

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. cable	Re: [U.S. Biotechnology Information] (4 pages)	02/10/1995	P1/b(1)
002. cable	[duplicate of 001] (4 pages)	02/13/1995	P1/b(1)
003. cable	Re: [U.S. Agricultural Biotechnology] (3 pages)	03/06/1995	P1/b(1)
004. cable	Re: Agricultural Biotechnology (5 pages)	03/06/1995	P1/b(1) <i>re 4/3/2020</i>
005. cable	Re: [The Agricultural Biotechnology Industry in Europe] (3 pages)	03/15/1995	P1/b(1)
006. cable	Re: [Wester Europe's Agricultural Biotechnology Industry] (5 pages)	03/15/1995	P1/b(1)
007. cable	Re: [Chinese Agricultural Biotechnology Industry] (3 pages)	03/29/1995	P1/b(1)
008. cable	Re: UK Interest in Agricultural Biotechnology (8 pages)	05/11/1995	P1/b(1) <i>re 4/3/2020</i>
009. cable	Re: [Dutch Development of Agricultural Biotechnology] (4 pages)	05/18/1995	P1/b(1)
010. cable	Re: Swiss Policy on Agricultural Biotechnology (4 pages)	07/24/1995	P1/b(1) <i>re 4/3/2020</i>
011. cable	Re: [Positions on Genetically Altered Agricultural Products] (2 pages)	08/01/1995	P1/b(1)
012. cable	Re: [Approval of GMO Product] (3 pages)	10/24/1995	P1/b(1) <i>re 4/3/2020</i>

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F
ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
013. cable	Re: [Public Opinion Strategy on Agricultural Biotechnology Issues] (3 pages)	10/30/1995	P1/b(1)
014. cable	Re: [Opposition of Agricultural Biotechnology] (3 pages)	10/30/1995	P1/b(1)
015. cable	Re: [Concern Over Genetically Modified Organisms] (3 pages)	10/31/1995	P1/b(1)
016. cable	Re: [Problems of Introducing Agricultural Biotechnology] (4 pages)	11/03/1995	P1/b(1)
017. cable	Re: [Genetically Modified Soybean Regulation] (3 pages)	12/07/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F

ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Cable

PREC: ROUTINE
CLASS: UNCLASSIFIED
LINE1: RAAUZYUW RUEHLOA1181 0241647-UUUU--RHEHAAX.
LINE2: ZNR UUUUU ZZH
LINE3: R 241647Z JAN 95
LINE4: FM AMEMBASSY LONDON
OSRI: RUEHLO
DTG: 241647Z JAN 95
ORIG: AMEMBASSY LONDON
TO: RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 3699
INFO: RUEHXQ/ALL EUROPEAN UNION POST COLLECTIVE
RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA 0631
SUBJ: UK ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NOVEL FOODS REPORTS
ON GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOODS

TEXT:
UNCLAS LONDON 001181

DEPT PASS AGRICULTURE ELECTRONICALLY FOR
FAS/ITP/SCHROETER; FAS/ITP/FAY; FAS/OFSTS/HARBERT;
FAS/HTP/PIASON; APHIS/GIDDINGS; FAA/AO/NE/NICKS

E.O. 12356: N/A
TAGS: EAGR, ETRD, EUN, UK
SUBJECT: UK ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NOVEL FOODS REPORTS
ON GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOODS

1. THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NOVEL FOODS AND PROCESSES
(FAC) DISCUSSED THE FOLLOWING GENETICALLY MODIFIED (GM)
FOOD PRODUCTS:

TOMATO PASTE FROM GM TOMATOES; OIL FROM GM OILSEED
RAPE; AND PROCESSED FOOD PRODUCTS DERIVED FROM GM
SOYBEAN LINES.

2. THE COMMITTEE SAW NO REASON WHY EACH OF THE THREE
PRODUCTS SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED FOR HUMAN FOOD USE AND
THIS ADVICE HAS BEEN ACCEPTED BY MINISTERS.

3. THE FAC WILL BE CONSIDERING THE LABELING ASPECTS OF
THE THREE PRODUCTS DURING FEBRUARY. NONE OF THE
PRODUCTS WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR SALE IN THE UK UNTIL THE
FAC HAS GIVEN ITS ADVICE ON LABELING IN EACH CASE. DEAL
BT
#1181

NNNN

SECT: SECTION: 01 OF 01

SSN: 1181

TOR: 950124142516 M1475382

DIST:

SIT: NSC

☐

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. cable	Re: [U.S. Biotechnology Information] (4 pages)	02/10/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F
ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. cable	[duplicate of 001] (4 pages)	02/13/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F
ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. cable	Re: [U.S. Agricultural Biotechnology] (3 pages)	03/06/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F
ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Cable

PREC: ROUTINE
CLASS: ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
LINE1: RAACZYUW RUEHCAA4634 0651942-CCCC--RHEHAAX.
LINE2: ZNY CCCCC ZZH
LINE3: R 061938Z MAR 95
LINE4: FM SECSTATE WASHDC
OSRI: RUEHC
DTG: 061938Z MAR 95
ORIG: SECSTATE WASHDC
TO: RUEHBS/AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS 0000
RUEHFR/AMEMBASSY PARIS 0000
RUEHOL/AMEMBASSY BONN 0000
RUEHTC/AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE 0000
RUEHSW/AMEMBASSY BERN 0000
RUEHLO/AMEMBASSY LONDON 0000
RUEHBS/USEU BRUSSELS
INFO: RUEHTH/AMEMBASSY ATHENS 0000
RUEHDL/AMEMBASSY DUBLIN 0000
RUEHMD/AMEMBASSY MADRID 0000
RUEHLI/AMEMBASSY LISBON 0000
RUEHCP/AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN 0000
RUEHLE/AMEMBASSY LUXEMBOURG 0000
SUBJ: AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY (C-TT5-00161)

TEXT:
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ STATE 054634

NOFORN

E.O. 12356: DECL:OADR
TAGS: AINF, KPRP, PINR, BE, FR, GM, NL, SZ, UK
SUBJECT: AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY (C-TT5-00161)

1. (~~CONFIDENTIAL~~) NOFORN - ENTIRE TEXT)

2. IN RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FROM THE OFFICE OF THE US TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND AGRICULTURE, AND THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY, WASHINGTON ANALYSTS MONITOR DEVELOPMENTS IN AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY. AS PART OF THIS TASKING, THEY RECENTLY FINISHED A PAPER ON MOUNTING POLICY DISPUTES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN UNION (EU) OVER AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY. ANALYSTS FIND THE SUMMARIES OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL JOURNAL ARTICLES FORWARDED TO WASHINGTON VERY HELPFUL AND APPRECIATE POSTS' EFFORTS TO PROVIDE THE MATERIAL. ANALYSTS WOULD ALSO APPRECIATE NEW REPORTING FROM POSTS IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS PROVIDED BELOW REGARDING FUNDING, PATENTS AND REGULATIONS, AND

ONGOING TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH EFFORTS BY THE EU IN THE AREA OF AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526, Sec. 3.5 (b)
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VR NARA, Date 7/26/2014
2016-0529-M (1.26)

3. ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND: THE EU MAINTAINS SEVERAL BARRIERS TO THE IMPORTATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY PRODUCTS. SUCH PRODUCTS INCLUDE: TRANSGENIC PLANTS (HERBICIDE AND VIRUS-RESISTANT CROPS, AND HEAT/DROUGHT/FROST TOLERANT CROPS), TRANSGENIC ANIMALS (ANIMALS DEVELOPED TO BE "PHARMACEUTICAL FACTORIES" BY INSERTING A GENE TO INDUCE THE PRODUCTION OF HUMAN PHARMACEUTICALS IN THE ANIMALS' MILK OR FOR LEANER MEAT OR HIGHER MILK YIELDS, ETC.), VETERINARY BIOPHARMACEUTICALS AND VACCINES (SUCH AS BST), AND BIOPESTICIDES AND BIOHERBICIDES. EU'S APPROVAL PROCESS AND PATENTING POLICIES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS HAVE HAMPERED US FIRMS--CURRENTLY LEADING WORLDWIDE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW PRODUCTS--IN THEIR EUROPEAN SALES EFFORTS.

4. FOR EXAMPLE, THE EU BANNED THE SALE OF US-DEVELOPED BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN (BST) BECAUSE OF SOCIAL AND MARKET CONCERNS RATHER THAN PURELY SCIENTIFIC REASONS AS REQUIRED BY THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE (GATT). AT THE SAME TIME THAT US MARKET ACCESS IS BEING INHIBITED, THE EU AND INDIVIDUAL MEMBER GOVERNMENTS ARE INCREASING SUBSIDIES TO EUROPEAN AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY FIRMS AND DEVELOPING REGULATORY ENVIRONMENTS MORE AMENABLE FOR R AND D. INDUSTRY ANALYSTS BELIEVE THESE MOVES SUGGEST THAT EU GOVERNMENTS MAY BE USING MARKET BARRIERS TO BUY TIME FOR EU FIRMS TO DEVELOP AND COMMERCIALIZE THEIR OWN PRODUCTS.

5. AS A RESULT, US POLICYMAKERS AND INDUSTRY ARE GROWING INCREASINGLY CONCERNED THAT FUTURE GENETICALLY-ENGINEERED AGRICULTURAL PROJECTS, SUCH AS THE SOYBEAN OR THE TOMATO, WILL NOT FIND OPEN EUROPEAN MARKETS AND THAT THEY WILL FACE GROWING COMPETITION FROM GOVERNMENT-SUPPORTED EUROPEAN FIRMS IN EMERGING AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY MARKETS. THESE EFFORTS TO LIMIT US MARKET ACCESS WILL BECOME INCREASINGLY IMPORTANT AS THE AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY GROWS OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS FROM APPROXIMATELY \$3 BILLION IN SALES IN 1993 TO WHAT INDUSTRY

ANALYSTS EXPECT TO BECOME A \$50 BILLION MARKET IN THE YEAR 2000.

6. RECOGNIZED EUROPEAN AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY FIRMS AND RESEARCH INSTITUTES PROGRAMS LISTED IN PRIORITY ORDER BY COUNTRY:

--BELGIUM: PLANT GENETIC SYSTEMS (ALSO KNOWN AS PGS).

--FRANCE: BIOAVENIR, GROUP LIMAGRAIN, RHONE POULENC, PASTEUR INSTITUTE, AND INRA.

--GERMANY: HOECHST, ROBERT KOCH INSTITUTE, MAX PLANCK (INSTITUTE FOR BREEDING RESEARCH, COLOGNE), BAYER, AND BASF.

--THE NETHERLANDS: MOGEN, VAN DER HAVE, GENE PHARMING EUROPE (US SUBSIDIARY), AND WAGENINGEN AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY.

--SWITZERLAND: FREDRICH MIESCHER INSTITUTE, CIBA SEEDS,
AND SANDOZ.

--UNITED KINGDOM: AGRICULTURAL GENETICS, ZENECA SEEDS,
JOHN INNES INSTITUTE, NOTTINGHAM UNIVERSITY, UNILEVER, AND
PPL THERAPEUTICS (FORMERLY PHARMACEUTICAL PROTEINS
LIMITED).

A. FUNDING: ANALYSTS BELIEVE THAT EU GOVERNMENTS PROVIDE
LARGE SUBSIDIES TO THE EU AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY
INDUSTRY IN ORDER TO INCREASE EU TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES.
ANALYSTS NEED CONTINUED REPORTING ON FUNDING, BOTH BY EU
AND MEMBER STATES, TO HELP THEM DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE
VIEW OF PRECISELY HOW THE EU FUNDS AGRICULTURAL
BIOTECHNOLOGY. QUALITY, DETAILED INFORMATION HAS IN THE
PAST PROVED DIFFICULT TO ACQUIRE.

