

Ban Terminator Campaign
www.banterminator.org
15 March 2006

Media Advisory – 20th-31st March 2006, Curitiba

The Battle in Brazil: Lines Drawn in Terminator Seed Fight

As 188 national governments gather in Curitiba, Brazil, for the Eighth Conference of the Parties (COP8) to the United Nations' Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), battle lines are being drawn on the issue of Terminator technology – crops genetically modified to produce sterile seeds, also known as “suicide seeds.” Almost 500 organisations – including farmer organizations and peasant movements, international civil society organizations, trade unions, faith organizations and churches – have now called on the world's governments to enact a ban on Terminator at the upcoming CBD meeting. (The complete list of organizations supporting a ban on Terminator is posted at www.banterminator.org/endorsements.)

Thousands of farmers organized through Via Campesina, the international peasant movement representing millions of farmers worldwide, have announced that they will demonstrate against Terminator outside the CBD conference centre. Working with other social movements as part of the Forum of Brazilian NGOs (FBOMS), Via Campesina will hold public events and rallies throughout COP8, including a day of opposition to Terminator on March 21st. To mark International Women's Day (March 8th), Pakistani women farmers met near Islamabad and vowed to resist any moves to introduce Terminator technology into their country. Last week in Porto Alegre, at the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development organized by the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, Rafael Alegria from Via Campesina received a standing ovation for his speech against Terminator. The parallel Forum for Land, Territory and Dignity also expressed its strong rejection of Terminator Technology.

From Australia and New Zealand to Spain, Germany, the UK and Canada, letter-writing campaigns are underway. Many thousands of citizens have asked their national delegations to support a ban on Terminator at the CBD, including 50,000 Canadians who have sent “Ban Terminator” protest cards to Prime Minister Stephen Harper. In India nearly 500,000 signatures supporting the Terminator moratorium have been collected. In Italy, more than 120 scientists have signed an anti-Terminator petition sent to the Minister of Agriculture. In Canada, there have been protests in Montreal, home of the CBD secretariat. A public “Terminator on Trial” event is scheduled for the evening of 20th March in Canada's capital city. National radio journalist Bob Carty will host the event in Ottawa and there will be a live video link to the CBD meeting in Curitiba. The “trial” will feature “testimony” from Indian scientist and activist Vandana Shiva and farmer Percy Schmeiser (famously sued by Monsanto for planting saved seed). Organizers expect hundreds to attend the trial acting as a people's jury.

In light of the vigorous and worldwide opposition to Terminator, even the world's three largest seed companies – Monsanto, Pioneer Hi-Bred (DuPont) and Syngenta – have now publicly distanced themselves from suicide seeds. ¹ However, it seems that a handful of governments from wealthy countries have come to Curitiba intending to press ahead with attempts to undermine the existing, six-year old global moratorium on Terminator.

At stake is the food security and livelihoods of 1.4 billion people who depend on farmer-saved seed.

In 2000, governments at the CBD agreed to a moratorium on field trials and commercial release of Terminator technology. Terminator is a type of genetically engineered technology called Genetic Use Restriction Technologies (or GURTs) at the UN. Six years later, governments from Africa, Asia and Latin America continue to support the moratorium, but Australia, New Zealand and Canada have attempted in recent years to introduce new wording into the text of the Convention that undermines the moratorium. These three countries appear to be doing the bidding of the US government, which is not a party to the CBD. The US would like Terminator to be regulated under national laws rather than internationally at the CBD. The pro-Terminator governments are pushing for “case by case risk assessment” of GURTs with the intention of allowing Terminator to be approved through existing legislation for genetically modified crops, without consideration for social and economic impacts. The “Terminator Trio” – Australia, New Zealand and Canada – have now been joined by a fourth: the UK government.

The interest in promoting Terminator on the part of a handful of wealthy governments is not hard to understand. The commercial seed market worldwide brings in approximately US\$23 billion in revenue annually, but trade sources estimate that if farmers could not save seed and were forced to buy new seed at each planting, the global seed market would increase beyond \$45 billion. The international civil society organization ETC Group estimates that at least US\$10 billion of the seed market increase would come from South farmers. Brazilian soybean farmers who are now using farm-saved seed would see their seed costs increase by approximately \$515 million each year. Argentina’s soybean farmers would pay an extra US\$276 million. Wheat farmers in Pakistan would face a price rise of US\$191 million, while cotton farmers in that country would pay out an additional US\$33 million. Rice farmers in the Philippines will pay another US\$172 million. Farmers in the North will also suffer. Terminator wheat, alone, will conservatively cost Canadian farmers an additional US\$85 million dollars per year.

