Preface

New GM plants – new debate

There are new genetically modified plants on the way. Plants that can produce medicine and industrial-products, and new ornamental plants. Within the next 10 years, several of these new GM plants might be fully developed and ready to be grown in Danish fields.

The development of the new GM plants gives occassion for asking how citizens in Denmark would assess the new GM plants and what arguments they would have for and against them: How would they assess the possible advantages and disadvantages for health and environment and the economic possibilities and consequences?

In order to illustrate these matters, the Danish Board of Technology has put together a so-called citizens' jury consisting of laymen, who made an assessment of the new GM plants during the spring of 2005. The citizens' jury was assembled from the 28th of April to the 2nd of May 2005. During those days, the citizens met a number of experts and stakeholders and discussed advantages and disadvantages of the new crops. On the basis of this dialogue, the citizens' jury formulated arguments for and against the new GM plants and conditions for the possible growing of the plants in Danish fields, and general recommendations in connection with this. Finally, the 16 citizens voted on the arguments, conditions and recommendations that they believed expressed their attitude towards the new GM plants in the best way.

The citizens' jury presented their assessments and voting results at a conference on the 2nd of May at the Danish Parliament, in the presence of politicians, players and interested parties.

A planning group has assisted the Danish Board of Technology in planning the projects and formulating the questions that the citizens' jury was presented with. The planning group also participated in the preparation of the written information material for the citizens' jury and in the selection of the experts and stakeholders that the citizens' jury met. The information material has been enclosed with this report, which also contains the final document of the citizens' jury, a description of the citizens' jury method and written contributions from the experts and stakeholders that held introductory presentations for the citizens. Further written material is available at the web page of the project www.tekno.dk/gmp.

The members of the planning group are:
Hans Christian Bruun Hansen, professor, Department of Natural Sciences, Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University
Erling Jelsøe, associate professor, Department of Environment, Technology and Social Studies, Roskilde University
Rikke Bagger Jørgensen, seniorscientist, Risø National Laboratory
Rikke Lundsgaard, Danish Society for Nature Conservation
Søren Mikkelsen, deputy director, Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences
Finn Okkels, research manager, POALIS A/S

The Danish Board of Technology would like to thank the experts, interested parties and players that have contributed to the project. We would particularly like to thank the 16 citizens that chose to spend 5 days discussing the new GM plants.

The Danish Board of Technology hopes that the assessments of the citizens' jury will be considered in the debate about the new GM plants.

Bjørn Bedsted, project manager
Jacob Skjødt Nielsen, project assistant

The Danish Board of Technology, june 2005

About The Danish Board of Technology's citizens' jury

The use of a citizens' jury is a method that involves the citizens in the assessment of technology. The purpose of the method is to enrich and extend the traditional debate between experts, interested parties and politicians with the the citizens' views on and attitudes towards new and possibly controversial technologies. The method makes it possible for citizens to express their assessments, which is important when science and technology has direct influence on their daily lives.

In 2005, the Danish Board of Technology made use of a citizens' jury for the first time in connection with the project about new GM plants. The development of the method has been inspired by American and British experiences with the public involvement method "Citizens' jury", but has been adapted to Danish conditions in connection with the project.

Below is a short description of the citizens' jury method, in the version created and used by the Danish Board of Technology in connection with the project "New GM plants – new debate".

The citizens' role

In a citizens' jury, the citizens play a leading role. The citizens must be laymen with regard to the specific subject of the citizens' jury. This means that the selected citizens do not have particular professional preconditions for participating, but make their assessment on the basis of their everyday experiences, visions and concerns. The basis of the method is that new technologies bring about questions that cannot be answered on a purely professional basis. Therefore, it is not particularly easy to take a position on – let alone make a descision about – how the society should apply or limit the use of new technologies such as for instance the new GM plants.

And this is where the public involvement methods come in. The citizens in the citizens' jury participate in a process where they take a position on a number of matters and discuss how they believe a technology should be applied – if at all. Contrary to another method of public involvement – the consensus conference – which the Danish Board of Technology has developed and implemented several times, it is not necessary for the citizens of the citizens' jury to reach an agreement. But the dialogue is important, in order for the different views to be known and considered and contribute to qualify the citizens' own opinions. Through dialogue with each other and a number of experts with varying knowledge and attitudes, the citizens asked questions and discussed their ideas. On this basis, they jointly formulated arguments for and against the new GM plants, conditions for possible growing of the plants in Danish fields, and general recommendations in connection with this. And finally the citizens voted on the arguments, conditions and recommendations that expressed their attitude towards and assessment of the new GM plants.