1) WHICH EUROPEAN FIRMS RECEIVE GOVERNMENT FUNDS FOR
AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY? HOW MUCH FUNDING DO THEY
RECEIVE? WHAT ARE THE MECHANISMS--MINISTRIES OR

PROGRAMS--INVOLVED? ARE GOVERNMENT FUNDS EARMARKED FOR
SPECIFIC PROJECTS? IF SO, WHICH ONES?

2) WHICH PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS RECEIVE GOVERNMENT FUNDING
FOR AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY? HOW MUCH FUNDING DO THEY
RECEIVE?

3) DO PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS RECEIVE ANY FUNDING? IF SO,
HOW MUCH?

4) HOW ARE AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY FUNDS ALLOCATED?
DOES FUNDING COME FROM THE EU OR FROM INDIVIDUAL MEMBER
STATE GOVERNMENTS? IS AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY FUNDING
INCREASING?

5) DO US FIRMS HAVE ACCESS TO FUNDING FOR AGRICULTURAL
BIOTECHNOLOGY? IF NOT, ON WHAT BASIS IS IT DENIED?

6) WHICH SPECIFIC GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ARE PROVIDING THE
MOST AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY FUNDING?

7) IS FUNDING PART OF AN OVERALL BIOTECHNOLOGY PLAN? IF
SO, HOW MUCH IS ALLOCATED TO AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY?
IF NOT, IS FUNDING FOCUSED SOLELY ON AGRICULTURAL
BIOTECHNOLOGY?

8) HOW WILL TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER OCCUR FROM GOVERNMENT
LABORATORIES FOR COMMERCIALIZATION?

9) IS THERE ANY EU FUNDING AVAILABLE, OTHER THAN FROM THE
FRAMEWORK? IF SO, HOW IS FUNDING BEING USED?

B. PATENTS AND REGULATIONS: PATENT AND REGULATORY ISSUES
IN BIOTECHNOLOGY DIFFER SLIGHTLY FROM THOSE IN OTHER
INDUSTRIES BECAUSE THE BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY IS
RELATIVELY YOUNG AND TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENTS OCCUR QUICKLY,

OFTEN OUTPACING GOVERNMENT PATENT AND REGULATORY POLICIES. THE RESULT IS THAT PATENT POLICIES OFTEN DO NOT PROTECT BIOTECHNOLOGY PRODUCTS, AND REGULATIONS OFTEN HINDER MARKETING OF PRODUCTS AND TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT.

AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY PATENT POLICIES AND REGULATIONS WORLDWIDE ARE STILL IN THE FORMATIVE STAGES.

- 1) WHAT PRODUCTS CURRENTLY RECEIVE PATENT PROTECTION? FOR EXAMPLE, THE UNITED STATES HAS HAD DIFFICULTY PATENTING THE "ONCO-MOUSE." DO OTHER PRODUCTS RECEIVE PATENT PROTECTION?
- 2) DO PATENT POLICIES OR JUST IMPLEMENTATION OF THOSE POLICIES DIFFER FROM THOSE IN THE UNITED STATES? IF SO, HOW DO THEY DIFFER?
- 3) CAN INDIVIDUAL MEMBER STATES PROVIDE MORE PATENT PROTECTION THAN THE EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE (EPO)? IF SO, TO WHAT EXTENT? WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S ONGOING DISCUSSIONS TO CHANGE PATENT COVERAGE FOR AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY? WHERE DO INDIVIDUAL MEMBER STATES, SUCH AS GERMANY, STAND ON THE ISSUE?

C. REGULATORY POLICY: MANY EXPERTS PREDICT THAT REGULATORY STANDARDS WILL PLAY A KEY ROLE IN THE COMPETITIVENESS OF THE AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY.

- 1) WHAT FIELD TRIAL REGULATIONS EXIST IN EACH COUNTRY? (NOTE: FIELD TRIAL REGULATIONS ARE BASED ON EU DIRECTIVES FOR CONTAINED USE/DELIBERATE RELEASE OF GENETICALLY-MODIFIED ORGANISMS.) IS IT MORE DIFFICULT FOR US FIRMS TO OBTAIN APPROVAL FOR FIELD TRIALS THAN EU FIRMS? FOR EXAMPLE, FRANCE HAS A REPUTATION FOR TAKING A PRAGMATIC APPROACH TOWARD INTERPRETING AGRICULTURAL REGULATIONS. WASHINGTON ANALYSTS WOULD LIKE TO ASSESS WHETHER FRENCH REGULATIONS ARE MORE LAX THAN THOSE OF OTHER EU MEMBER STATES.
- 2) ARE REGULATIONS INHIBITING RESEARCH OR CREATING NON-TARIFF TRADE BARRIERS, OTHER THAN MANDATORY LABELING OF GENETICALLY-ENGINEERED FOODS AND THE BAN ON GROWTH HORMONES AND BST? IF SO, HOW?
- 3) HOW ARE MEMBER STATES OTHERWISE BIASED AGAINST US FIRMS AND PRODUCTS? WHAT GOVERNMENT OFFICES HAVE THE POWER TO LIMIT US ACCESS TO THE EU MARKET, FOR EXAMPLE, THE COMMITTEE FOR VETERINARY MEDICINAL PRODUCTS (CVMP), AND TO WHAT EXTENT DO THEY DO IT?
- 4) WHAT ARE FUTURE EUROPEAN COMMISSION PLANS FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY PRODUCTS?
- 5) WHAT TRADE RESTRICTIONS EXIST FOR SEEDS IN THE EU? WHAT PERTINENT REGULATIONS EXIST, OTHER THAN GENETIC ENGINEERING DIRECTIVES?

6) WHAT REGULATIONS EXIST FOR ANIMAL RESEARCH?

D. TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH EFFORTS: AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY PRODUCTS THAT ARE IN THE PIPELINE AND THAT ARE LIKELY TO REACH THE MARKET OVER THE NEXT FIVE TO SEVEN YEARS ARE OF GREAT INTEREST TO POLICYMAKERS SINCE THEY GIVE SOME INDICATION OF THE TYPES OF POLICY ISSUES THAT WILL CONFRONT THEM.

1) WHAT ARE LIKELY TO BE THE FIRST PRODUCTS TO MARKET? IF THE PRODUCT IS LOCAL, WHICH FIRM DEVELOPED IT? WAS THE RESEARCH GOVERNMENT FUNDED?

2) EU AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY SEEMS FOCUSED PRIMARILY ON PLANTS. DO EXAMPLES EXIST OF TECHNICAL ACHIEVEMENTS INVOLVING ANIMALS OR VETERINARY BIOPHARMACEUTICALS, OTHER THAN THE UNITED KINGDOM'S PPL THERAPEUTICS OR THE NETHERLANDS' GENE PHARMING EUROPE?

3) WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED MARKETS, PARTICULARLY IN THE EU, FOR AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY PRODUCTS ALREADY BEING DEVELOPED?

4) WHAT ARE THE LEADING GOVERNMENT LABORATORIES, INCLUDING THEIR RESEARCH CONCENTRATION?

7. PLEASE CITE C-TT5-00161 IN THE SUBJECT LINE OF

REPORTING IN RESPONSE TO THE ABOVE QUESTIONS. CHRISTOPHER
BT
#4634

NNNN

SECT: SECTION: 01 OF 01

SSN: 4634

TOR: 950306144510 M1548914

DIST:

SIT: NSC

<^DIST>

PRT: SPETRINO

□

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

005. cable	Re: [The Agricultural Biotechnology Industry in Europe] (3 pages)	03/15/1995	P1/b(1)
------------	---	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F
ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

006. cable	Re: [Wester Europe's Agricultural Biotechnology Industry] (5 pages)	03/15/1995	P1/b(1)
------------	---	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F
ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
007. cable	Re: [Chinese Agricultural Biotechnology Industry] (3 pages)	03/29/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F
ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Cable

PREC: ROUTINE
CLASS: ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
LINE1: RAACZYUW RUEHLOA6814 1311725-CCCC--RHEHAAX.
LINE2: ZNY CCCCC ZZH
LINE3: R 111725Z MAY 95
LINE4: FM AMEMBASSY LONDON
OSRI: RUEHLO
DTG: 111725Z MAY 95
ORIG: AMEMBASSY LONDON
TO: RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 8576
INFO: RUEHLOE/AMCONSUL EDINBURGH 6215
RUEHLOB/AMCONSUL BELFAST 6888
SUBJ: UK INTEREST IN AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY
(C-TT5-00161)

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526, Sec. 3.5 (b)
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By V2 NARA, Date 11/26/2015
2016-0524-m (1.30)

TEXT:
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 01 OF 04 LONDON 006814

DEPT FOR OES/STH, OES/ETC, OES/E

DEPT PASS WHITE HOUSE FOR OEP, OSTP - RACHEL LEVINSON

DEPT PASS AGRICULTURE FOR FAS/ITP/ROBERTS AND APHIS

DEPT PASS EPA FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DEPT PASS USDOC FOR UNDERSECRETARY MARY GOOD AND NOAA

DEPT PASS FOR USDOE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DEPT PASS NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATMON FOR INTERNATIONAL
PROGRAMS

E.O. 12356: N/A
TAGS: TBIO, AINF, KSCA, PINR, UK
SUBJECT: UK INTEREST IN AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY
(C-TT5-00161)

REF: A) STATE 54634, B) LONDON 4356, C) LONDON 6551

1. (~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ NOFORN - ENTIRE TEXT)

2. POST CONTINUES TO EXPLORE ISSUES RAISED BY REF THROUGH
LOCAL CONTACTS AND WILL UPDATE DEPARTMENT AS NECESSARY.
THIS MESSAGE IS A SUMMARY OF POST'S INFORMATION TO DATE.
RESPONSES ARE KEYED TO REFTEL A'S FORMAT.

A. FUNDING

1). IT IS DIFFICULT TO CALCULATE THE AMOUNT OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS WHICH INDIVIDUAL COMPANIES RECEIVE DUE TO THE FUNDING SCHEMES WHICH ARE PREVALENT IN THE UK. THE THREE CHIEF MECHANISMS FOR UK GOVERNMENT FUNDING ARE THE BIOTECHNOLOGY AND BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES RESEARCH COUNCIL (BBSRC), THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES, AND FOOD (MAFF), AND THE UNIVERSITIES FUNDING COUNCIL (UFC). MOST FIRMS INVOLVED IN BIOTECHNOLOGY ENGAGE IN COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH EFFORTS WITH UNIVERSITIES AND GOVERNMENT RESEARCH COUNCILS SUCH AS THE BBSRC AND THE MEDICAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (MRC). AS PART OF ITS EFFORT TO IMPLEMENT THE OUTCOMES OF THE TECHNOLOGY FORESIGHT PROGRAM, THE UK GOVERNMENT HAS RENEWED ITS EMPHASIS ON COLLABORATIVE R AND D PROJECTS BETWEEN INDUSTRY, ACADEMIA, AND THE GOVERNMENT THROUGH PROGRAMS SUCH AS LINK. (THE TECHNOLOGY FORESIGHT PROGRAM IS A STUDY WHICH WAS COMMISSIONED BY THE UK GOVERNMENT FOLLOWING THE PUBLICATION OF THE WHITE PAPER, "REALISING OUR POTENTIAL", TO RECOMMEND WAYS IN WHICH THE UK COULD PROMOTE INDUSTRIALLY RELEVANT RESEARCH. THE LINK PROGRAM IS ONE OF TWO MECHANISMS, ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY (DTI), WHICH WILL BE USED TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TECHNOLOGY FORESIGHT EXERCISE.) IN ITS 1995-96 SCIENCE BUDGET, THE GOVERNMENT ALLOCATED BPS 161.6 MILLION TO THE BBSRC, BPS 277.8 MILLION TO THE MRC, AND BPS 3 MILLION TO THE LINK PROGRAM. (THE CURRENT EXCHANGE RATE IS APPROXIMATELY USD 1.60 EQUALS BPS ONE POUND.) THE SCIENCE BUDGET ALSO IDENTIFIED SIX "STRATEGIC" AREAS FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORT, INCLUDING GENOME STUDIES, IMMUNOLOGY, BIOPROCESSING INFORMATION, AND WEALTH-CREATION FROM PLANTS, WHICH THE SCIENCE BUDGET DEFINES AS "MANIPULATING THE METABOLIC PATHWAYS WITHIN PLANTS TO PRODUCE A RANGE OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS SUCH AS FINE CHEMICALS, POLYMERS, VACCINES, BIOPHARMACEUTICALS, DESIGNER OILS, AND MODIFIED STARCHES.

