

# Low Level Presence: Present Situation and Market Implications



**Center for  
Environmental  
Risk Assessment**

**The Plant Biotechnology and  
Biosafety Workshop**

**Embrapa · Brasilia · 8-10 April 2013**

# Outline

- Introduction to low level presence
- GM food safety assessment
- Low level presence in GM food
- Environmental risk assessment
- Low level presence in seed
- International efforts to address LLP in food and seed

## What is “low level presence”?

- “Some adventitious mixing is unavoidable”
- Low levels of GM events that have been approved in the country of origin and that are present in shipments to importing countries that have yet to approve these events
- Zero tolerance for unapproved events is the regulatory norm
- Does not refer to events that have not been authorized for commercialization anywhere

# Sources of LLP

- Asynchronous approvals
  - Most likely cause of LLP
  - At least one cultivating country has already authorized a GM event while other importing countries have not
- Isolated foreign approvals
  - A cultivating country has authorized a GM event, but its developer does not seek approval in importing countries
- **Result: Trade disruptions**

# Example times to approvals

- Canada: 20-24 months   
- USA: 24-30 months  FDA: 12-18 months  
- Japan: 36 months (~ 1 year taken up with the stage-3 field trial in-country)   ()
- EU: 42-48 months  
- China: 30-36 months (only 3 application dates per year, March 1, July 1, and Nov 1; in-country field trial)  
- Mexico: 9-12 months assuming prior USA or Canada approval  
- Australia & New Zealand: 9 months  
- Brazil: 8-12 months   

# Traditional views of food safety

- Historically, our beliefs about the safety of foods have been based almost entirely on tradition and cultural experience
- In practice, very few of the foods we eat today have been subject to any toxicological studies and yet they are generally accepted as safe
- Even foods that contain toxins or anti-nutrients or allergens have been considered safe through a long history of use
  - Consider potatoes, tomatoes, peanuts, eggs, milk products, wheat products, strawberries and other fruits, fish, shellfish, etc.

# GM food safety assessment

- At the heart of the safety assessment process is the principle that GM foods **CAN** be compared with traditional counterparts that have an established history of safe use
- This comparison can be based on an examination of the same types of risk factors for both (e.g. toxins, potential allergens, key nutrients, anti-nutrients).

# Codex 2003 Plant Guideline

- Guideline for the Conduct of Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Recombinant DNA-Plants
- The Guideline supports the Principles for the Risk Analysis of Foods Derived from Modern Biotechnology.
- Addresses safety and nutritional aspects of foods consisting of, or derived from, plants that have a history of safe use as sources of food, and that have been modified by modern biotechnology to exhibit new or altered expression of traits.
- It does **not** address animal feed or animals fed with the feed.
- It does **not** address environmental risks.



# Framework of the GE food safety assessment

- Description of the rDNA plant
- Description of host plant and its use as food
- Description of donor organism(s)
- Description of the genetic modification(s)
- Characterization of the genetic modification(s)
- Safety assessment:
  - Expressed substances
  - Assessment of potential toxicity and allergenicity
  - Compositional analyses of key components
  - Evaluation of metabolites
  - Food processing
  - Nutritional modification
  - Other considerations (e.g. marker genes)

# Annexes to the Codex Plant Guideline

- Annex 1: Assessment of Possible Allergenicity (2003)
- Annex 2: Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from rDNA Plants Modified for Nutritional or Health Benefits (2008)
- Annex 3: Food Safety Assessment in Situations of Low-Level Presence of rDNA Plant Material in Food (2008)

## Defining LLP in food in Annex 3

- “Low levels of recombinant DNA plant materials that have passed a food safety assessment according to the Codex Guideline for the conduct of Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Recombinant-DNA Plants in one or more countries may on occasion be present in food in importing countries in which the food safety of the relevant recombinant-DNA plants has not been determined.”