Description of process and method

The course of events basically consisted of the Danish Board of Technology putting together and planning group with a wide and balanced composition of different interests, attitudes and knowledge. The planning group assisted the Danish Board of Technology in planning the project and formulating the questions that the citizens' jury was presented with. Furthermore, the planning group participated in the

preparation of written information material for the citizens' jury, and the selection of the experts that the citizens' jury met.

The citizens' jury was made up of laymen with different backgrounds. The citizens were found by sending an invitation to 2000 randomly selected Danish citizens between the ages of 20 and 65, found through the interior ministry's registry of civil registration numbers. In this invitation, the citizens were encouraged to write an application for participation in the citizens' jury. On the basis of the 150 applications that the Danish Board of Technology received, 16 participants were selected. The aim was to select a citizens' jury that was representative of the population with regard to gender, place of residence, age, education and occupation. Furthermore, it was a precondition that the citizens did not have particular professional expert knowledge of the subject.

The Danish Board of Technology arranged a workshop, where a number of invited experts and stakeholders discussed which GM plants and which themes it would be relevant to ask the citizens to take a stand on.

The debate at the workshop made it possible for the project management and the planning group to formulate an number of general questions and three select GM plant categories that the citizens should take a position on; GM plants for medical and industrial purposes, and GM ornamental plants. The questions for the citizens were divided into three levels. These levels were; which arguments are there for and against GM plants within the category in question (medicine, industry or ornamentation); on which conditions can GM plants for medicine, industry or ornamentation respectively be grown in Danish markets; and which general recommendations are there for the future handling of new GM plants.

On the basis of the discussions at the workshop and in the planning group, a freelance journalist prepared the information material for the citizens. The information material presented existing knowledge of the new GM plants and described the most important problems, attitudes and conflicts that exist in connection with GM plants. This helped the members of the citizens' jury become familiar with different aspects of the subject. The information material is enclosed with this report.

The programme for the actual citizens' jury days, where the citizens met in Copenhagen, was arranged to support and supplement the information material, as the days varied between presentations and dialogue with the invited experts, and group and plenary work, where only the citizens participated. The citizens' jury days took place from the citizens' first meeting Thursday until the concluding conference on Monday, which was held at the Joint Hall of Christiansborg, the parliament building. The entire programme is available on the web page of the Danish Board of Technology and in the report.

Friday, Saturday and Sunday, the citizens participated in dialogue with the invited experts and stakeholders – and with each other. The panel of experts treated a large number of problems through oral and written presentations, with the purpose of giving the selected citizens varied and comprehensive knowledge of the subject. On the basis of this, and on the basis of their knowledge, questions and curiosity, the citizens continuously formulated the arguments, conditions and recommendations that they found important. The citizens adapted and clarified the formulations through dialogue with each other. In order for a formulation to be included in the voting, there had to be at least one participant that would consider voting for it. A process consultant and the project management helped the citizens throughout the process, but otherwise remained neutral.
Sunday evening and night, the citizens had clarified the final formulations, and they were given a number of votes that they could place on the formulations that they preferred. The number of votes depended on the number of formulations for a particular point. The citizens were not allowed to place more than half of their votes on one formulation. All formulations and the voting results were then printed in a

final document, which was handed out at the conference on Monday. The final document can be found in the following chapter, and the specific voting procedures are also described in that chapter.

The final document contains the result of the citizens' jury on the subject. This includes all the arguments, conditions and recommendations formulated by the citizens, and the respective number of votes that the formulations were given. The final document speaks for itself and works as a report for descision makers and interested parties about the attitudes, hopes and worries that ordinary people have in connection with the new GM plants.

At the conference on Monday, the citizens presented the results of their votes and read their arguments, conditions and recommendations aloud for the audience. Afterwards, politicians from 6 parties made short presentations, where they talked about the things that had surprised them about the vote and what they thought might be useful. Similarly, four interested parties made presentations, where they also commented on the citizens' voting results. In between the presentations there was time for questions and dialogue between the citizens, the politicians, the interested parties and the press.