2 AND 3). THE BBSRC SUPPORTS MUCH OF THE AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH IN THE UK THROUGH SPECIAL INITIATIVES, DIRECTED PROGRAMS, AND ITS RESEARCH INSTITUTES. SPECIAL INITIATIVES WHICH THE BBSRC FUNDED IN 1994 INCLUDED BIOLOGY OF SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHIES, THE PIG (PORCINE) SCIENCE PROGRAM, PLANT AND ANIMAL GENOME ANALYSIS, AND STEM CELL MOLECULAR BIOLOGY. DIRECTED PROGRAMS PROMOTE COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE SCIENCE BASE (NON-INDUSTRY RESEARCHERS AND SCIENTISTS) AND INDUSTRY AND ARE ADMINISTERED THROUGH THE AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS DIRECTORATE AND THE FOOD DIRECTORATE OF THE BBSRC. THE AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS DIRECTORATE AWARDS GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES FOR COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS: CROP AND LIVESTOCK IMPROVEMENT, CROP AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION, CROP PROTECTION, ANIMAL HEALTH AND WELFARE, AND AGRICULTURE/ENVIRONMENT INTERACTIONS. THE FOOD DIRECTORATE SOLICITS RESEARCH PROPOSALS FROM UNIVERSITIES WISHING TO COLLABORATE WITH INDUSTRY FOR STRATEGIC RESEARCH INTO THE AGRICULTURE AND HORTICULTURE INDUSTRIES WHICH RELATE TO THE QUALITY OF FOOD AND RAW MATERIALS. BBSRC SPONSORED INSTITUTES INCLUDE THE JOHN INNES CENTRE, THE ROSLIN INSTITUTE, THE INSTITUTE FOR ANIMAL HEALTH, AND THE BABRAHAM INSTITUTE. IN ADDITION, THE INSTITUTE OF ARABLE CROPS

RESEARCH RECEIVS 38 PERCENT OF ITS FUNDING FROM BBSRC, 25.5 PERCENT FROM MAFF, AND 36.5 PERCENT FROM INDUSTRY AND GRANTS.

4). THE BULK OF AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY FUNDS ARE ALLOCATED THROUGH THE BRITISH RESEARCH COUNCILS (PRINCIPALLY, THE BBSRC). THE 1995-96 BRITISH SCIENCE BUDGET REPRESENTS A SLIGHT INCREASE OVER THE 1994 BUDGET
~~C O N F I D E N T I A L~~ SECTION 02 OF 04 LONDON 006814

DEPT FOR OES/STH, OES/ETC, OES/E

DEPT PASS WHITE HOUSE FOR OEP, OSTP - RACHEL LEVINSON

DEPT PASS AGRICULTURE FOR FAS/ITP/ROBERTS AND APHIS

DEPT PASS EPA FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DEPT PASS USDOC FOR UNDERSECRETARY MARY GOOD AND NOAA

DEPT PASS FOR USDOE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DEPT PASS NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

E.O. 12356: N/A

TAGS: TBIO, AINF, KSCA, PINR, UK

SUBJECT: UK INTEREST IN AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY
(C-TT5-00161)

FORECAST. THOUGH THE CURRENT BUDGET INCLUDES MANY INITIATIVES AIMED AT BIOTECHNOLOGICAL R AND D AND AT IMPROVING TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER, IN REAL TERMS, UK GOVERNMENT SPENDING ON RESEARCH HAS DECLINED EVERY YEAR SINCE 1989.

5). US FIRMS MAY PARTICIPATE IN COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH EFFORTS IN THE UK AND MAY APPLY FOR GRANTS FOR RESEARCH PERFORMED IN THE UK. (RECENTLY, TWO US FIRMS, BIOGEN, AND CYTEL, INC., HAVE SPONSORED PROJECTS AT THE MRC.)

6). THE BBSRC PROVIDES THE BULK OF FUNDING FOR AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY. OTHER FUNDING SOURCES ARE THE UFC, MAFF, THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (OST), AND THE DTI.

7). THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT HAS NO STATED BIOTECHNOLOGICAL "PLAN". HOWEVER, IT HAS INITIATED CONCERTED EFFORTS (I.E. TECHNOLOGY FORESIGHT, LINK, THE WHITE PAPER, "REALISING OUR POTENTIAL", AND THE DTI'S INITIATIVE, "BIOTECHNOLOGY MEANS BUSINESS") TO PROMOTE BASIC R AND D AND TO IMPROVE BRITISH GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS THROUGH IMPROVED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER. DUE TO THE EXCELLENCE OF BIOTECHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN BRITAIN, AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY IS ONE AREA IN WHICH THE GOVERNMENT BELIEVES THE UK HAS THE POTENTIAL TO BE A WORLD LEADER.

8). THE TECHNOLOGY FORESIGHT PROGRAM IDENTIFIED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AS ESSENTIAL TO BRITISH GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS. THROUGH PROGRAMS SUCH AS LINK, WHICH PROMOTES COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH EFFORTS BETWEEN INDUSTRY, ACADEMIA, AND THE PUBLIC

SECTOR; THE "REALISING OUR POTENTIAL" AWARD SCHEME, WHICH AIMS TO ENHANCE COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE UK SCIENCE BASE AND INDUSTRY BY GRANTING AWARDS TO SCIENTISTS INVOLVED IN INDUSTRIALLY RELEVANT RESEARCH; AND THE INNOVATIVE MANUFACTURING INITIATIVE, THE GOVERNMENT HOPES TO SPEED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER. IN ADDITION, THE BBSRC AWARDS GRANTS TO PROJECTS WHICH EMPHASIZE RESEARCH THAT CORRESPONDS WITH INDUSTRY NEEDS. THERE IS A GENERAL TREND IN THE UK TOWARDS "NEEDS PULL" RESEARCH (BASED ON INDUSTRY DEMANDS) RATHER THAN "SCIENCE PUSH" RESEARCH (RESEARCH FOR RESEARCH'S SAKE). THE TECHNOLOGY FORESIGHT PROGRAM IS PUBLISHING A SERIES OF RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH WILL ADDRESS, AMONG OTHER TOPICS, THE ISSUE OF TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.

B. PATENTS AND REGULATIONS

1). PATENT REGULATIONS ARE INTERPRETED SO THAT IF CLAIMS ARE DIRECTED TO TAXONOMIC GROUPS OF PLANTS OR ANIMALS WHICH ARE LARGER THAN PLANT OR ANIMAL VARIETIES, THEN THE CLAIM MAY BE ACCEPTABLE PROVIDED IT IS APPARENT FROM THE DESCRIPTION THAT THE INVENTION IS APPLICABLE TO THIS LARGER GROUP. THERE IS A DESIRE IN THE UK TO MOVE PATENTING AWAY FROM MORAL AND ETHICAL QUESTIONS WHICH, TO DATE, SEEM TO PLAGUE EUROPEAN DISCUSSIONS ON PATENTABILITY. (REFTEL B) ACCORDING TO RON JAMES, MANAGING DIRECTOR OF BRITAIN'S PPL THERAPEUTICS, "IN EUROPE, ETHICAL AND ANIMAL WELFARE ISSUES HAVE WRONGLY DOMINATED THE DEBATE ON WHAT SHOULD BE PATENTABLE."

2). PATENT POLICIES IN THE UK ARE GENERALLY SIMILAR TO THOSE IN THE US, HOWEVER, THERE ARE SOME KEY DIFFERENCES. THE FIRST IS THAT IN THE UK PATENTS ARE GRANTED TO THE FIRST TO FILE AS OPPOSED TO THE FIRST-TO-INVENT RULE USED IN THE US. A SECOND DIFFERENCE IS THE AUTOMATIC PUBLICATION OF PATENT DETAILS IN 18 MONTHS. BRITISH BIOTECH FIRMS HAVE INDICATED THAT THESE ARE TWO COMPONENTS OF THE BRITISH SYSTEM WHICH THEY FIND PREFERABLE TO THE US SYSTEM. IN A SURVEY BY ARTHUR ANDERSON, FIRMS INDICATED DISSATISFACTION WITH THE HIGH COST (BOTH IN-HOUSE AND FOR EXTERNAL ADVISORS), THE AMOUNT OF TIME IT TAKES FOR CLAIMS TO BE PROCESSED, AND THE GENERAL COMPLEXITY OF THE BRITISH PATENT PROCESS. ADDITIONALLY, THEY INDICATED THAT THEY WOULD PREFER TO HAVE A GRACE PERIOD OF TWELVE MONTHS FOR PRIOR PUBLICATION, AS IS THE CASE UNDER US PATENT LAW.

3). THE REJECTION OF THE EU BIOTECHNOLOGY PATENT DIRECTIVE WAS NOT CONSIDERED A MAJOR BLOW BY THE BRITISH BIOTECH
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 03 OF 04 LONDON 006814

DEPT FOR OES/STH, OES/ETC, OES/E

DEPT PASS WHITE HOUSE FOR OEP, OSTP - RACHEL LEVINSON

DEPT PASS AGRICULTURE FOR FAS/ITP/ROBERTS AND APHIS

DEPT PASS EPA FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DEPT PASS USDOC FOR UNDERSECRETARY MARY GOOD AND NOAA

DEPT PASS FOR USDOE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DEPT PASS NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

E.O. 12356: N/A

TAGS: TBIO, AINF, KSCA, PINR, UK

SUBJECT: UK INTEREST IN AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY
(C-TT5-00161)

INDUSTRY, WHICH BELIEVES THAT UK PATENT LAW PROVIDES FOR GREATER PROTECTION THAN THE PROPOSED DIRECTIVE WOULD HAVE. THAT BEING SAID, HOWEVER, THERE IS A DESIRE TO HAVE HARMONIZED POLICIES THROUGHOUT EUROPE. RON JAMES, MANAGING DIRECTOR OF PPL THERAPEUTICS ADDED THAT "UK BIOPHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES HAVE FOR FAR TOO LONG HAD NO ALTERNATIVE BUT TO LIVE WITH THE ASSUMPTION THAT WE CAN OBTAIN SENSIBLE PATENT COVER IN EUROPE FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS WE HAVE MADE IF OUR BUILT-IN ASSUMPTION TURNS OUT TO HAVE BEEN WRONG THERE WILL BE A MAJOR HICCUP." THE BRITISH BIOTECH INDUSTRY HAS EXPRESSED A GENERAL MISTRUST OF EUROPEAN PATENT PROTECTION. THIS IS PARTLY DUE TO THE FACT THAT A "EUROPEAN PATENT" CAN BE OVERRIDDEN AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL (AND VICE VERSA) AND PARTLY BECAUSE THE BIOTECH INDUSTRY IS DEVELOPING AT SUCH A FAST PACE. SOME BRITISH BIOTECH EXECUTIVES FEEL THAT THE EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE HAS BEEN GRANTING PATENTS FOR GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS (GMOS) THAT ARE TOO BROAD.

