

CRITICAL EATING:  
GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOODS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
- DESIGNING INTERNATIONAL BODIES ON RISK MANAGEMENT IN  
EVOLVING SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY WITH GLOBAL IMPACT

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF LAW  
AND THE COMMITTEE OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF THE SCIENCE OF LAW

Dirk Walter Heumüller

August 2001

## **Abstract**

This thesis aims at providing insights on how to set up and design international decision-making bodies in evolving science and technology with global impact. It addresses the institutional side of growing concerns about participatory democracy while using the current debate over genetically engineered foods as means of exploring possible options.

The analysis focuses on how policy-advice on genetically engineered foods is structured, both on the domestic and international levels. Domestic efforts in Canada, the USA, and Europe are analyzed together with alternative instruments such as Consensus Conferences. For the international level, the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius, the U.S.-EU Consultative Forum, and the Biosafety Protocol are analyzed in depth. Since setting up and designing decision-making bodies in evolving science and technology has already been practiced on several issues and in various ways, this thesis also draws on past significant experiences with such bodies. Finally, this thesis identifies the crucial features of international bodies on risk management in evolving science & technology and applies the findings on the design of a future international panel on genetically engineered foods. Although the focus is on the issue of genetically engineered foods, the findings may be of broader application and be of value in future efforts to cope with issues of science, high technology, civil society and development within a globalizing, but nevertheless pluralistic and multicultural, world.

## Table of Contents

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>INTRODUCTION:</b> .....   | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>CHAPTER 1: “THE STORY OF G.E.F.” – WHAT IS AT STAKE</b> .....   | <b>4</b>   |
| <b>CHAPTER 2: DECISION-MAKING ON G.E.F. TODAY</b> .....  | <b>13</b>  |
| A.    Basis of the analysis: analytical path, measurement applied .....  | 13         |
| B.    Domestic decision-making bodies .....  | 17         |
| 1.    Canada.....  | 19         |
| 2.    U.S.A.....   | 30         |
| 3.    The European Union .....   | 49         |
| 4.    Consensus/Citizen conferences on the national level .....  | 71         |
| 5.    Conclusions/Implications – the role of national advisory bodies ..   | 81         |
| C.    International decision-making bodies on the issue of g.e.f. ....   | 88         |
| 1.    Needs on the international level.....  | 89         |
| 2.    Overview on international efforts .....  | 91         |
| 3.    UN–Joint FAO/WHO Codex Task Force .....  | 95         |
| 4.    U.S.-EU Consultative Forum (CF).....   | 111        |
| 5.    Cartagena Biosafety Protocol/Biosafety Clearing House/CBD ..   | 119        |
| D.    Conclusions/Implications: what is still lacking.....   | 127        |
| <b>CHAPTER 3: EXPERIENCES FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL BODIES</b> .....  | <b>135</b> |
| A.    IPCC .....   | 135        |
| B.    CBD-SBSTTA .....   | 138        |
| C.    Millennium Ecosystem Assessment – overview on the approach .....   | 141        |
| D.    Conclusions/Implications: what worked – major aspects for designing<br>advice in evolving science & technology with global impact..... | 143        |
| <b>CHAPTER 4: DESIGNING AN INTERNATIONAL DECISION-MAKING BODY ON G.E.F. –<br/>            ADDING VALUE</b> .....                             | <b>148</b> |
| A.    Mission and Objectives .....   | 148        |
| B.    Internal body structure .....  | 154        |
| 1.    How to implement scientific knowledge? The role of<br>scientists/civil society/politics.....   | 155        |
| 2.    How to involve the public? .....   | 157        |
| C.    The IPGEF as part of international governance .....  | 158        |
| 1.    Potential institutional alternatives.....  | 158        |
| 2.    Suggested institutional setting.....   | 161        |
| 3.    Procedures and value adding results. ....  | 164        |
| <b>CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....   | <b>166</b> |
| <b>APPENDICES</b> .....  | <b>167</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 1: COMPARATIVE PUBLIC OPINIONS “% WHO WANT TO ENCOURAGE<br/>            BIOTECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS”</b> .....                    | <b>167</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 2: REGULATING BIO-ENGINEERED CROPS IN THE U.S.</b> .....   | <b>168</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 3: WORLD GM AREAS 1999/2000</b> .....  | <b>169</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 4: U.S. CORN AND SOY EXPORTS TO THE EU (1995-1999)</b> .....   | <b>170</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 5: EUROPEAN ATTITUDES TO SEVEN APPLICATIONS OF BIOTECHNOLOGY<br/>            .....</b>   | <b>171</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 6: ANTI-G.E.F.-CAMPAIGN IN THE U.S.A.</b> .....  | <b>172</b> |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>APPENDIX 7: ANTI-G.E.F.-CAMPAIGN IN THE EU. ....</b>  | <b>173</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 8: OPINIONS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON PLANTS RELATED TO G.E.F. UNTIL APRIL 2001.....</b>                        | <b>174</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 9: OPINIONS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON FOOD DIRECTLY ADDRESSING G.E.F. UNTIL APRIL 2001.....</b>                 | <b>177</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 10: GMO'S IN THE FOOD CHAIN.....</b>   | <b>178</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 11: TRANSGENIC ATLANTIC SALMON, CONTAINING AN ANTIFREEZE PROTEIN PROMOTER MEASURED AGAINST CONTROL SIBLINGS.....</b> | <b>179</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 12: "WHO SHOULD SIT AT THE TABLE WHEN SCIENCE POLICY IS BEING DECIDED?" .....</b>                                    | <b>180</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 13: DANISH STYLE "CITIZEN CONSENSUS CONFERENCES" .....</b>   | <b>181</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 14: 10 MAJOR QUESTIONS OF THE DANISH PANEL, 1999 .....</b>   | <b>182</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 15: QUESTIONS OF THE CANADIAN PANEL, 1999 .....</b>  | <b>183</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 16: CANADIAN LAY PANEL REPORT – ANSWER EXAMPLE.....</b>  | <b>183</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 17: CANADIAN SUMMARY OF THE FRENCH CITIZEN PANEL REPORT .....</b>  | <b>184</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 18: BODY STRUCTURE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION.....</b>   | <b>185</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 19: PATENT HOLDERS IN AGRICULTURE .....</b>  | <b>186</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 20: SELECTION &amp; APPOINTMENT OF EXPERTS FOR FAO/WHO EXPERT CONSULTATIONS .....</b>                                | <b>187</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 21: HOW CODEX ALIMENTARIUS OPERATES (STEP PROCEDURE) .....</b>   | <b>188</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 22: SUSTAINABILITY SCIENCE WITHIN A DIVIDED WORLD. ....</b>  | <b>189</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 23, PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON EXPERT MEETINGS WITHIN THE BIOSAFETY PROTOCOL .....</b>                                  | <b>190</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 24: IPCC STRUCTURE .....</b>   | <b>191</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 25: INTERLINKAGES AMONG PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS WITH GLOBAL DIMENSION .....</b>                                       | <b>192</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX 26:.....</b>   | <b>193</b> |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>  | <b>194</b> |