

Austrian comments – stacked events

Andreas Heissenberger

Conventional counterpart

- Non GMO parental line not always available
- Justification needs to be based on set criteria, to be included in the document.
- Appropriate non-GM comparators should always be used.
- Codex Alimentarius Commission (2003) “If no isogenic parental line is available , a line as close as possible should be chosen”

Negative segregant

- Not to be used as “conventional” counterpart, i.e. non GM-comparator:
- GMO-Definition from Dir. 2001/18/EC:
 - “(GMO) means an organism, ... , in which the genetic material has been altered in a way that does not occur naturally by mating and/or natural recombination”;
- Comparator document states for single events:
 - “However, effects of the genetic modification process cannot be completely discounted using only a negative segregant as a comparator; therefore the possibility of unintended effects in single events must be assessed using a non-GM conventional counterpart.”

Main aspects

- For stacks a set of different comparators is needed
- True conventional counterpart should be obligatory
 - Non GM parental line
 - Same or similar breeding history
 - Justification criteria for exclusion of conventional counterpart must be clearly defined
- Additional comparators
 - Single events or stacks that have been used in creating the stack under assessment
 - Negative segregants