The final document of the citizens' jury

This final document contains the voting results that a citizens' jury of 16 laymen have come to after four days of discussions regarding advantages and disadvantages of new genetically modified plants for medical, industrial and ornamental/recreative purposes (e.g. christmas trees and lawn grass) with a number of different experts and players in this field.

The members of the citizens' jury :

Anders Filtenborg Spliid, Vandel, 1974, boarding school teacher and photographer
Anne Lylloff Petersen, Roskilde, 1965, system manager
Ann-Lise Vest Hansen, Copenhagen, 1942, dressmaker
Brian Teglgaard Jensen, Frederiksberg, 1970, real estate agent
Else Agergaard, Ribe, 1956, teacher
Frank Assing, Svenstrup J, 1962, machine technician
Henriette Vibeke Valeur Lorentzen, Jyderup, 1980, student of political science
Jens Jørn S. Nielsen, Odder, 1941, diploma in specialised business studies, retired
Jytte Christensen, Borup, 1950, office clerk
Kaj Bæk Larsen, Assens, 1948, semi-skilled worker
Klaus Leonhardt Danielsen, Kastrup, 1959, CTI consultant
Klaus Rasmussen, Lundby, 1963, general labourer
Palle Kristensen, Allerød, 1951, janitor
Sabine Heesemann, Kolding, 1975, nurse
Sara Hegelund, Skive, 1980, student teacher
Stinne Orboe Nielsen, Haslev, 1965, ctp operator

The citizens' jury has been asked to decide on the following questions:

1. Which arguments for or against the matter should be weighted the most, when making a descision in the future as to whether the following plants should be grown in Danish fields?

- GM plants for the production of medicine
- GM plants that produce enzymes, starch, plastic etc. for industrial use
- GM ornamental plants and GM plants for recreational use

2. On which conditions can the following plants be allowed to be grown in Danish fields?

- GM plants for the production of medicine
- GM plants that produce enzymes, starch, plastic etc. for industrial use
- GM ornamental plants and GM plants for recreational use

3. Does the citizens' jury have any general recommendations for the future handling of new GM plants?

The citizens' jury formulated the different possible responses themselves and finally placed their votes on the arguments, conditions and recommendations that they found to be most convincing.

The process leading to the voting result

Continuously during the jury days, the citizens' jury has formulated arguments, conditions and recommendations in groups and plenary discussions. At the end of the process, the formulations have been clarified by the citizens' jury, after which each member of the citizens' jury has voted on the different possible responses. 7 votes have taken place. Each member of the citizens' jury has been given the opportunity to place a number of votes that corresponds to half of the possible responses that have been formulated for the specific vote. Then they have placed their votes on the responses that they give the highest priority – however, with the limitation that they were not allowed to place more than five votes each on a specific response.

Specifically, the members were given the right amount of stickers at each vote, which they could then distribute on the specific responses, which were all placed on the wall in the voting room.

For instance, the members of the citizens' jury have jointly formulated 20 arguments for and against GM industrial plants. Therefore, they were given 10 votes each, which they have placed on the arguments for or against that matter that they give the highest priority.

And, as a further example, they have been given 8 votes each to place on the 16 conditions for growing GM medicine plants in Denmark.

The votes have been held in the following order:

1st vote: Arguments for and against growing GM plants for industrial use in Danish fields
(10 votes each)
2nd vote: Conditions for growing GM plants for industrial use in Danish fields
(6 votes each)
3rd vote: Arguments for and against growing GM plants for the production of medicine in Danish fields (9 votes each)
4th vote: Conditions for growing GM plants for the production of medicine in Danish fields
(8 votes each)
5th vote: Arguments for and against growing GM ornamental plants in Danish fields
(10 votes each)
6th vote: Conditions for growing GM ornamental plants in Danish fields
(6 votes each)
7th vote: General recommendations for the future handling of new GM plants
(7 votes each)

Voting results

The results are presented in the order that the 7 votes were held. First 2 votes about industrial plants, then 2 about medical plants, followed by 2 about ornamental plants and finally a vote about general recommendations.

GM plants for industrial use

1st vote: Arguments for and against growing GM plants for industrial use in Danish fields

The arguments for and against this matter have been formulated by the members of the citizens' jury. At this vote, they were each given 10 votes, which they could distribute on the 20 arguments for or against the matter in accordance with highest priority. A total of 160 votes.

