

Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

The question of the role of the member states with respect to the EU institutions with reference to the authorization, restriction or prohibition of the cultivation of GMOs (Genetically Modified Organisms) in their territory: What standpoint should EU Members States hold at when bearing in mind that they are responsible for ensuring a high level of protection of human life and health, animal health and welfare, the environment and interests of consumers, but at the same time ensuring the effective functioning of the internal market?



The Kepler Model European Parliament,

- A) Bearing in mind the inability to predict the full consequences of planting crops due to lack of research and experience.
- B) Fully aware of cross-pollination and its effects on both non GMO-fields and the ecosystem in general.
- C) Keeping in mind the abundance of food in the EU.
- D) Deeply concerned about poverty and starvation in certain countries
 - 1. Bearing in mind the high productivity and nutritional value of GMOs
- E) Noting with deep concern that countries not obliged to label GMO products may export them to the EU
 - 1. Deeply regretting having to do time and money consuming research on those products
- F) Taking into account existing policies of the EU regarding GMOs.
 - 1. Affirming that GMO goods produced in an EU member country have to be labeled.
 - 2. Noting with approval that the EU supports regions that declare themselves GMO-free and cannot force these regions to cultivate GMOs on their land.
- G) Noting with regret the difficulties that member states have to overcome in order to limit the import of GMOs authorized at the European level. (Italy, Sweden)
- I) Having considered the risk of GMO's impact on biodiversity.
- J) Bearing in mind that GMOs may raise some ethical questions.
 - 1. Fully believing that consumers have a right to choose between GMO and non-GMO products.
- K) Noting that the acceptance of GMOs could affect smaller farmer's ability of competition.
 - 1. Keeping in mind the importance of smaller farmers for the domestic economy.
- L) Aware of the difficulties of supervising the smaller farmer's obedience of GMO-related laws.

1. Requests GMO-planting countries to participate more significantly in research on the EU level, in order to try to avoid negative consequences.¹
 - a. further requests research on buffer zones
2. Further recommends to focus on long-term research regarding human health.
 - a. Encourages and financially supports planting on the EU level approved GMOs in countries facing starvation outside the EU.
3. suggest setting minimum buffer zones in all EU member states respectively to each concrete GMO plant in order to stay below the 0,9% GMO content²
 - a. Further proclaims that a neighbour of a GMO field has the right to set a greater buffer zone in order to have the possibility to grow GMO-free³ products.
4. Approves the ongoing procedure of labelling goods imported from countries that are not obliged to label GMOs.
 - a. Calls upon EU to request countries not obliged to label GMOs to financially participate in the labelling process.
5. Recommends that member states should be able to limit but not ban the import of GMOs
6. Emphasizes particular countries of the EU to give a special financial support to their own small farmers, who are not producing GMOs.
7. Reaffirms, that producers have the right to plant GMO's under the laws of each EU member state.
8. Further requests member states to include information about GMOs in their educational system
9. Proclaims to start informational campaign in public media within the EU funded by EU itself
10. Recommending counties⁴ to check on all their small farmers for GMOs and to send these results to the EU.
11. Instructs the president to forward the resolution to the European Parliament, the European Commission and the Council of Ministers.

¹Regarding environmental damage, such as cross-pollination, biodiversity, the extension of chemical agriculture, with damage on the ecosystem and unknown long-term impacts

² Referring to the study of Department of Horticulture and Crop Science we know that there are many studies showing different numbers, about how far should be non-GMO's from a source of pollen, but the most strict research showed, that 0,5% contamination was detected in about 300 meters (984 ft.)

³ As a GMO-free product can be labelled any product containing 0.1% of GMO or less.

⁴ for dividing a state into regions, NUTS system could be used.