C. REGULATORY POLICY

1). UK REGULATIONS REQUIRE LOCAL WRITTEN CONSENT FOR ALL GMO WORK AND NOTIFICATION TO THE GOVERNMENT HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE. THE UK TENDS TO FALL IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SPECTRUM WITH REGARD TO INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EU DIRECTIVES ON REGULATION. THE VIEW HERE IS THAT GERMANY AND DENMARK TAKE A STRICTER STANCE, WHILE FRANCE AND BELGIUM HAVE LESS STRINGENT POLICIES. THERE ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT REGULATORY OBSTACLES TO US FIRMS TRYING TO OBTAIN FIELD TRIAL APPROVALS IN THE UK.

2.) UK REGULATIONS DO NOT POSE NON-TARIFF BARRIERS TO US FIRMS. HOWEVER, IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT MANY UK FIRMS TEND TO FEEL THAT US REGULATIONS ARE MORE TRANSPARENT AND STREAMLINED. THERE IS A FEAR AMONG SOME THAT THIS FACTOR, REAL OR PERCEIVED, WILL LEAD TO INCREASING NUMBERS OF BRITISH FIRMS CONDUCTING RESEARCH IN THE US. IN THE UK, ASSESSMENTS ARE HORIZONTAL (PROCESS-BASED), WHICH DOESN'T ALLOW FOR THE "FAST-TRACKING" THAT THE US SYSTEM OF VERTICAL (PRODUCT-BASED) ASSESSMENT DOES. BRITISH BIOTECH FIRMS HAVE EXPRESSED A PREFERENCE FOR VERTICAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS.

3). THERE IS AN ACTIVE AND INFLUENTIAL ANIMAL RIGHTS LOBBY IN THE UK. AT THIS TIME, MOST AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH FOCUSES ON PLANTS. (THE ONLY NOTABLE EXCEPTIONS TO THIS IN THE UK ARE PPL THERAPEUTICS AND THE BBSRC.) WITHOUT A CHANGE IN PUBLIC PERCEPTION, THERE IS LITTLE INCENTIVE FOR THE UK GOVERNMENT TO AGGRESSIVELY PROMOTE BIOTECHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH INVOLVING ANIMALS. THE EUROPEAN MEDICAL EVALUATION AGENCY, ESTABLISHED IN LONDON EARLIER THIS YEAR, HAS THE AUTHORITY TO LICENSE AND REGULATE MEDICINES FOR HUMAN AND VETERINARY USE. NEW REGULATIONS CALL FOR THE LICENSING AND REGULATION OF ANY MEDICINAL PRODUCTS DEVELOPED BY THE FOLLOWING BIOTECHNOLOGICAL PROCESSES:

- RECOMBINANT DNA TECHNOLOGY;
- CONTROLLED EXPRESSION OF GENES CODING FOR BIOLOGICALLY ACTIVE PROTEINS;
- HYBRIDOMA AND MONOCLONAL ANTIBODY METHODS;
- ALL PERFORMANCE ENHANCING VETERINARY MEDICINAL PRODUCTS (INCLUDING THOSE NOT DERIVED FROM BIOTECHNOLOGY) WHICH PROMOTE GROWTH OR INCREASE YIELDS.

4). WITH THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT'S RECENT REJECTION OF THE EU BIOTECHNOLOGY PATENT DIRECTIVE, IT IS DIFFICULT TO SAY AT THIS TIME HOW THE EU POLICY WILL CHANGE IN THE FUTURE. TWO OF THE CHIEF CONCERNS OF THE BRITISH AGRICULTURAL BIOTECH INDUSTRY IN REGARDS TO THE EU DIRECTIVE WERE THE ISSUES OF "FARMER'S PRIVILEGE" AND COMPULSORY CROSS-LICENSING. THESE WILL CONTINUE TO BE AREAS OF INTEREST.

D. TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH EFFORTS

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 04 OF 04 LONDON 006814

DEPT FOR OES/STH, OES/ETC, OES/E

DEPT PASS WHITE HOUSE FOR OEP, OSTP - RACHEL LEVINSON

DEPT PASS AGRICULTURE FOR FAS/ITP/ROBERTS AND APHIS

DEPT PASS EPA FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DEPT PASS USDOC FOR UNDERSECRETARY MARY GOOD AND NOAA

DEPT PASS FOR USDOE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DEPT PASS NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

E.O. 12356: N/A

TAGS: TBIO, AINF, KSCA, PINR, UK

SUBJECT: UK INTEREST IN AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY
(C-TT5-00161)

1.) A FRENCH FIRM, SEITA, IN CONJUNCTION WITH RHONE-POULENC, HAS RECEIVED EUROPEAN MARKETING APPROVAL FOR TOBACCO PLANTS MODIFIED TO WITHSTAND THE BROMOXYNIL HERBICIDE. ONE OF THE

FIRST FOOD PRODUCTS ON THE MARKET COULD BE THE AMILOPECTINE POTATO (A MODIFIED STARCH POTATO) FROM THE FIRM AVEBE. COMPANIES SUCH AS VAN DER HAVE, PGS, AND CIBA GEIGY ARE EXPECTED TO COME OUT WITH HERBICIDE RESISTANT PRODUCTS IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

2). IT IS THE OPINION OF MANY IN THE BRITISH BIOTECH INDUSTRY THAT THE PRODUCTION OF TRANSGENIC ANIMALS IN EUROPE WILL PROBABLY NOT BE FOCUSED ON IMPROVING FOOD AND FIBER ALUE OF AGRICULTURAL ANIMALS FOR SOME YEARS BECAUSE OF ANIMAL RIGHTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PRESSURE GROUPS.

3). MOST OPINION POLLS SUGGEST THAT THE EUROPEAN PUBLIC IS LESS RECEPTIVE TO GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS AND ANIMALS (FOR FOOD) THAN TO BIOPHARMACEUTICALS. HOWEVER, CROP PROTECTION AND CROP ENHANCEMENT ARE TWO PROMISING MARKETS. THERE ARE CURRENTLY NO PEST-RESISTANT CROPS ON THE MARKET, THOUGH THERE ARE SEVERAL IN THE PIPELINE.

4). BBSRC IS AT THE FOREFRONT OF AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH FUNDING. BBSRC-FUNDED RESEARCH IS COVERED IN QUESTIONS 2 AND 3 OF SECTION "A".

COMMENTS:

TECHNOLOGY FORESIGHT

THE RECENTLY PUBLISHED TECHNOLOGY FORESIGHT REPORT ON AGRICULTURE, NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE ENVIRONMENT (REFTEL C) IDENTIFIES AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY AS ONE OF THREE KEY AREAS RECOMMENDED FOR EXTRA INVESTMENT IN "ANIMAL, MICROBIAL, AND PLANT BIOTECHNOLOGY AND COGNATE SCIENCES TO UNDERPIN NEW PRODUCTS AND PROCESSES IN A WIDE RANGE OF ACTIVITIES, E.G. AQUACULTURE AND PHARMACEUTICALS.

APPROVAL OF FOODS FROM GENETICALLY MODIFIED PLANTS

UK GOVERNMENT HAS GIVEN FORMAL SAFETY APPROVAL FOR THREE FOODS DERIVED FROM GENETICALLY MODIFIED PLANTS. THESE INCLUDE TOMATO PASTE FROM ZENECA, UK, RAPESEED OIL FROM PLANT GENETIC SYSTEMS OF BELGIUM, AND SOYA BEAN EXTRACT FROM MONSANTO, A U.S. COMPANY.

CROWE

BT

#6814

NNNN

SECT: SECTION: 01 OF 04

<^SECT>SECTION: 02 OF 04

<^SECT>SECTION: 03 OF 04

<^SECT>SECTION: 04 OF 04

SSN: 6814

<^SSN>6814

<^SSN>6814

<^SSN>6814

TOR: 950511134642 M1663093

<^TOR>950511134644 M1663094

<^TOR>950511134746 M1663095

<^TOR>950511134746 M1663096

DIST:

SIT: NSC

□

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

009. cable	Re: [Dutch Development of Agricultural Biotechnology] (4 pages)	05/18/1995	P1/b(1)
------------	---	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F
ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Cable

PREC: ROUTINE
CLASS: ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
LINE1: RAACZYUW RUEHWA3433 2051527-CCCC--RHEHAAX.
LINE2: ZNY CCCCC ZZH
LINE3: R 241527Z JUL 95
LINE4: FM AMEMBASSY BERN
OSRI: RUEHSW
DTG: 241527Z JUL 95
ORIG: AMEMBASSY BERN
TO: RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 8992
INFO: RUEHBS/USEU BRUSSELS
SUBJ: SWISS POLICY ON AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY (C-
TT5-00161)

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526, Sec. 3.5 (b)
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VL NARA, Date 11/26/2009
2016-0529 - M (1.32)

TEXT:

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 01 OF 02 BERN 003433

E.O. 12356: DECL: OADR
TAGS: AINF, KPRP, PINR, SZ
SUBJECT: SWISS POLICY ON AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY (C-
TT5-00161)

REF: STATE 54634

1. ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ - ENTIRE TEXT.

2. ALTHOUGH MANY OF THE QUESTIONS IN REFTEL WERE DIRECTED TOWARDS EU POLICIES AND PRACTICES, SWISS COMPANIES HAVE ACTIVE PROGRAMS IN BIOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH, AND THE SWISS GOVERNMENT HAS A MUCH MORE OPEN ATTITUDE TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT, AND MARKETING, OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED PRODUCTS. INDEED, NONE OF THE EU RESTRICTIONS IDENTIFIED IN REFTEL EXIST HERE.

3. WE MET WITH SANDOZ, THE FREDRICH MIESCHER INSTITUTE, THE SWISS HEALTH MINISTRY, AND THE SWISS PATENT OFFICE TO OBTAIN ANSWERS TO REFTEL QUESTIONS. WE ALSO ATTEMPTED TO CONTACT CIBA SEEDS, BUT WERE TOLD THAT THEY HAVE MOVED ALL THEIR OPERATIONS TO THE UNITED STATES. ANSWERS BELOW ARE KEYED TO REFTEL.

A. FUNDING

THE SWISS GOVERNMENT PROVIDES FUNDING, FROM THE SCIENCE MINISTRY BUDGET, FOR AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH (ABR). THE MAIN VEHICLE IS THE GOS 'SCHWERPUNKT' (FOCUS) PROGRAM, WHICH TARGETS PROMISING RESEARCH SECTORS; BIOTECHNOLOGY ("THE BIOTECHNOLOGY OF HIGHER PLANTS") IS ONE OF THE IMPORTANT 'MODULES' IN THE SCHWERPUNKT PROGRAM. THE PROGRAM IS ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, WHICH ALSO ESTABLISHES RESEARCH

PRIORITIES. CUMULATIVE SPENDING ON BIOTECHNOLOGY UNDER THIS PROGRAM, ACCORDING TO INDUSTRY ESTIMATES, WAS SFR 37 MILLION BY THE END OF 1994. ACCORDING TO THE FREDERICH MIESCHER INSTITUTE (FMI), ONLY ABOUT ONE-QUARTER OF THE BIOTECH MONEY GOES TO ABR. RECIPIENTS OF THE FUNDS TEND TO BE ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS -- 35 PCT OF THE SFR 37 MILLION WENT TO UNIVERSITIES, 49 PCT TO ETH (SWITZERLAND'S PREMIER RESEARCH/ACADEMIC CENTER), 2 PCT TO ENGINEERING SCHOOLS, 4 PCT TO AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH STATIONS, AND 10 PCT TO PRIVATE FIRMS. ETH RECEIVES THE LARGEST PERCENTAGE OF ABR FUNDS (UP TO 50 PCT) OF ANY SINGLE SWISS INSTITUTION. SWITZERLAND'S LARGEST CHEMICAL COMPANIES (INCLUDING CIBA AND SANDOZ) DO NOT PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROGRAM -- AS A MATTER OF POLICY, THEY DO NOT WANT GOVERNMENT MONEY FOR PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT. FOR THE PERIOD 1996-99, BIOTECH RESEARCH IS SLATED TO RECEIVE SFR 14 MILLION FROM THE SCHWERPUNKT PROGRAM.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ABR COMES FROM A PROGRAM KNOWN AS KFWF (CREDITS FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH). THIS FUND ONLY SUPPORTS JOINT INDUSTRY/ACADEMIC PROJECTS, WITH ALL THE MONEY GOING TO THE UNIVERSITY. AT THE END OF 1992 THERE WERE ONLY 8 PROJECTS IN THE FIELD OF BIOTECHNOLOGY, WITH GOVERNMENT SPENDING VALUED AT SFR 1.9 MILLION AND INDUSTRY SPENDING AT SFR 3.2 MILLION.