Arguments for GM plants for industrial use: 109 out of 160 possible votes

By growing GM plants in Denmark we can maintain research and development at national level as well as the danish system of control (21 votes)

GM plants are a possibility of reducing the continuously growing industrial use of chemicals.
(16 votes)

Possibility of production of more environmentally benign products (15 votes)

Due to the limited oil resources, GM plants could be an alternative, for example for the production of bioplastics (12 votes)

The use of GM plants could reduce the use of resources in comparison with traditional production (for instance, the GM potato contains more starch) (9 votes)

Could lead to a reduction in the use of herbicides (8 votes)

The control of GM plants is more strict than the regulation of traditional types of production (8 votes)

The use of chemicals in the production process can probably be reduced (for instance reduction of lignin contents in wood for paper production) (6 votes)

The growing of GM plants in other countries has not caused any major problems, in spite of more lenient control (5 votes)

Alternative to raw materials (for example oil for the production of plastic) (4 votes)

We have the knowledge and experience to be able to implement the necessary control measures (4 votes)

Possible financial gain through improved yield per square metre (1 vote)

Arguments against GM plants for industrial use: 51 out of 160 possible votes

When growing GM plants, there may be a risk of spreading unintended characteristics and genes (for example the spread of oilseed rape pollen to the surrounding nature) (16 votes)

There may be a risk that GM plants for industrial production liberate undesirable substances, which are leached to the the subsoil water (13 votes)

They may be a risk that GM plants for industrial production are mixed with plants for food and feed production (10 votes)

It is not possible to achieve complete certainty in relation to risks (5 votes)

Fundamental change of God's creation (3 votes)

Risk that GM plants are used for criminal purposes (for example poisonous plants that are mixed with food or feed products) (2 votes)

Denmark lacks experience in growing GM plants (1 vote)

You should not tamper with nature – unless you have a good reason (such as saving lives) (1 vote)

2nd vote: Conditions for growing GM plants for industrial use in Danish fields

The conditions have been formulated by the members of the citizens' jury. At this vote, they have each been given 6 votes, which they could distribute on the 12 conditions in accordance with highest priority. A total of 96 votes.

The environmental impact should not be increased in comparison with traditional production methods (12 votes)

The present regulations, including the act on co-existence, should be maintained as a minimum requirement (12 votes)

Any negative effect on subsoil water and soil should be part of the risk assessment (11 votes)

Disposal of GM plants and plant parts must be handled safely and with as little environmental risk as possible (10 votes)

There should be strict requirements for approval of new products. This applies when plants are to be approved for further research, and when the fully developed plant is to be approved for production. In case of new knowledge, the control requirements should be adapted(10 votes)

That the spreading of genes is controllable and meet the threshold values given in the act on co-existence (9 votes)

Examination of the impact on subsoil water must be part of the control process when the GM plants are in the field (8 votes)

The risk of deteriation of the environment must be weighted higher than the creation of jobs (8 votes)

Research/production/control takes place with a balance between public research and financial interests of the industry (7 votes)

If the GM plant contains toxins, it must undergo risk assessment like pesticides (for example bt-toxin and lectin)
(4 votes)

A farmer producing GM plants may not produce foods within the same plant species (for example starch potatoes and edible potatoes) (4 votes)

A farmer producing GM plants for industrial use is not allowed to have food production at the same time (1 vote)

GM plants for the production of medicine

3rd vote: Arguments for and against growing GM plants for the production of medicine in Danish fields

The arguments for and against this matter have been formulated by the members of the citizens' jury. At this vote, they have each been given 9 votes, which they could distribute on the 18 arguments for or against the matter in accordance with highest priority. A total of 144 votes.

Arguments for GM plants for the production of medicine: 85 out of 144 votes

This production gives us the opportunity to develop new types of medicine, for example by effectively covering the needs of patients who cannot absorb vitamin B12 without taking very expensive medicine (16 votes)

GM medicine from plants reduces the risk of transferring diseases in comparison with production of pharmaceuticals in animal and human cells (15 votes)

There can be financial advantages to this type of medicine production due to lower costs for the individual patient and the public budgets. Furthermore, there may be the possibility of offering treatments that are not offered today because of high costs (15 votes)

It is an advantage for the environment that we can use plants to produce raw material for the production of medicine, as this might result in less use of chemicals (15 votes)

In Denmark, we have significant knowledge and experience, and we are subjected to secure and strict legislation/regulation in comparison with foreign conditions (13 votes)

