

**From:** [redacted] (CAB-KATAINEN) on behalf of [redacted] (CAB-KATAINEN)  
**Sent:** 01 March 2016 10:09  
**To:** [redacted] (CAB-KATAINEN); [redacted] (CAB-KATAINEN); [redacted] (CAB-KATAINEN); [redacted] (CAB-ANDRIUKAITIS); [redacted] (CAB-ANDRIUKAITIS); [redacted] (SG); [redacted] (SG)  
**Subject:** Meeting with Greenpeace on "new plant breeding techniques", 24/2/2016, summary report

Dear colleagues,

Please find below for your information a summary report from the meeting with Greenpeace that took place on 24 February.

Kind regards,

[redacted]

\*\*\*

**Participants:**

[redacted] (DHoC CAB Katainen), [redacted] (CAB Katainen), [redacted] (SG/E/1)  
[redacted] (Greenpeace European unit)

**Background:**

The meeting had been requested by Greenpeace in order to present its views on the interpretation of the scope of the GMO EU-legislation as regards new breeding techniques (NBTs).

**Summary:**

Greenpeace presented its viewpoints whereby they consider that NBTs fall within the scope of EU GMO legislation and stressed that this legislation provides, in Annex I of Directive 2001/18/EC an "open list" of "techniques" (i.e. the scope is not defined by referring to products). Greenpeace argued that NBTs pose a risk to safety and highlighted work of the Austrian *Umweltundesamt* and the Norwegian "centre for biosafety". Greenpeace also referred to a decision of a court in New Zealand interpreting the scope of the Cartagena Convention on biosafety. Finally, Greenpeace gave some more information about the "Cibus dossier" and an ongoing assessment in DE.

Regarding the process and next procedural steps, Greenpeace queried what is the state of play and expressed its expectation to be invited by DG SANTE to a stakeholder meeting. CAB Katainen informed that inter-service consultation had not been launched.