GURTS: (some) Governments Urging Release of Terminator Seeds

What follows is more information on the four pro-Terminator governments’ positions in the days leading up to the Battle in Brazil.

Canada – in deaf mode

Opposition to Terminator is strong among Canada's farm organizations.. No major farm organisation in Canada currently supports Terminator. The Union des producteurs agricoles (UPA), representing 44,000 Québec farmers and the National Farmers Union, as well as Canadian Organic Growers are opposed to Terminator. Last week, the 200,000-member Canadian Federation of Agriculture passed a critical resolution requesting an assessment of Terminator’s impacts on farmers. But it doesn’t appear that the Canadian government is listening. Canada first attempted to overturn the CBD moratorium on Terminator in February 2005 at a UN meeting in Bangkok. Referring to Canada’s position, Giuliano Tulusso of Agriculture Canada admitted, “We haven’t necessarily actively consulted farmers.”² In fact, it’s difficult to know whom the Canadian Government has consulted. The 90 or so organizations of the Canadian Council for International Co-operation have asked that the moratorium on Terminator be strengthened and have received no reply from the Canadian government; neither have churches such as the United Church of Canada. Despite Terminator’s unpopularity among Canada’s farmers and public, Agriculture Canada still feels that Canada should support Terminator at the CBD: “There’s always a risk with any technology,” explains Giuliano Tulusso. “The brakes on your car are not 100 per-cent effective either. They can fail.”³

Australia – in the dark?

The Australian government led the most recent attempt to undermine the *de facto* moratorium on Terminator at a CBD meeting in Granada in January. With an official from the US State Department

by her side during key negotiations, Australian delegate Susan Jones insisted on a “case by case risk assessment” of GURTs. When civil society representatives recently met with the office of Australia’s agriculture minister, officials seemed genuinely surprised by the Australian delegation’s behaviour in Granada, indicating that Australia doesn’t have a formal policy on the GURTs issue.

New Zealand – in denial?

Documents obtained by the Sustainability Council of New Zealand under New Zealand’s Official Information Act show that New Zealand has supported field trials and “case by case assessment” of Terminator since February 2005 and that representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade have been actively involved in lobbying at the CBD to undermine the moratorium. Inexplicably, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Winston Peters, appeared oblivious to the issue and even denied the existence of the Convention on Biological Diversity. In two days of parliamentary exchanges with MP Nandor Tanczos concerning New Zealand’s position on Terminator, Minister Peters repeatedly asserted, “There is no such international convention or treaty.” When treaty text and a list of the signatories to the CBD was tabled, he responded saying, “I seek leave to table a paper from the convention in respect of Terminator technology, but I cannot, because there is no such convention.” The New Zealand public appears better informed, with thousands of New Zealanders sending email messages to the government asking for a ban on Terminator.

UK – in on the act?

While the UK has previously supported the CBD *de facto* moratorium on Terminator as part of the EU, Prime Minister Tony Blair is known to be close to the biotech industry and, as a result, it seems the UK’s opposition to Terminator is weakening.

UK Environment Ministers have refused to meet with civil society groups, preferring to put civil servants in the firing line. The UK’s Environment Ministry quietly released its own position paper, stating that it will now support “case by case risk assessment” of Terminator (see <http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/gm/eu/gurts-0602.htm>). This policy is backed by the UK Department for International Development.