# Importance of the Codex Plant Guideline

- Created a robust, scientifically sound and internationally accepted approach to the safety assessment of GM foods
- Has facilitated harmonization as many countries have used the Codex Principles and the Plant Guideline in new or revised national regulations or guidance
- **Very helpful for the resolution of LLP in food situations**

# Environmental risk assessment (ERA)

- No “Codex equivalent” organization
- Key intergovernmental players
  - Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)
  - International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)
  - Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

# Environmental risk assessment

- What is risk assessment?
  - The process of establishing information regarding acceptable levels of a risk and/or levels of risk for an individual, group, society, or the environment (Society for Risk Analysis)
- What is risk?
  - Risk = hazard x exposure

# Sources of potential harm

- Concerns that are consistently addressed across different regulatory systems:
  - Will the GM plant become a weed of agriculture or invasive of natural habitats?
  - Will gene flow to sexually compatible relatives result in established populations of weedy or invasive hybrids?
  - Will there be an adverse environmental impact on non-target organisms?
  - Will there be an adverse impact on biodiversity? (usually addressed by a weight of evidence approach based on the first three sources of potential harm)

## Defining “LLP in seed”

- **Seed** that contains a low level of a GM event that has been authorized for commercial cultivation (following an environmental risk assessment) in one or more countries but not in the country of import



# Seed includes...

Scenario 1: Viable plant material imported for FFP



Scenario 2: Seed for planting



## ERA of LLP in seed

- ERA of LLP in seed should follow the accepted risk assessment paradigm
  - Risk = hazard x exposure
  - Trait - host plant - receiving environment
- Use problem formulation to identify plausible risk hypotheses
  - Utilize information and data from existing ERAs (and literature)

## Commercial approval in one or more other countries implies that...

- No evidence that the reproductive biology of the plant was altered, thus the potential for weediness or invasiveness is unchanged
- Impacts of gene flow to sexually compatible relatives in that geography considered minimal
- No anticipated environmental impact on non-target organisms in that geography
- No anticipated impact on biodiversity in the cultivating country

## Let's apply what we know...

- ERA of LLP in seed should explicitly take into account:
  - The extensive body of knowledge gained from ERA of GM events for unconfined release
  - The experience and knowledge gained from cultivating GM crops
  - The mitigating impact afforded by low-level exposure

# Examples sources of information

- **Biology documents**
  - OECD consensus documents
  - Country biology documents
- **CERA monographs on the environmental safety of novel proteins**
  - PAT, CP4EPSPS, Cry1Ab, Cry1Ac, Vip3Aa, Cry34Ab/Cry35Ab
- **Risk assessments and decision documents published by regulatory authorities**
- **Databases**
  - OECD BioTrack
  - BCH
  - CERA's GM Crop Database

# Options for addressing ERA of LLP in seed

**Option 1:** ERA based on a subset of data, relevant only to plausible risk hypotheses

- Case-specific
- Provides flexibility for country-specific exemptions (e.g., crops that will not persist in the receiving environment; familiar proteins with a history of environmental safety)
- **Generation of in-country data is not required**

# Options for addressing ERA of LLP in seed

**Option 2:** Acceptance of scientific opinion prepared by the regulatory authority in the country where the GM event has been approved for cultivation

- Recognizes the harmonized nature of ERA guidance
- **No new ERA required by the country of import**

# Options for addressing ERA of LLP in seed

## Option 3: No requirement for any ERA for LLP in seed scenarios

- Recognizes that to date no GM crop plants have had adverse environmental impacts (e.g., EC DG Research. 2010. "A Decade of EU-funded GMO Research")



# Options for addressing ERA of LLP in seed

- Scientifically defensible
- Compliant with Parties obligations under the Cartagena Protocol
- Allows regulatory authorities to focus human, financial and institutional resources in a manner that is commensurate with risk

## How to address LLP in the longer term

- The best approach to avoiding LLP situations is to promote the synchronicity of approvals
- This will require harmonization of time standards and will be greatly facilitated by harmonization of requirements and approaches for risk/safety assessment.

# International Engagement on LLP

- 1<sup>st</sup> International Meeting on LLP
  - Vancouver, Canada in March 2012
  - LLP in food
  - International Statement on Low Level Presence
- 2<sup>nd</sup> International Meeting on LLP
  - Rosario, Argentina in September 2012
  - LLP in food and seed

## International Engagement on LLP

- OECD Working Group on the Harmonization of Regulatory Oversight in Biotechnology
- “Low Level Presence of Transgenic Plants in Seed and Grain Commodities: Environmental Risk/Safety Assessment , and Availability and Use of Information”



Center for  
Environmental  
Risk Assessment

תודה  
Dankie Gracias  
Спасибо شکرًا  
Merci Takk  
Köszönjük Terima kasih  
Grazie Dziękujemy Děkojame  
Ďakujeme Vielen Dank Paldies  
Kiitos Täname teid 谢谢  
**Thank You** Tak  
感謝您 Obrigado Teşekkür Ederiz  
감사합니다  
Σας ευχαριστούμε ขอบคณ  
Bedankt Děkujeme vám  
ありがとうございます  
Tack