.357-365.

Warwick S. I., Beckie H J.and Hall LM (2009). Gene Flow, Invasiveness, and Ecological Impact of Genetically Modified Crops. Ann NY Acad Sci, 1168**,** pp.72-99.

Watanabe T and Sano T (1998) Neurological effects of glufosinate poisoning with a brief review. Human & Experimental Toxicology 17:35-39.

Zastrow-Hayes, G.M., Lin, H., Sigmund, A.L., Hoffman, J.L., Alarcon, C.M., Hayes, K.R., Richmond, T.A., Jeddeloh, J.A., May, G.D. & Beatty, M.K. (2015). Southern-by-Sequencing: A Robust Screening Approach for Molecular Characterization of Genetically Modified Crops, The Plant Genome, vol. 8, no. 1.

Zhao J-Z, Cao J, Collins H, Bates S L, Roush R T, Earle E D, Shelton A, (2005). Concurrent use of transgenic plants expressing a single and two Bacillus thuringiensis genes speeds insect adaptation to pyramided plants. Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences, 102(24), pp. 8426-8430.

Zwahlen C., Hilbeck A., Howald R. and Nentwig W. (2003) Molecular Ecology. 12, pp. 1077-86.