Michael Meacher, Labour MP (and UK Environment Minister at the time the UK signed the CBD *de facto* moratorium in 2000), has written to his successor asking that the revised policy be dropped before the meeting in Curitiba. Mr Meacher wrote, “The UK must demonstrate its commitment to global food security and have a strong position at the CBD meeting in March, to ensure that Terminator seeds never see the light of day.”⁴ Nearly 200 cross-party members of the UK parliament have signed a motion calling for the CBD Terminator moratorium to be maintained and there has been a recent debate on the matter in the UK Parliament during which an opposition MP said, “Once the technology is let out of Pandora’s box, there is no putting it back.”⁵

Notes to editors:

The Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP8) begins Monday 20th March 2006 and continues until the following Friday 31st March. The issue of Terminator technology is expected to be addressed during the second and third days of the meeting (Tuesday March 21st and Wednesday March 22nd). The Ban Terminator campaign will provide daily news updates from Curitiba throughout COP8 at www.banterminator.org and, in Portuguese, at www.cop8.org.br. The ETC group will also offer a perspective on events on its web log: www.etcblog.org.

International media seeking updates, interviews or analysis can contact Jim Thomas in Curitiba at jim@etcgroup.org (+55 [41] 88341049; alternate number: +1 613 241-2267). Spanish speakers can contact Verónica Villa at veronica@etcgroup.org. French and Portuguese speakers can contact Karine Peschard at karine@etcgroup.org.

- ¹ The world's three largest seed companies have pledged not to commercialize seed sterilization technologies. Monsanto's pledge is available on its web site at www.monsanto.com/monsanto/content/media/pubs/2005/pledgereport.pdf. The pledge, as it is stated in the Pledge Report, is currently incorrect, according to Monsanto's head of public policy, Diane Herndon. In an email message to the Ban Terminator Campaign dated 27 March 2006, Ms. Herndon clarified that the mention of "non food crops" was a mistake. For more details, see <http://www.etcgroup.org/article.asp?newsid=546>. In an email message to the ETC Group dated 2 March 2006, Tom West, Vice President of Pioneer Hi-Bred International (#2 seed company, owned by DuPont), wrote: "DuPont has not changed our position on this matter. While we continue to work on the use of gene switches in seed products...we have no plans to use biotechnology to interfere with the traditional practice of saving seed by farmers." Syngenta's Lionel Stanbrook of Syngenta International AG (the world's #3 seed company) has also informed The Ban Terminator campaign that it does not intend to commercialize Terminator Technology – referring to a clear position statement on the Syngenta website (available at http://www.syngenta.com/en/about_syngenta/our_views.aspx).
- Only one company publicly vows to commercialize Terminator Technology: Delta and Pine Land (D&PL), the world's 11th largest seed company and joint owner of three US patents on Terminator with the US Department of Agriculture. In 1998, D&PL has said it expected the technology would be used on over one billion acres, especially in countries such as India, Pakistan and China.
- ² Kelly Patterson, "Seeds of discontent: A blessing or a curse to mankind? Critics of genetically modified food and grain-industry giants await UN ruling on 'suicide seeds,'" *The Ottawa Citizen*, Sunday, March 5, 2006.
- ³ Ibid.
- ⁴ Michael Meacher, "Defra is sowing the seeds of poor farmers' destruction," *The Guardian*, March 15, 2006.
- ⁵ To see the full debate's transcript see 8 March 2006, columns 919-925 on <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/cm060308/debindx/60308-x.htm>.

TERMINATOR SEEDS AT COP8 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

What is Terminator Technology?

Terminator technology refers to plants that have been genetically modified to render sterile seeds at harvest. It is one of a class of GM technologies known as Genetic Use Restriction Technology (or GURTS) that allow genetic traits to be switched on and off via application of an external inducer such as a chemical. The United Nations refers to sterile seed technologies as Varietal-GURTS (or V-GURTS).

Who has developed Terminator Technology?

Terminator technology was developed by the multinational seed/agrochemical industry and the US government to prevent farmers from saving and re-planting harvested seed and to maximize seed industry profits. The US Department of Agriculture and Delta & Pine Land, the world's 11th largest seed company, jointly hold three patents on Terminator technology. Delta & Pine Land are currently testing the technology in greenhouses and a representative is now travelling worldwide to promote his company's Terminator technology. Syngenta, DuPont, BASF and Monsanto also hold patents on Terminator technology.

Who are the stakeholders?