It is important to be part of the development, as GM technology and products will be imported from other countries anyway (11 votes)

Arguments against GM plants for the production of medicine: 59 out of 144 possible votes

When growing GM plants, there may be a risk of spreading undesirable characteristics and genes (for example the spread of pollen to the surrounding nature) (11 votes)

There is a risk that substances being produced in GM plants, such as toxins, enzymes or proteines, are leached into the subsoil water from plant residues or roots (9 votes)

Increased focus on GM medicine may decrease the focus on alternative treatments (8 votes)

Lacking knowledge of the significance and consequences of the unidentified DNA ("junk DNA") (6 votes)

It is ethically problematic to insert human or animal genes in plant material (5 votes)

There is a risk that animals and insects or people eat medicine-producing crops. A risk that genetic characteristics are transferred from plants to humans (5 votes)

There is a risk that animals and insects or people eat medicine-producing crops. A risk in relation to health effects (5 votes)

It is not possible to achieve total certainty about the risks (5 votes)

It may become necessary to use pesticides on fields where GM plants are grown, which would have an impact on the environment (3 votes)

Fundamental change of God's creation (1 vote)

The risk of GM plants being used for criminal purposes (such as poisonous plants that are mixed with food or feed products) (1 vote)

It is unnatural to insert human or animal genes in plant material (0 votes)

4th vote: Conditions for growing GM plants for the production of medicin in Danish fields

The conditions have been formulated by the members of the citizens' jury. At this vote, they have each been given 8 votes, which they could distribute on 16 conditions in accordance with highest priority. A total of 128 stemmer.

Production that includes human or animal genes should take place as a contained production (17 votes)

Disposal of GM plants and parts of plants must be handled securely and with as little environmental risk as possible (16 votes)

There should be strict requirements in connection with the approval of new products. This applies when new plants are to be approved for further research and when the fully developed plant is to be approved for production. In case of new knowledge, the regulative requirements must be adapted (14 votes)

Any negative effect on subsoil water and soil must be part of the risk assessment (10 votes)

At consumer level, the GM products must be labelled with the origin of the inserted gene. This could be similar to the e-marking of foods (9 votes)

The present legislation, including the act on co-existence, must be maintained as a minimum requirement (9 votes)

That research/production/control should take place as a balance between public research and financial interests of the industry (9 votes)

The production should be able to make a medical treatment better or less expensive or be beneficial to the environment (health considerations should be weighted higher than the producers' economic gains (8 votes)

Examination of the impact on the subsoil water must be part of the control process when the GM plants are in the field (8 votes)

The environmental impact should definitely not be increased in comparison with traditional production (8 votes)

Safety should be assessed from case to case (7 votes)

There should be a guarantee that there are sufficient funds for public research and control (7 votes)

Feed or food crops should not be used, in order to make sure that there is no risk of mixing or a suspicion of mixing (3 votes)

Farmers are prohibited to mix production of foods and GM medicine within the same plant species, such as potatoes for consumption and potatoes for GM medicine (3 votes)

Food crops should not be used (1 vote)

Farmers may not produce foods and GM medicine-producing plants at the same time (1 vote)

GM ornamental plants

5th vote: Arguments for and against GM ornamental plants in Danish fields

The arguments for and against this matter have been formulated by the members of the citizens' jury. At this vote, they have each been given 10 votes, which they could distribute on any of the 19 arguments for and against the matter in accordance with highest priority. A total of 160 votes.

Arguments for GM ornamental plants: 75 out of 160 possible votes

Gene modification is not considered as problematic, as it is a matter of plant-to-plant gene modification, and it could be a good test balloon that can give us important information for future GM research (18 votes)

The development of new production methods could strengthen Danish trade and industry with regard to competitiveness and export (13 votes)

In some cases, GM ornamental plants can reduce the use of chemicals – such as plant growth regulators and insecticides (13 votes)

We have a strong/sufficient control system and we have the necessary knowledge and experience to be able to carry out the necessary control measures (13 votes)

There is a stricter control of GM plant breeding than traditional plant improvement (8 votes)

Drought-tolerant GM ornamental plants reduce the need for irrigation (5 votes)

GM ornamental plants satisfy a need with customers for new and different species – with regard to aesthetics as well as durability (2 votes)

Could create more jobs (2 votes)

GM ornamental plants could make the world prettier (1 vote)

