Subject: Re: Apologies for bugging you again RE: Question about your CBD Online postings
From: Fred Gould <fgould@ncsu.edu>
Date: 7/26/2017 6:15 PM
To: "Friedman, Robert" <rfriedman@jcvi.org>

Oh, that's good. When I got your last email, I couldn't remember if I had responded.
(I am sort of on vacation)

> On Jul 26, 2017, at 5:40 PM, Friedman, Robert <rfriedman@jcvi.org> wrote:
>
> I just found that your reply was caught by my spam filter.
>
> Robert M. Friedman
> Vice President for Policy and University Relations
> J. Craig Venter Institute
> 4120 Capricorn Lane, La Jolla, CA 92037
> phone: 858-200-1810
> cell phone: 240.888.9801
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Fred Gould [mailto:fgould@ncsu.edu]
> **Sent:** Friday, July 21, 2017 1:11 PM
> **To:** Friedman, Robert <rfriedman@jcvi.org>
> **Subject:** Re: Question about your CBD Online postings
>
> I've already done some posting so it would be better to come from somebody else. I'll be glad to review.
>
> > On Jul 21, 2017, at 3:08 PM, Friedman, Robert <rfriedman@jcvi.org> wrote:
> >
> > Hi Fred—
> >
> > I think it would be very helpful if you (or someone else) highlighted a few of your report's key conclusions with respect to biodiversity. In particular, I am referring boldface "Findings" in chapter 4 (section on environmental effects of genetically engineered crops). Most of the participants will not take the time to read the report (or even the summary). Are you hesitant to do so because you chaired the report (or perhaps some other reason)?
> >
> > **FINDING:** Planting of *Bt* varieties of crops tends to result in higher insect biodiversity than planting of similar varieties without the *Bt* trait that are treated with synthetic insecticides.
> >
> > **FINDING:** In the United States, farmers' fields with glyphosate-resistant GE crops sprayed with glyphosate have similar or more weed biodiversity than fields with non-GE crop varieties.
> >
> > **FINDING:** Although gene flow has occurred, no examples have demonstrated an adverse environmental effect of gene flow from a GE crop to a wild, related plant species.
> >
> > I could not find a comparably succinct statement in the "landscape and ecosystem level" section (but you might).

I know this will be met with howls by some, but how much literature did your committee review? Obviously, as the investment ads say, “Past performance is not indicative of future results”, but the question for this part of the forum is evaluation of evidence. Are there other findings that directly address the three objectives of the CBD?

I am happy to do it if you are uncomfortable. If so, I would just ask you to review my posting first. I am going to do a posting on the “components and products” part of the question, which would be a nightmare if the CBD decided that they needed to pull those aspects under its “jurisdiction”.

Regards,
Bob

Robert M. Friedman
Vice President for Policy and University Relations
J. Craig Venter Institute
4120 Capricorn Lane, La Jolla, CA 92037
phone: 858-200-1810
cell phone: 240.888.9801

From: bch@cbd.int [mailto:bch@cbd.int]
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2017 6:28 AM
To: Friedman, Robert <rfriedman@jcvi.org>
Subject: Synbio Forum Topic 2: Further analysis of evidence of benefits and adverse effects of organisms, components and products of synthetic biology - A new message has been posted to the forum

Dear Mr. Robert Friedman,

The following message has been posted by **Mr. Fred Gould, North Carolina State University** on **2017-07-21 05:21**.

RE: Opening of discussion *[#8650]*

Dear Participants,
Just a note to point out that the major tasks given to the US National Academies committee on "Genetically Engineered Crops: Experiences and Prospects" were:

"1 Assess the evidence for purported negative effects of GE crops and their accompanying
technologies, such as poor yields, deleterious effects on human
and animal health, increased use of pesticides and herbicides, the creation of
“super-weeds,” reduced genetic diversity, fewer seed choices for producers,
and negative impacts on farmers in developing countries and on producers of
non-GE crops, and others, as appropriate.
2 Assess the evidence for purported benefits of GE crops and their accompanying
technologies, such as reductions in pesticide use, reduced soil loss and
better water quality through synergy with no-till cultivation practices, reduced
crop loss from pests and weeds, increased flexibility and time for producers,
reduced spoilage and mycotoxin contamination, better nutritional value potential,

improved resistance to drought and salinity, and others, as appropriate."

The committee also looked at the potential for future impacts of new technologies.

Because of this directive to the committee, the report which I already sent to this forum has many examples where evidence for negative and positive effects was examined. This report could be a good reference for the AHTEG.