- **Small-scale farmers** face the biggest threats from Terminator seeds as their ability to grow and improve crops depends on selecting and saving seeds from year to year. Over 1.4 billion people in the world depend on farm-saved seed as their primary seed source. The dynamic exchange of seeds between communities and peoples is threatened by sterile seed technologies.
- For many **local communities and Indigenous peoples**, seed saving is connected with traditional knowledge relating to agricultural biodiversity and deeply held and long practiced cultural and spiritual traditions, all of which are threatened by Terminator.
- **Environmental action groups** also take issue with Terminator seeds, since Terminator seeds threaten agricultural biodiversity and pose new biosafety risks. In the first generation, pollen from Terminator plants can travel and cross with wild relatives or neighbouring crops resulting in plants with sterile seeds.

- **The seed and biotechnology industry** wants Terminator in order to protect corporate patents over seeds, particularly genetically modified seeds, and to force farmers to buy commercial seed each season.
- **Most governments** have spoken up against Terminator and in defence of the farmers in their countries. There are only a few rich governments that are promoting Terminator – namely Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain – with the United States.

Terminator's potential impacts include:

- dependency on commercial seeds
- displacing traditional, Indigenous, or local ecological knowledge and cultural and spiritual practices
- disrupting traditional seed exchange practices
- irreversible changes to ecosystems from contamination with Terminator genes
- yield loss due to cross-pollination by Terminator plants
- reduced agricultural biodiversity

What is the status of Terminator technology?

- In 2000, the UN Convention on Biological Diversity adopted language that created an international *de facto* moratorium on Terminator seeds, recommending that governments neither field-test nor commercialize genetic seed sterilization technologies (Decision V/5, Section III, paragraph 23).
- Terminator has not yet been commercialized or field-tested — although trials are currently being conducted in greenhouses in the US.
- The moratorium is being undermined by newly proposed language of “case by case risk assessment” of Terminator. The language was pushed forward at a meeting of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity in Granada, Spain in January 2006 by the Australian government, with support from the US, Canada and New Zealand. This new language echoes Monsanto's own reference to looking at Terminator on a “case by case” basis.

“Case by case risk assessment” generally focuses on a narrow, science-based risk assessment that does not consider the potential socio-economic impacts of new technologies. The goal of the case-by-case approach is to see Terminator crops regulated like any other genetically modified plant.

Terminator at the CBD COP8

The UN Convention on Biological Diversity’s 8th Conference of the Parties will determine the future of the *de facto* moratorium on Terminator technology. Terminator is expected to be raised in the agenda during the second day (Tuesday 21st March). The Ban Terminator campaign will be providing daily news updates from Curitiba during the meeting of the CBD – see http://www.banterminator.org/news_updates and also at www.etcblog.org

The Ban Terminator Campaign

The International Ban Terminator Campaign was formed in May 2005 by civil society groups and movements in response to the threats posed by Terminator and the new corporate promotion of the technology. The Ban Terminator Campaign seeks to promote government bans on Terminator technology at the national and international levels, and supports the efforts of civil society, farmers, Indigenous peoples and social movements to campaign against it. The Campaign is supported by groups and movements across the world including AS-PTA (Assessoria e Serviços a Projectos em Agricultura Alternativa), ETC Group, GRAIN, Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism, ITDG (Intermediate Technology Development Group), Pesticide Action Network – Asia and the Pacific, Third World Network, Via Campesina.

Ban Terminator Campaign www.banterminator.org

Jim Thomas – jim@etcgroup.org - (41) 8834-1049 mobile

SIGNATORIES TO THE INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO BAN TERMINATOR

March 16, 2006

"We oppose all forms of Terminator technology (Genetic Use Restriction Technologies or GURTs).

We ask all national governments and international bodies to ban Terminator in order to ensure that the technology is never field tested or commercialized."