Arguments against GM ornamental plants: 85 out of 160 possible votes

If Roundup-resistent GM plants, such as bent grass, are introduced, it could create a problem, in case the plants are spread to areas where Roundup is used for weed control (23 votes)

When growing GM plants, there could be a risk of spreading undesirable characteristics and genes (such as the spread of pollen to the surrounding nature) (15 votes)

Significant risk of spreading genes, because of insufficient possibility of controlling the individual consumers' use of the plants (12 votes)

It can be problematic not to have an annual rotation of crops where GM plants are grown, for example in the case of Christmas trees, as the soil is otherwise subject to constant impact, resulting in leaching of substances (11 votes)

GM ornamental plants could be considered useless and thus generate negative attitudes in the society towards gene technology (9 votes)

You should not tamper with nature – unless you have a good reason (such as saving lives) (5 votes)

It is a waste of research resources (3 votes)

There are no health benefits (3 votes)

Fundamental change of God's work (2 votes)

It is not possible to achieve 100% certainty in relation to the risks (2 votes)

6th vote: Conditions for growing GM ornamental plansts in Danish fields

The conditions have been formulated by the members of the citizens' jury. At this vote, they have each been given 6 votes, which they could distribute between the 11 conditions in accordance with highest priority. A total of 96 votes.

Herbicide-tolerant grasses must not be approved, as there is a significant risk of spread to cultivated areas as well as to other vegetation (21 votes)

The environmental impact, for example the use of chemicals/pesticides, must not be increased in comparison with traditional production (12 votes)

As there can be particular environmental risks in connection with GM ornamental plants, the consumer must be informed of the correct handling of the plant and of any risks connected with the plant (10 votes)

GM plants that are grown for several years (for example 5-10 years) without rotation must not be approved for the Danish market (such as christmas trees) (9 votes)

The approval of ornamental plants must be given lower priority than the approval of plants for medicine (8 votes)

The disposal of GM plants and plant parts must take place in a responsible way and with as little environmental risk as possible
(7 votes)

There must be strict requirements in connection with the approval of new products. This applies when plants are to be approved for further research and when the fully developed plant is to be approved for production. In case of new knowledge, the control requirements must be adapted (7 votes)

Examination of the impact on the subsoil water must be part of the control process when GM plants are in the field (6 votes)

Introduction of co-existance regulations for GM ornamental plants in nurseries and other places producing GM ornamental plants. (6 votes)

Research/production/control must take place as a balance between public research and financial interests (5 votes)

Present regulations, including the act on co-existence, must be maintained as minimum requirements (5 votes)

General recommendations

7th vote: Recommendations for the future handling of new GM plants

The recommendations have been formulated by the members of the citizens' jury. At this vote, they have been given 7 votes each, which they could distribute on the 13 recommendations in accordance with highest priority. A total of 112 votes. However, when counting the votes, it turned out that 117 votes had been placed. It is uncertain how this error has occured.

There is a need for public education. Knowledge and an open and nuanced debate contribute to demystifying the technology. This should take place through education through TV, radio, written media, the internet and education already in primary school. The education must contain factual information containing for example comparison with conventional production, legislation (rules about co-existence, approval procedures and the control process, etc.) and risks connected with GM plants (27 votes)

It must be possible for the consumer to choose between genetically modified and traditionally produced products (14 votes)

It must be advantegous to establish production in Denmark based on safe systems and with significant consideration for environment and health (12 votes)

It must be taken into consideration that the companies need efficient case handling throughout the entire approval process, also at political level (11 votes)

When GM plants are to be approved, it must be investigated if the water environment, particularly the subsoil water, is affected and to which degree it is affected (10 votes)

The public GM research must be given funds, to prevent that the industry alone sets the agenda (10 votes)

The competent authorities must be given sufficient funds for continued thorough control of GM plants (7 votes)

The GM area should be given more research funds (7 votes)

It should be ensured that there is a Danish system for approval of GM plants that also makes it possible for smaller companies to afford approval of their products (7 votes)

It should be possible for farmers to grow GM plants and regular crops on the same farm (5 votes)

The individual farmer should be able to choose which crops to grow (the act on co-existence) (4 votes)

It should be ensured that GM plants can be visually distinguished from other plants – as far as possible (for example through a different colour) (3 votes)

Development of simple tests in the field that make it possible to distinguish GM plants, instead of distinguishing through colour. (0 votes)