

**Subject:** RE: Question about your CBD Online postings  
**From:** "Friedman, Robert" <rfriedman@jcvi.org>  
**Date:** 7/26/2017 2:53 PM  
**To:** Fred Gould <fred\_gould@ncsu.edu>

Hi Fred—

You might be on vacation or you might have just missed this email. In case it is the latter, I am wondering what you think about my highlighting some of (what I think) are key conclusions from Chapter 4 of your NASEM report in a post for the online forum? (Assuming that you do not want to do that yourself. See my note below.)

This stuff gets tiring. And we are only in round 2 of 4.

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:** Friedman, Robert  
**Sent:** Friday, July 21, 2017 12:08 PM  
**To:** 'Fred Gould' <fred\_gould@ncsu.edu>  
**Subject:** Question about your CBD Online postings

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) [<mailto:bch@cbd.int>]

**Sent:** Friday, July 21, 2017 6:28 AM

**To:** Friedman, Robert <[rfriedman@jcvi.org](mailto: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.

[See this post in the online forum](#) | [Reply](#) | [Unsubscribe](#)

**FURTHER ASSISTANCE**

If you have any questions, suggestions or problems with the use of this service, please contact the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity at: [bch@cbd.int](mailto:bch@cbd.int)

[22 May 2017-International Day for Biological Diversity:Biodiversity and Sustainable Tourism](#)  
[22 May 2017-International Day for Biological Diversity:  
Biodiversity and Sustainable Tourism](#)