As of March 16, 2006, this campaign is endorsed by **493 organizations** from the following countries:

Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Guinea, India, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Romania, Slovenia, United Kingdom, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Uruguay, Puerto Rico, USA, Venezuela, Zambia

The complete list of endorsements is available at:
www.banterminator.org/endorsements

BAN TERMINATOR CAMPAIGN EVENTS AT THE COP8 – MARCH 20-31

MONDAY 20

Intellectual Property: Biodiversity & Patents Under the CBD

Global Civil Society Forum, 1pm-4pm

Karin Nansen (ASC), Silvia Rodriguez (GRAIN), Silvia Ribeiro (ETC Group)

Farmers' Rights and Access and Benefit-Sharing

CBDC Side Event, 6:30pm-8:15pm (tbc)

SEARICE (Philippines)

Terminator on Trial Live video feed to Ottawa (Canada)

Press Briefing Room, 8pm-11pm

With: Roberto Requião (Governor of Parana) tbc, Campbell Davidson (Agriculture Canada), Pat Mooney (ETC Group), Francisca Rodriguez (Via Campesina), Vandana Shiva, Percy Schmeiser

TUESDAY 21

Panel for Action Day Against Terminator

Global Civil Society Forum, 10 -12

Francisca Rodriguez (Anamuri, Chile, Via Campesina), Hope Shand (ETC Group), MST, representatives from Africa and Asia

Terminator Technology - Potential Impacts of Genetic Use Restriction Technologies

B1-24 Level 0 Side Event Room 6, 13:15pm-15pm

Biodiversity and Nutrition Food Fair – Latin America, Africa, Asia

CBDC – Community Biodiversity Development and Conservation

6-8pm Civil society tent

WEDNESDAY 22

Press Briefing 'The Real Cost of Terminator'

Press Briefing Room, 9:30am

Pat Mooney and Hope Shand(ETC Group), Alejandro Argumedo (ANDES), Via Campesina (tbc)

THURSDAY 23

New Forms of Biopiracy and New Technologies

Global Civil Society Forum, 1pm-4pm

Hope Shand, Pat Mooney and Silvia Ribeiro (ETC Group), Maria Jose Guazelli (Centro Ecologico)

New Technologies and Biodiversity: Nanotechnology, Synthetic Biology and Weather Modification

CBD Side event, 6:30pm-8:15pm

Pat Mooney, Hope Shand, Jim Thomas (ETC Group)

FRIDAY 24

The Captain Hook Awards for Biopiracy

Global Civil Society Forum, noon & Press Briefing Room 2pm

Announcing winners of 'The Captain Hook Awards for Biopiracy' Coalition against Biopiracy

Seeds: Heritage of the People at the Service of Humanity

Global Civil Society Forum, 10am

Via Campesina, CBDC, ETC Group, and GRAIN

Terminator and Farmers Rights

CBDC ; 6:30 – 8:15

BAN TERMINATOR CAMPAIGN

RESOURCE LIST

Available from the Ban Terminator Website www.banterminator.org

IN ENGLISH:

Introduction:

- Terminator Technology: Suicide Seeds Are Back!
<http://www.banterminator.org/p/99>

Science:

- Ban Terminator Briefing: [Terminator Technology and Genetic Contamination](#)
- EcoNexus Scientific Critique in Brief, Based on Submission to UN SBSTTA10 meeting. [V-GURTS \(Terminator\) as a biological containment tool?](#) February 2005;
- GeneWatch UK " [GM Contamination: Can biological containment work for crops and society?](#)"
<http://www.banterminator.org/p/100>

Peasants and Small-Scale Farmers:

- Ban Terminator Briefing: Terminator Technology and Farmers' Rights (March 2006)
<http://www.banterminator.org/p/101>

Indigenous Peoples, Traditional Knowledge and Biodiversity:

- Ban Terminator Briefing (January 2006): [Traditional Knowledge and Terminator Technology](#)
<http://www.banterminator.org/p/124>

The Industry:

- List of patents on Terminator - updated October 2005
- Global Seed Industry Concentration – 2005, ETC Communiqué, September/October 2005
<http://www.banterminator.org/p/103>

PORTUGUÊS:

- Tecnologia Terminator: As Sementes Suicidas Estão de Volta! Antecedentes
<http://pt.banterminator.org/p/99>
- Tecnologia Terminator e Contaminação Genética
<http://pt.banterminator.org/p/100>
- A Tecnologia Terminator e os Direitos dos Agricultores Março 2006
<http://pt.banterminator.org/p/101>