SWITZERLAND ALSO PARTICIPATES ON A LIMITED BASIS IN THE EUROPEAN 'EUREKA' PROGRAM, ALTHOUGH OUR SOURCES DID NOT BELIEVE THAT ANY SWISS MONEY HAD GONE FOR ABR. THE SWISS GOVERNMENT IS CURRENTLY NEGOTIATING FOR A PLACE IN THE EU'S FRAMEWORK PROGRAM ON RESEARCH AND WILL CONTRIBUTE HEAVILY TO THAT PROGRAM, BUT IT IS TOO EARLY TO TELL IF THE NEGOTIATIONS WILL BE SUCCESSFUL.

WITH THE EXCEPTION OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH (EXTENSION) SERVICES, THE GOVERNMENT ITSELF DOES NOT CARRY OUT ABR. AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH STATIONS CARRY OUT APPLIED RESEARCH, BUT THEIR ACTIVITIES ARE BEING CUT BACK IN FAVOR OF OTHER RESEARCH PROJECTS.

A5. U.S. FIRMS HAVE THE SAME ACCESS TO ABR FUNDS AS SWISS FIRMS AND INSTITUTIONS.

A7. THERE IS NO OVERALL GOS BIOTECHNOLOGY PLAN. OTHER THAN GIVING THE SECTOR PRIORITY AS A MODULE WITHIN THE SCHWERPUNKT PROGRAM, INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED ON THEIR SPECIFIC MERITS.

A8. BECAUSE OF THE CLOSE COOPERATION BETWEEN INDUSTRY AND ACADEMIC RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS (PARTICULARLY THROUGH THE KFWF PROGRAM), COMMERCIALIZATION IS NOT A PROBLEM. ONE SOURCE REPORTED, HOWEVER, THAT SWISS RESEARCHERS ARE FAR BEHIND THEIR AMERICAN COUNTERPARTS WHEN IT COMES TO SEEKING PATENT PROTECTION FOR THE FRUITS OF THEIR RESEARCH.

B. PATENTS

SWISS PATENT LAW IS IDENTICAL TO MUNICH (THE EUROPEAN PATENT CONVENTION). WHILE, IN THEORY, THE GOS MIGHT PATENT SOMETHING LIKE THE ONCO MOUSE (SINCE THE LAW LEAVES ROOM FOR INTERPRETATION), IN PRACTICE THE GOS WOULD NOT PATENT A CONTROVERSIAL PRODUCT UNTIL A DECISION WAS TAKEN IN MUNICH. OUR IMPRESSION IS THAT THE GOS FOLLOWS THE STRAIGHT AND NARROW WHEN IT COMES TO PATENT
~~C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L~~ SECTION 02 OF 02 BERN 003433

E.O. 12356: DECL: OADR
TAGS: AINF, KPRP, PINR, SZ
SUBJECT: SWISS POLICY ON AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY (C-TT5-00161)

LAW IMPLEMENTATION; THE PROBLEM IS THAT THE LAW IS NOT AS BROAD AS U.S. LEGISLATION IN PROMOTING PATENTABILITY IN THE BIOTECH FIELD.

C. REGULATORY POLICY

ALL OUR SOURCES AGREE THAT GOS REGULATORY POLICY IS SUPPORTIVE OF AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY. FIELD TRIALS HAVE RECENTLY BEEN APPROVED FOR A GENETICALLY MODIFIED VACCINE TO CONTROL RABIES IN FOXES; THERE ARE NO RESTRICTIONS ON SALES OF PRODUCTS FROM ANIMALS WHICH HAVE BEEN GIVEN GROWTH HORMONES OR BST (PROVIDED THERE IS NO RESIDUE); AND HEALTH MINISTRY OFFICIALS TOLD US THERE WOULD BE NO PROBLEM OBTAINING MARKETING APPROVAL FOR ITEMS LIKE THE FLAVOR-SAVOR TOMATO. THE ONLY EXCEPTION TO THIS LAISSEZ FAIRE POLICY IS A LABELING REQUIREMENT FOR GENETICALLY MODIFIED PRODUCTS. BUT EVEN THIS REQUIREMENT ONLY APPLIES TO FINAL PRODUCTS, BUT ADDITIVES WHICH LEAVE NO RESIDUE.

THERE IS NO DISCRIMINATION AGAINST U.S. PRODUCTS. INDEED, SWISS FIRMS CONDUCT MOST OF THEIR ABR IN THE UNITED STATES (THROUGH SUBSIDIARIES OR ACQUISITIONS) AND HAVE ENCOURAGED THE GOS TO MAINTAIN OPEN BORDERS FOR BIOTECH PRODUCTS.

REGARDING FIELD TRIAL REGULATIONS, THE LAW IS SILENT ON THE QUESTION OF TRANSGENIC ORGANISMS. THEREFORE, SUCH TRIALS ARE NOT PROHIBITED. ONE MUST FOLLOW NORMAL SAFETY REQUIREMENTS, HOWEVER. BECAUSE THERE IS NO SEED RESEARCH IN SWITZERLAND, THE QUESTION OF FIELD TRIALS HASN'T ARISEN. SWISS COMPANIES TEND TO DO THEIR SEED TRIALS IN THE U.S., HOLLAND, OR FRANCE. WE CAN PROVIDE COPIES (IN GERMAN OR FRENCH) OF SWISS FIELD TRIAL REGULATIONS, IF THESE WOULD BE HELPFUL.

C5. ACCORDING TO THE INDUSTRY, SWISS LAW IS LESS RESTRICTIVE THAN THE UNITED STATES.

COMMENT: THE OUTLOOK FOR GOS REGULATORY POLICY IS CLOUDED BY A VOTER INITIATIVE (SPEARHEADED BY GREENS AND OTHER LEFT-WING GROUPS) THAT WOULD SEVERELY RESTRICT BIOTECH ACTIVITY IN SWITZERLAND. THE PROPOSED LAW WOULD PROHIBIT THE PRODUCTION OR SALE OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED ANIMALS;

PROHIBIT FIELD RESEARCH; AND DENY PATENTABILITY FOR GENETICALLY MODIFIED PRODUCTS AND PARTS, AS WELL AS PROCESSES. THE GOS OPPOSES THE INITIATIVE BUT MUST SCHEDULE A NATIONAL REFERENDUM BEFORE THE END OF 1996.

C6. WITH RESPECT TO ANIMAL RESEARCH, THE SECTOR IS THE MOST HIGHLY REGULATED OF ANY BIOTECH FIELD. THE LAW REQUIRES THAT THE RESEARCH NOT HURT THE DIGNITY OF THE ANIMAL, WHICH HAS MEANT, INTER ALIA, THAT RABBITS CAN'T BE KEPT IN CAGES. OUR INDUSTRY SOURCES CONSIDER BIOTECH RESEARCH INVOLVING ANIMALS TO HAVE LITTLE FUTURE IN SWITZERLAND. WE CAN PROVIDE THE REGULATIONS IN FRENCH OR GERMAN, IF DESIRED.

D. TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH EFFORTS

THE MOST OFTEN-MENTIONED PRODUCTS ARE PHARMACEUTICALS (DIAGNOSTICS) WHICH COME FROM TRANSGENIC ORGANISMS, AND VIRUS AND HERBICIDE RESISTANT VEGETABLES, ESPECIALLY CORN, SOYA, AND SUGAR BEETS. SANDOZ ALSO MENTIONED SOME OF THE OBVIOUS ONES -- GENETICALLY MODIFIED SEEDS, MILK, TOMATOES, SOYBEANS, AS WELL AS CORN AND OTHER OILSEEDS.

NELSEN

BT

#3433

NNNN

SECT: SECTION: 01 OF 02
<^SECT>SECTION: 02 OF 02
SSN: 3433
<^SSN>3433
TOR: 950724121030 M1778115
<^TOR>950724121141 M1778117
DIST: SIT: GARDNER NSC VERSHBOW
□

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

011. cable	Re: [Positions on Genetically Altered Agricultural Products] (2 pages)	08/01/1995	P1/b(1)
------------	--	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F

ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Cable

PREC: IMMEDIATE

CLASS: UNCLASSIFIED

LINE1: OAAUZYUW RUEHSMA6371 2921559-UUUU--RHEHAAX.

LINE2: ZNR UUUUU ZZH

LINE3: O 191559Z OCT 95

LINE4: FM AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM

OSRI: RUEHSM

DTG: 191559Z OCT 95

ORIG: AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM

TO: RUEHIA/USIA WASHDC IMMEDIATE 7693
RUEHRC/USDA FAS WASHDC IMMEDIATE
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 5428

INFO: RUCPDOG/USDOC WASHDC
RUEHNY/AMEMBASSY OSLO 0252
RUEHXQ/ALLEU COLLECTIVE
RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA 4509

SUBJ: IMPORTATION OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED
ORGANISMS - ROUNDUP READY ISSUE

TEXT:

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 STOCKHOLM 006371

DEPT PASS USTR
GENEVA FOR USTR
EU POSTS FOR AG COUNSELORS
FAS FOR ITP/SCHROETER/ROBERTS, CMP/RUDD,
FAA/NE APHIS FOR MEDLEY/KUBICEK/PAYNE
COMMERCE FOR 4212/IEP/EUR/NED/DEVLIN

E.O. 12356: N/A

TAGS: EIND, ETRD, EAGR, EUN, SW
SUBJECT: IMPORTATION OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED
ORGANISMS - ROUNDUP READY ISSUE

1. FOLLOWING IS THE EMBASSY'S UNOFFICIAL TRANSLATION OF
AN ARTICLE IN SVENSKA DAGBLADET OCTOBER 19, 1995 WRITTEN
BY THE NEWSPAPERS BRUSSELS CORRESPONDENT AND HEADLINED
"SWEDEN COULD CAUSE TRADE WAR."

2. SWEDEN'S POSITION ON GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS
COULD TRIGGER A TRADE WAR BETWEEN THE EU AND THE U.S.
BOTH SWEDISH COMMISSIONER ANITA GRADIN'S OFFICE,
RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND LEGAL QUESTIONS WITHIN THE
EU COMMISSION, AND SWEDISH OFFICIALS HAVE DELAYED THE
APPROVAL OF NEW PRODUCTS, PROMPTING THE U.S. TO ACCUSE
SWEDEN OF "GREEN PROTECTIONISM".

3. THE U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE AND U.S. FIRMS
ANXIOUSLY WAIT FOR THE EU'S REACTION TO A NEW STRAIN OF
SOYBEAN.

THIS DEVELOPMENT TAKES PLACE AT A CRITICAL POINT IN

TIME, SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH EU AND U.S. TALKS ABOUT A NEW, TRANSATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP TO BE CONCLUDED AT A SUMMIT MEETING IN DECEMBER.

NO CHEMICALS

4. THE SOYBEAN IN QUESTION HAS BEEN MODIFIED AND GIVEN PROPERTIES TO BETTER RESIST PEST DAMAGE WHICH IN TURN WILL MAKE IT POSSIBLE TO LIMIT THE USE OF PESTICIDES. AN IMPORT APPLICATION HAS TEMPORARILY BEEN HALTED THROUGH INTERVENTION BY THE FOUR MEMBER STATES: SWEDEN, DENMARK, SPAIN, AND AUSTRIA. SWEDES AND DANES INSIST THAT PRODUCTS CONTAINING THE CRUSHED SOYBEAN SHOULD BE LABELLED "GENETICALLY MODIFIED" TO MAKE CUSTOMERS AWARE OF WHAT THEY ARE BUYING. AN AMERICAN DIPLOMAT SAYS: "THERE IS NOTHING IN THE EU REGULATIONS THAT SUPPORTS THIS DEMAND."

5. AMERICAN CONCERNS FOCUS ON A PREVIOUS CASE WHICH STILL, 18 MONTHS AFTER APPLICATION, HAS NOT BEEN GRANTED A PERMIT, THIS IS A CASE CONCERNING RAPESEED FROM A BELGIAN FIRM. THE CASE HAS BEEN DELAYED BY ANITA GRADIN'S OFFICE IN THE EU COMMISSION WHICH REQUESTED THE PRODUCT TO BE LABELLED. THE AMERICANS HAVE STARTED APPLYING PRESSURE ON THE EU COMMISSION IN ORDER TO AVOID THE FATE OF THE RAPESEED CASE. U.S. REPRESENTATIVES ALREADY LAST SUMMER VISITED EUROPEAN CAPITALS TO EMPHASIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS QUESTIONldHAM-SEK 10 BILLION, AND U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVES ARE THREATENING TO APPROACH THE WTO UNLESS THEY RECEIVE EU APPROVAL.

6. ACCORDING TO WTO REGULATIONS, A TRADE PARTNER CANNOT STOP IMPORT UNLESS THERE IS SCIENTIFIC PROOF TO SUPPORT THE DECISION. CRITICS SO FAR HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO PRESENT A CASE AGAINST THE TWO PRODUCTS. THE REASON FOR THE STRONG U.S. REACTION IS THAT THIS GOES BEYOND THE SOYBEANS. IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS, A NUMBER OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS WILL HIT THE MARKET AND THE SOYBEAN IS ONLY ONE OF MANY TO COME. THE U.S. IS A WORLD LEADER IN THE BIOTECHNOLOGICAL FIELD.

7. "WE WILL NOT HESITATE TO RESORT TO TRADE SANCTIONS IF THE EU DOES NOT PLAY ACCORDING TO THE WTO RULES", SAYS A U.S. DIPLOMAT.

8. THE INDUSTRY IS ALSO IRRITATED OVER THE SLOW EU PROCEDURES AND THE INCONSISTENT ATTITUDE OF THE ORGANIZATION. POLITICIANS AND OFFICIALS DELAYING THE ISSUES HAVE NOT MADE IT CLEAR IF THEY ARE READY TO START A FRESH DISCUSSION ON BIOTECHNOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES AND IF SO, IF THEY ADVOCATE A CHANGE OF THE EU REGULATIONS. NEITHER IS COMMISSIONER GRADIN'S OFFICE CAPABLE OF SAYING IF NEW RULES ARE NEEDED OR IN WHICH DIRECTION IT IS HEADING. "RIGHT NOW WE ARE RECEIVING MIXED SIGNALS EVERY DAY," SAYS A MONSANTO REPRESENTATIVE TO SVENSKA DAGBLADET.

9. THERE SEEMS TO BE A GENERAL DISAGREEMENT ON

GENETICALLY

MODIFIED PRODUCTS. IN SWEDEN, THE NATIONAL BOARD OF AGRICULTURE MIGHT GIVE ITS APPROVAL OF THE SOYBEAN WHILE THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT WOULD LIKE TO LOOK INTO THE LONG-TERM CONSEQUENCES. WHILE SWEDEN, DENMARK AND AUSTRIA HESITATE TO APPROVE GENETICALLY UNCLAS SECTION 02 OF 02 STOCKHOLM 006371

DEPT PASS USTR
GENEVA FOR USTR
EU POSTS FOR AG COUNSELORS
FAS FOR ITP/SCHROETER/ROBERTS, CMP/RUDD,
FAA/NE APHIS FOR MEDLEY/KUBICEK/PAYNE
COMMERCE FOR 4212/IEP/EUR/NED/DEVLIN

E.O. 12356: N/A
TAGS: EIND, ETRD, EAGR, EUN, SW
SUBJECT: IMPORTATION OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS - ROUNDUP READY ISSUE

MODIFIED PRODUCTS, THE UK HAS GIVEN ITS APPROVAL AND OTHER COUNTRIES ARE PREPARED TO SAY YES TO THE COMMISSION'S WRITTEN IMPORT PROPOSAL TO BE PRESENTED AT A LATER DATE.

10. IN THE EU COMMISSION, ENVIRONMENT COMMISSIONER RITT BJERREGAARD APPEARS TO DELAY THE MATTER, HER DOUBTS SHARED BY ANITA GRADIN. HOWEVER, THE COMMISSION'S DEPARTMENTS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND EXTERNAL TRADE QUESTIONS AS WELL AS MOST OF THE OTHER COMMISSIONERS SEEM TO BE IN FAVOR OF THE U.S. IMPORT.

ALSO IN EUROPE

11. EUROPE'S BIOTECH INDUSTRY SHARES ITS CONCERN WITH THE AMERICANS OVER THE SLOW PROCESSING BY THE EU COMMISSION. AT THE SAME TIME, THE INDUSTRY POINTS OUT THAT THE EU "WHITE BOOK" ON COMPETITION AND EMPLOYMENT POINTS AT BIOTECHNOLOGY AS A FUTURE GROWTH INDUSTRY. THE SAME WAS SAID BY THE EU HEADS OF STATE AT TWO PREVIOUS SUMMIT MEETINGS. "THIS COULD STOP ALL EUROPEAN ATTEMPTS TO GET ON AN EQUAL FOOTING IN THE BIOTECH COMPETITION WITH THE AMERICANS," SAYS JIM DICKSON FROM THE EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF BIOTECH INDUSTRIES.

12. THE SWEDISH NATIONAL BOARD OF AGRICULTURE HAS GIVEN ITS APPROVAL TO RESEARCH AND THE GROWING OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED CEREALS. THE BELGIAN RAPESEED STRAIN, DELAYED BY THE EU COMMISSION, IS ONE OF THOSE. ANOTHER ONE IS A POTATO, TRIED OUT BY SWEDISH FIRM SVALOV-WEIBULL AND A THIRD IS A SUGAR BEET FROM HILLESOG, ALSO IN SWEDEN. IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO MARKET THESE PRODUCTS, OTHER PERMITS ARE REQUIRED. AN APPLICATION TO THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE IS FORWARDED TO THE EU MEMBER STATES. THE EU COMMISSION THEN WILL GRANT A SALES PERMIT. IF ONLY ONE OF THE MEMBER STATES DISAPPROVES, THE DISPUTE WILL BE RESOLVED BY THE EU MINISTERS FOR AGRICULTURE. A PRODUCT APPROVED BY THE EU CAN NOT BE BARRED BY ANY EU

COUNTRY.

SIEBERT
BT
#6371

NNNN

SECT: SECTION: 01 OF 02
<^SECT>SECTION: 02 OF 02
SSN: 6371
<^SSN>6371
TOR: 951019130826 M1909892
<^TOR>951019121250 M1909745
DIST: SIT: NSC
☐

Cable

PREC: ROUTINE

CLASS: UNCLASSIFIED

LINE1: RAAUZYUW RUEHBSA0978 2971433-UUUU--RHEHAAX.

LINE2: ZNR UUUUU ZZH

LINE3: R 241433Z OCT 95

LINE4: FM USEU BRUSSELS

OSRI: RUEHBS

DTG: 241433Z OCT 95

ORIG: USEU BRUSSELS

TO: RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC
RUEHRC/USDA FAS WASHDC

INFO: RUEHMIL/AMCONSUL MILAN
RUEHAG/AMCONSUL HAMBURG
RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA
RUEHXQ/ALLEU COLLECTIVE

SUBJ: COMMISSIONER GRADIN'S CABINET DENIES HOLDING UP
APPROVAL OF GMO PRODUCT AND NEWS REGARDING THE ROUNDUP
READY SOYBEAN APPROVAL

REFERENCES: (A) STOCKHOLM 6371 (B) USEU BRUSSELS 7555

TEXT:

UNCLAS BRUSSELS 010978

SENSITIVE

OSCE FOR DRAZEK, TO FAS FOR ITP/SCHROETER/ROBERTS AND
C&MP/RUDD, TO APHIS FOR MEDLEY/KUBICEK/PAYNE
STATE PASS USTR FOR MURPHY AND KASKA
STATE PASS HHS/FDA FOR MARYANSKI AND FLAMM
STATE PASS EPA FOR MILEWSKI
BONN PASS ATO HAMBURG
GENEVA FOR USTR, ALSO AGRICULTURE/THORN
EC POSTS PASS AGCOUNSELOR
MILAN FOR AGRICULTURE

E.O. 12356: N/A

TAGS: EAGR, ETRD, EUN

SUBJECT: COMMISSIONER GRADIN'S CABINET DENIES HOLDING UP
APPROVAL OF GMO PRODUCT AND NEWS REGARDING THE ROUNDUP
READY SOYBEAN APPROVAL

REFERENCES: (A) STOCKHOLM 6371 (B) USEU BRUSSELS 7555

1. SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED - PLEASE PROTECT
ACCORDINGLY.

2. CHRISTER ASP (PROTECT), THE CHEF DE CABINET FOR
COMMISSIONER ANITA GRADIN, ON 23 OCTOBER DENIED TO DCM
THE ASSERTION IN THE NEWSPAPER ARTICLE REPORTED REF A
THAT COMMISSIONER GRADIN IS DELAYING APPROVAL OF PLANT
GENETIC SYSTEMS' (PGS) OILSEED RAPE. ASP INDICATED THAT
GRADIN WAS BEING USED BY ENVIRONMENT COMMISSIONER

BJERREGAARD AS A PATSY TO COVER UP BJERREGAARD'S EFFORTS TO HALT APPROVAL.

3. ASP REPORTED THAT COMMISSIONER GRADIN WAS PRESENTED WITH THE PROPOSAL TO APPROVE THE PGS OILSEED RAPE IN JULY UNDER A WRITTEN PROCEDURE. HE SAID THAT GRADIN ASKED COMMISSION SECRETARY-GENERAL DAVID WILLIAMSON IF SHE COULD PASS THE PROPOSAL WITH A STATEMENT IN THE PROTOCOL EXPRESSING HER PREFERENCE FOR INFORMING CONSUMERS OF THE PRESENCE OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS. WILLIAMSON REPORTEDLY AGREED TO NOTE HER CONCERN.

4. IT WAS IN MID-SEPTEMBER, ASP SAID, THAT GRADIN'S CABINET HEARD THAT THE APPROVAL WAS BLOCKED AND THAT THE BLAME WAS BEING ATTRIBUTED TO GRADIN. ALTHOUGH COMMISSIONER BJERREGAARD HAD PREVIOUSLY ACCEPTED THE OILSEED RAPE, ASP SAID SHE APPARENTLY USED THE STATEMENT FROM COMMISSIONER GRADIN AS AN EXCUSE TO STOP APPROVAL. ASP SAID THAT DAVID WILLIAMSON TOLD HIM TEN DAYS AGO THAT THE STATEMENT IN THE PROTOCOL WAS SETTLED AND THE OILSEED RAPE SHOULD BE APPROVED. BUT ASP SAID HE DID NOT KNOW IF BJERREGAARD WAS STILL HOLDING UP APPROVAL. ASP EMPHASIZED THAT COMMISSIONER GRADIN HAD NO WISH TO HALT APPROVAL OF THE PGS OILSEED RAPE OR ANY OTHER PRODUCT, SHE SIMPLY WANTED TO NOTE HER CONCERNS ABOUT A CONSUMER'S RIGHT TO BE INFORMED.

5. ONE OF OUR COMMISSION CONTACTS REPORTS THAT COMMISSIONER BJERREGAARD WANTS TO AMEND THE PGS APPROVAL TO REQUIRE LABELING WHICH WOULD DECLARE THAT THE PRODUCT WAS GENETICALLY MODIFIED. THE CONTACT CLAIMS THAT DAVID WILLIAMSON IS UPSET WITH BJERREGAARD SINCE SHE SIGNED OFF ON THE APPROVAL BEFORE IT WENT TO THE OTHER COMMISSIONERS; IT IS BAD FORM FOR HER TO SEEK CHANGES NOW.

6. FINALLY, REGARDING THE APPROVAL OF THE ROUNDUP READY SOYBEAN, WE HEAR THAT THE PROPOSAL HAS BEEN CLEARED BY THE DIRECTORATE-GENERALS CONCERNED. DG XI (ENVIRONMENT) SHOULD FORWARD THE PROPOSAL TO COMMISSIONER BJERREGAARD THIS WEEK. WE WILL CONTINUE TO MONITOR THE SITUATION AND REPORT.

(DRAFTED:FAS:SGNENON; CLEARED:FAS:GPOPE, ECON:BHARMAN;
APPROVED:DCM:EAWAYNE) EIZENSTAT

BT

#0978

NNNN

SECT: SECTION: 01 OF 01

SSN: 0978

TOR: 951024112725 M1917054

DIST:

SIT: NSC

☐

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

013. cable	Re: [Public Opinion Strategy on Agricultural Biotechnology Issues] (3 pages)	10/30/1995	P1/b(1)
------------	---	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F

ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
014. cable	Re: [Opposition ot Agricultural Biotechnology] (3 pages)	10/30/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F

ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Cable

PREC: IMMEDIATE
CLASS: UNCLASSIFIED
LINE1: OAAUZYUW RUEHCAA6518 3041410-UUUU--RHEHAAX.
LINE2: ZNR UUUUU ZZH ZEX
LINE3: O R 311410Z OCT 95
LINE4: FM SECSTATE WASHDC
OSRI: RUEHC
DTG: 311410Z OCT 95
ORIG: SECSTATE WASHDC
TO: RUEHTC/AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE IMMEDIATE 5217
INFO: ALL EUROPEAN UNION POST COLLECTIVE
SUBJ: RESPONSE TO DUTCH LETTER ON FOOD LAW AND GMO'S
TEXT:
UNCLAS STATE 256518

PLEASE PASS AGRICULTURAL COUNSELOR

E.O. 12356: N/A
TAGS: EAGR ETRD EUN
SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO DUTCH LETTER ON FOOD LAW AND GMO'S
REF: (A) 95 THE HAGUE 5340

WASHINGTON AGENCIES APPRECIATE EMBOFFS' CONTINUED VIGILANCE IN REPORTING ON DEVELOPMENTS RELATED TO THE DUTCH AND EUROPEAN UNION'S APPROVAL OF THE ROUNDUP READY SOYBEAN. AT THIS JUNCTURE, WASHINGTON AGENCIES FEEL, IT BEST TO TREAT THE ISSUE IN THE NARROWEST TERMS POSSIBLE, IN ORDER NOT TO JEOPARDIZE THE ONGOING EU 90/220 REVIEWS OF SEVERAL GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS, INCLUDING CORN AND SOYBEANS. ACCORDINGLY, POST IS REQUESTED TO USE THE BELOW SUGGESTED TEXT TO RESPOND TO INCOMING LETTER FROM MINISTRY OF HEALTH, WELFARE, AND SPORTS.

BEGIN TEXT OF LETTER.

QUOTE: THANK YOU FOR YOUR LETTER DATED SEPTEMBER 18, 1995, REGARDING NOVEL FOODS. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES RECOGNIZES YOUR GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST IN ASSESSING THE SAFETY OF FOOD PRODUCTS CONSUMED WITHIN THE NETHERLANDS AND WE APPRECIATE YOUR MINISTRY'S APPRISING US AGAIN OF THIS LAW.

WE NOTE WITH INTEREST THE POINT MADE THAT ALL FOODS FROM NEW TECHNOLOGIES ARE BANNED FROM MARKETING WITHIN THE NETHERLANDS UNTIL A PREMARKET SAFETY EVALUATION IS CARRIED OUT. WILL THIS REQUIREMENT BE EFFECTIVE FROM JULY 1993 OR FROM JULY 1995? THAT IS, WOULD PRODUCTS AND PROCESSES USED PRIOR TO THE ENACTMENT OF THIS LAW BE EXEMPT?

AS REGARDS WHETHER THE PRODUCT CURRENTLY IN QUESTION --

THE MONSANTO ROUNDUP READY SOYBEAN -- WILL BE REVIEWED UNDER YOUR PREMARKET CLEARANCE PROCEDURE, WE UNDERSTAND MONSANTO WILL OR HAS REQUESTED THAT SUCH REVIEW BE CARRIED OUT. AS WE UNDERSTAND FROM YOUR NOVEL FOOD DECREE, A DETERMINATION WITHIN THE REVIEW IS NORMALLY COMPLETED WITHIN A THREE MONTH PERIOD. WE HOPE THAT THIS REVIEW IS MADE EXPEDITIOUSLY.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR DRAWING OUR ATTENTION TO YOUR NOVEL FOOD LAW. WE HOPE THAT A REGULATION COVERING NOVEL FOODS IS APPROVED SOON ON THE EUROPEAN UNION LEVEL. ONCE SUCH A REGULATION IS APPROVED IT WILL CLARIFY MUCH OF THE UNCERTAINTY CURRENTLY PRESENT GLOBALLY. WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO WORK WITH THE EU COMMISSION AND WITH OTHER MEMBER STATES TO FINALIZE A NOVEL FOOD REGULATION THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION.

CLOSING/AMBASSADOR

END QUOTE.
CHRISTOPHER
BT
#6518

NNNN

SECT: SECTION: 01 OF 01

SSN: 6518

TOR: 951031101401 M1928215

DIST:

SIT: NSC

□

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
015. cable	Re: [Concern Over Genetically Modified Organisms] (3 pages)	10/31/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F
ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
016. cable	Re: [Problems of Introducing Agricultural Biotechnology] (4 pages)	11/03/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F
ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Cable

PREC: ROUTINE
CLASS: UNCLASSIFIED
LINE1: RAAUZYUW RUEHBSA2163 3351711-UUUU--RHEHAAX.
LINE2: ZNR UUUUU ZZH
LINE3: R 011711Z DEC 95
LINE4: FM USEU BRUSSELS
OSRI: RUEHBS
DTG: 011711Z DEC 95
ORIG: USEU BRUSSELS
TO: RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC
RUEHRC/USDA FAS WASHDC
INFO: RUEHAG/AMCONSUL HAMBURG
RUEHXQ/ALLEU COLLECTIVE
RUEHMIL/AMCONSUL MILAN
RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA
SUBJ: COLLEGE OF COMMISSIONERS APPROVES GMO OILSEED
RAPE

TEXT:
UNCLAS BRUSSELS 012163

SENSITIVE
OSEC FOR DRAZEK, TO FAS FOR ITP/SCHROETER/ROBERTS AND
C&MP/RUDD, TO APHIS FOR MEDLEY/KUBICEK/PAYNE
STATE PASS USTR FOR MURPHY AND KASKA
STATE PASS HHS/FDA FOR MARYANSKI AND FLAMM
STATE PASS EPA FOR MILEWSKI
BONN PASS ATO HAMBURG
GENEVA FOR USTR, ALSO AGRICULTURE/THORN
EC POSTS PASS AGCOUNSELOR
MILAN FOR AGRICULTURE

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: EAGR, ETRD, EUN
SUBJECT: COLLEGE OF COMMISSIONERS APPROVES GMO OILSEED
RAPE

1. ON 29 NOVEMBER, EUROPEAN COMMISSIONERS ADOPTED A COMMISSION DECISION PERMITTING THE DELIBERATE RELEASE, UNDER DIRECTIVE 90/220, OF A GENETICALLY MODIFIED OILSEED RAPE PRODUCED BY PLANT GENETIC SYSTEMS. CONTRARY TO THE WISHES OF ENVIROMENT COMMISSIONER RITT BJERREGAARD, THE DECISION INCLUDES NO PROVISION FOR LABELING THE OILSEED RAPE AS GENETICALLY MODIFIED. LABELS WOULD ONLY HAVE TO INDICATE THAT THE PRODUCT IS HERBICIDE-RESISTANT.

2. WE HAVE BEEN TOLD THAT COMMISSIONER BJERREGAARD'S CABINET HAS MADE STATEMENTS INDICATING THAT THE DECISION WAS NOT FINAL AND THE LABELING QUESTION WOULD GO BACK FOR MEMBER STATE DISCUSSIONS (I.E., THE ARTICLE 21 COMMITTEE PROVIDED FOR IN DIRECTIVE 90/220). OUR COMMISSION

CONTACTS SAY THAT IS NOT CORRECT, THE COMMISSION HAS
ACCEPTED THE RELEASE WITHOUT LABELING AND THE ONLY STEP
REMAINING IS PUBLICATION IN THE OFFICIAL JOURNAL. THE
ONLY WAY FOR THE DECISION TO BE OVERTURNED IS FOR THE
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS TO VOTE TO DO SO WITH A QUALIFIED
MAJORITY WITHIN THREE MONTHS. (COMMENT: THIS WOULD BE
UNLIKELY SINCE THE COUNCIL REJECTED MANDATORY GMO
LABELING IN THE PROPOSED NOVEL FOODS REGULATION.)

(DRAFTED:FAS:SGNENON; CLEARED:ECON:BHARMAN;
APPROVED:FAS:GPOPE) EIZENSTAT
BT
#2163

NNNN

SECT: SECTION: 01 OF 01

SSN: 2163

TOR: 951201125317 M1978041

DIST:

SIT: NSC

□

Cable

PREC: ROUTINE

CLASS: UNCLASSIFIED

LINE1: RAAUZYUW REHBSAA2269 3401002-UUUU--RHEHAAX.

LINE2: ZNR UUUUU ZZH

LINE3: R 061002Z DEC 95

LINE4: FM USEU BRUSSELS

OSRI: REHBS

DTG: 061002Z DEC 95

ORIG: USEU BRUSSELS

TO: RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC
RUEHRC/USDA FAS WASHDC

INFO: RUEHAG/AMCONSUL HAMBURG
RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA
RUEHMIL/AMCONSUL MILAN
RUEHXQ/ALLEU COLLECTIVE

SUBJ: AMBASSADOR EIZENSTAT'S CONVERSATION WITH
COMMISSION SYG ON GMO'S

REFERENCES: USEU BRUSSELS 12163

TEXT:

UNCLAS BRUSSELS 012269

OSCE FOR DRAZEK, TO FAS FOR ITP/SCHROETER/ROBERTS AND
C&MP/RUDD, TO APHIS FOR MEDLEY/KUBICEK/PAYNE
STATE PASS USTR FOR MURPHY AND KASKA
STATE PASS HHS/FDA FOR MARYANSKI AND FLAMM
STATE PASS EPA FOR MILEWSKI
BONN PASS ATO HAMBURG
GENEVA FOR USTR, ALSO AGRICULTURE/THORN
EC POSTS PASS AGCOUNSEL
MILAN FOR AGRICULTURE

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: EAGR, ETRD, EUN

SUBJECT: AMBASSADOR EIZENSTAT'S CONVERSATION WITH
COMMISSION SYG ON GMO'S

REFERENCES: USEU BRUSSELS 12163

1. AMBASSADOR EIZENSTAT OBTAINED DETAILS ON THE
COMMISSION'S APPROVAL OF A GENETICALLY MODIFIED OILSEED
RAPE (REFTTEL) IN A CONVERSATION WITH DAVID WILLIAMSON,
THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION ON 1
DECEMBER. WILLIAMSON REPORTED THAT THE COMMISSION
CLEARLY DECIDED, IN ITS 29 NOVEMBER MEETING, TO MAKE NO
REFERENCE TO GENETIC MODIFICATION ON THE LABELS OF GMO
PRODUCTS BY REJECTING COMMISSIONER BJERREGAARD'S EFFORTS
TO REQUIRE SUCH LABELING FOR THE OILSEED RAPE. HE SAID
THAT THE DECISION WOULD HAVE IMPLICATIONS FOR OTHER
PENDING GMOS, INCLUDING THE ROUNDUP READY SOYBEAN (RRS),

SINCE "THE GUILLOTINE HAS FALLEN ON THE IDEA OF LABELING PRODUCTS SIMPLY BECAUSE THEY ARE PRODUCED WITH IOTECHNOLOGY." WILLIAMSON NOTED, HOWEVER, THAT THE COMMISSION ASSURED COMMISSIONER BJERREGAARD THERE WOULD BE A DISCUSSION OF THE LABELING ISSUE WHEN DIRECTIVE 90/220 COMES UP FOR REVIEW NEXT YEAR.

2. WILLIAMSON ADMITTED THERE WAS A LEGAL HITCH REGARDING THE APPROVAL OF THE OILSEED RAPE BY THE COMMISSION. HE SAID THAT THE ORIGINAL COMMISSION DECISION DRAFTED BY DG XI (ENVIRONMENT) AND PRESENTED TO THE ARTICLE 21 COMMITTEE OF MEMBER STATE REPRESENTATIVES CONTAINED A GMO LABELING PROVISION. THE MEMBER STATE REPRESENTATIVES VOTED TO APPROVE THE DECISION AND AFTERWARDS, IN RESPONSE TO STRONG OBJECTIONS FROM THE OTHER DIRECTORATES-GENERAL, DG XI TOOK OUT THE LABELING REQUIREMENT. DG XI THEN CONSULTED WITH THE ARTICLE 21 COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES BY TELEPHONE TO NOTIFY THEM OF THE CHANGE AND TO CONDUCT THE VOTE AGAIN. ONCE MORE, THE DECISION WAS APPROVED. WILLIAMSON SAID THAT THE COMMISSION'S LEGAL SERVICE DID NOT BELIEVE THE TELEPHONE VOTE WAS VALID AND THEREFORE WAS REQUIRING ANOTHER DISCUSSION OF THE DECISION ON THE OILSEED RAPE. WILLIAMSON COMPLAINED THAT IT WAS ABSURD FOR THE LEGAL SERVICE TO QUESTION THE VALIDITY OF A TELEPHONE VOTE BUT THERE WAS NOTHING TO BE DONE. HE SAID THAT HE WAS CONFIDENT THAT THE NEW MEMBER STATE VOTE WOULD SUPPORT APPROVAL.

3. WHEN AMBASSADOR EIZENSTAT ASKED ABOUT THE STATUS OF A GMO CORN PRODUCED BY CIBA GEIGY WHICH WE HAD HEARD HAD BEEN HELD UP FOR TWO MONTHS, WILLIAMSON RESPONDED THAT HE WOULD CALL DG XI TO "LIGHT A FIRE". WILLIAMSON SAID THAT THE BASIC POSITION OF THE COMMISSION OPPOSING LABELING WAS ESTABLISHED IN THE OILSEED RAPE VOTE AND THAT THE APPROVAL PROCESS FOR PRODUCTS LIKE THE ROUNDUP READY SOYBEAN SHOULD BE FREED UP.

4. WILLIAMSON REPLIED TO THE AMBASSADOR'S QUESTION REGARDING THE EVALUATION OF THE APPLICABILITY OF DIRECTIVE 90/220 TO THE ROUNDUP READY SOYBEAN BY SAYING THAT HE HAD NOTHING TO REPORT. WILLIAMSON ADMITTED THAT HE HAD BEEN PREOCCUPIED WITH THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE MADRID SUMMIT AND PROMISED TO FOLLOW-UP LATER. WILLIAMSON STATED THAT ALL HIS EARLIER COMMENTS WERE CONDITIONED ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE RRS WAS COVERED BY THE DIRECTIVE, OTHERWISE MEMBER STATE RULES WOULD PREVAIL. IN HIS ESTIMATE, THREE MEMBER STATES WOULD TRY TO RESTRICT IMPORTS OF RRS IF 90/220 DID NOT APPLY. WILLIAMSON SAID HIS OPINION WAS THAT THERE WAS NO WAY TO COMPLETELY CONTROL THE SHIPMENTS OF ROUNDUP READY SOYBEANS FROM THE PORTS TO CRUSHING FACILITIES IN THE EU. THEREFORE, HE FELT THAT THEY SHOULD BE COVERED BY 90/220.

(DRAFTED:FA

S:SGNENON; CLEARED:FAS:GPOPE, DCM:EAWAYNE,
ECON:BHARMAN; APPROVED:AMB:SEEIZENSTAT) EIZENSTAT

BT

#2269

NNNN

SECT: SECTION: 01 OF 01

SSN: 2269

TOR: 951206060832 M1984782

DIST:

SIT: NSC

☐

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
017. cable	Re: [Genetically Modified Soybean Regulation] (3 pages)	12/07/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Cables
Jan 1995 - Dec 1996 ([GMO...])
OA/Box Number: 510000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/24/1995 - 12/29/1995]

2013-0836-F

ke3002

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Cable

PREC: ROUTINE
CLASS: UNCLASSIFIED
LINE1: RAAUZYUW RUEHCPA6575 3631257-UUUU--RHEHAAX.
LINE2: ZNR UUUUU ZZH
LINE3: R 291257Z DEC 95
LINE4: FM AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN
OSRI: RUEHCP
DTG: 291257Z DEC 95
ORIG: AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN
TO: SECSTATE WASHDC 8276
INFO: ////
SUBJ: DANISH RESEARCH ON GENETICALLY MODIFIED PLANTS

TEXT:
UNCLAS COPENHAGEN 006575

E.O. 12958: NA
TAGS: ETRD, EAGR, SENV, USTR, DA
SUBJECT: DANISH RESEARCH ON GENETICALLY MODIFIED PLANTS

1. ON DECEMBER 18, ECONOFF, REG ESTCOUNS AND ECON ADVISOR MET WITH THE PROJECT DIRECTOR FOR RISK ASSESSMENT OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED PLANTS, MS. RIKKE BAGGER JOERGENSEN, AND HER ASSISTANTS DR. THURE HAUSER AND DR. THOMAS R. MIKKELSEN AT THE DANISH NATIONAL LABORATORY RISOE. EMBOFFS ASKED FOR THE MEETING TO LEARN ABOUT DANISH RESEARCH INTO THE RISK THAT HERBICIDE RESISTANCE CAN BE TRANSFERRED FROM GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS TO WEEDS. THIS RESEARCH HAS RECEIVED SOME PRESS COVERAGE IN DENMARK IN CONNECTION WITH EU APPROVAL OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED RAPE AND ROUNDUP READY SOYBEANS.

2. JOERGENSEN CONFIRMED THAT SHE IS LEADING RESEARCH INTO RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH CULTIVATION OF 4ERBICIDE RESISTANT SPECIES. HER PROJECT IS SPECIFICALLY DIRECTED TOWARD INVESTIGATION OF THE RISK OF SPREADING HERBICIDE RESISTANCE FROM BASTA RESISTANT GENETICALLY MODIFIED RAPE PLANTS TO WEEDS. SHE EXPLAINED THAT THE POSSIBILITY OF TRANSFER EXISTS ONLY IF BASTA RESISTANT RAPE PLANTS ARE GROWING IN ASSOCIATION WITH WEEDS WITH WHICH THEY ARE AB)E TO INBREED. FOR THIS POSSIBILITY TO EXIST, THE BASTA RESISTANT RAPE AND THE WEEDS MUST BE CLOSELY RELATED, I.E., THE WEED MUST BE A WILD FORM OF RAPE. THE MECHANISM BY WHICH THE INBREEDING TAKES PLACE LITERALLY RELATES TO THE ACTIVITJES OF THE BIRDS AND THE BEES, ETC, AS STUDIED IN SCIENCE CLASS SO LONG AGO, I.E., BY POLLEN TRANSFER.

3. AT THIS POINT IN THE PROJECT, JOERGENSEN'S TEAM HAS ESTABLISHED THAT BASTA RESISTANCE CAN BE TRANSFERRED AND LATER PASSED TO SUCCEEDING GENERATIONS OF WEEDS. DR. MIKKELSEN GAVE EMBOFFS A TOUR OF HIS EXPERIMENTAL

FACILITY, WHICH RESEMBLES A WARM WALK-IN FREEZER WITH GROW LIGHTS, AND SHOWED EMBOFFS SOME SCRAWNY PLANTS GROWING IN A FLAT. HE EXPLAINED THAT THEY WERE BASTA RESISTANT WEEDS WHICH WILL MATURE INTO RAPE-LIKE WEEDS. THESE WEEDS ARE CLOSELY RELATED TO AND CAN CROSSBREED WITH, COMMERCIALY INTERESTING HYBRIDS OF RAPE. THESE WEEDS PRODUCE SEEDS WHICH ARE HARVESTED AND CRUSHED ALONG WITH RAPE SEEDS. THE SEEDS OF THE WEEDS ARE, HOWEVER, UNDESIRABLE, AS OILS CRUSHED FROM THEM CONTAIN TOXINS WHICH HAVE BEEN BRED OUT OF RAPE SEEDS INTENDED FOR EDIBLE OIL PRODUCTION. THE WEEDS ALSO PRODUCE FEWER AND SMALLER SEEDS THAN THE HYBRID VARIETIES PLANTED BY FARMERS.

4. JOERGENSEN AND HER TEAM ARE CONDUCTING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AIMED AT INCREASING THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE RISK THAT CHARACTERISTICS OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED PLANTS WILL SPREAD TO OTHER SPECIES RATHER THAN EVALUATING THE CONSEQUENCES OF SUCH AN EVENT. NONETHELESS, JOERGENSEN SAID SHE HAS BEEN CONSULTED ON THE RISKS OF INTRODUCING HERBICIDE RESISTANT SPECIES, SUCH AS ROUNDUP READY SOYBEANS. SHE ALSO NOTED THAT RESEARCHERS AT THE ROYAL AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY IN COPENHAGEN AND THE UNIVERSITY OF AARHUS ARE WORKING ON COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES FOR GENETICALLY MODIFIED PLANTS. THESE INSTITUTIONS ARE BETTER PLACED TO CONDUCT RISK-BENEFIT ANALYSIS BECAUSE SUCH ANALYSIS IS CLOSELY TIED TO AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES.

5. LIKE OTHER DANISH TECHNICIANS, JOERGENSEN AND HER TEAM MAINTAIN CONTACT WITH FELLOW SCIENTISTS IN THE UNITED STATES THROUGH PERSONAL CONTACTS, ATTENDANCE AT PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES AND BY READING THE LITERATURE IN THE FIELD. SHE IS PLANNING TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE U.S. BOTANICAL SOCIETY IN THE SUMMER OF 1996. IN THAT CONNECTION, EMBOFFS SUGGESTED THAT SHE SEEK TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE U.S.I.S. VOLUNTARY VISITOR PROGRAM TO MAXIMIZE HER RANGE OF CONTACTS IN THE U.S.

ELSON

BT

#6575

NNNN

SECT: SECTION: 01 OF 01

SSN: 6575

TOR: 951229085832 M2017091

DIST:

SIT: NSC

□