To obtain documents or for more information: jim@etcgroup.org

COP 8 DRAFT DECISION ON GURTS

C. Potential socio-economic impacts of genetic use restriction technologies (GURTs) on indigenous and local communities

Paragraphs 1-6 of the following draft decision are taken from recommendation 4/7 of the fourth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions (UNEP/CBD/COP/8/7, annex I). Paragraphs 7-11 come from paragraphs 3 (b)-(e) of SBSTTA recommendation X/11. **In paragraph 3 (a) of that recommendation, SBSTTA recommended that the Conference of the Parties should determine the scope of the mandate of its bodies relating to genetic use restriction technologies.**

The Conference of the Parties

1. *Reaffirms* its decision V/5, section III (Genetic use restriction technologies);
2. *Invites* Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations and stakeholders to:
 - (a) Respect the right of farmers and indigenous and local communities to use, save and exchange their farm-saved seeds /propagating materials; where appropriate, subject to national legislation;
 - (b) Promote cooperation and synergies between agencies and experts in order to undertake further research and studies on potential impacts and other aspects of genetic use restriction technologies, including their ecological, socio-economic and cultural impacts on indigenous and local communities, including on a case-by-case risk assessment basis with respect to different categories of genetic use restriction technologies, [\[1\]](#)/ subject to the precautionary approach; and
 - (c) Disseminate relevant information, based on scientific research and studies, on ecological, socio-economic and cultural impacts of genetic use restriction technologies on indigenous and local communities, including through the clearing-house mechanism;
3. *Urges* Parties and Governments, international and regional financial institutions and development agencies, as well as other donors to promote technology transfer and support capacity-building measures, in accordance with national needs and priorities, for risk assessment and risk management, by developing countries Parties and Parties with economies in transition aimed at addressing the ecological, socio-economic and cultural aspects of genetic use restriction technologies;
4. *Also urges* Parties and Governments, international and regional financial institutions and development agencies, as well as other donors to support, *inter alia*, through capacity-building measures, smallholder farmers and indigenous and local communities in the application of section III of decision V/5;
5. *Further urges* Parties to promote and facilitate the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in all future discussions on genetic use restriction technologies under the Convention on Biological Diversity;
6. *Invites* the World Intellectual Property Organization, the United Nations

Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to undertake, within their respective mandates, studies on the factual record of patents granted, as well as any pending patent applications and related patent policies on genetic use restriction technologies and on the ethical and spiritual consequences of genetic use restriction technologies;

7. *Reaffirms* decision V/5, section III (Genetic use restriction technologies);

8. *Encourages* Parties, other Governments, relevant organizations, and interested stakeholders to:

(a) Respect traditional knowledge and farmers' rights to the preservation of seeds under traditional cultivation;

(b) Continue to undertake further research on the impacts of genetic use restriction technologies, including their ecological, social, economic and cultural impacts, particularly on indigenous and local communities; and

(c) Continue to disseminate the results of studies on the potential environmental (e.g., risk assessment), socio-economic and cultural impacts of genetic use restriction technologies on smallholder farmers, indigenous and local communities, and make these studies available in a transparent manner through, inter alia, the clearing-house mechanism;

9. *Invites* the Governing Body of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture to examine, within the context of its work, priorities and available resources, the potential impacts of genetic use restriction technologies with special consideration to the impacts on indigenous and local communities, smallholder farmers and Farmers' Rights;

10. *Notes* that there is a strong demand for capacity-building and technology transfer, particularly for developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and that adequate resources need to be provided, particularly relating to the assessment of, and decision-making, on genetic use restriction technologies, including regarding cultural and socio-economic aspects, in accordance with Articles 12, 16, 17, 18 and 20 of the Convention, and *supports* capacity-building initiatives covering environmental, cultural and socio-economic aspects to enable Parties to make informed decisions and actions on genetic use restriction technologies with the participation of local and indigenous communities and other stakeholders; and

11. *Notes* that the issues related to genetic use restriction technologies should be presented in appropriate language and simplified form, in particular in order to facilitate the participation of indigenous and local communities in the development and implementation of appropriate policies and strategies.

[1]/ This is meant to be with respect to different variations within different categories of genetic use restriction technologies.

Media Contacts for the Ban Terminator Campaign

English: Jim Thomas - jim@etcgroup.org - ph: +55 (41) 88341049

Espanol: Veronica Villa – veronica@etcgroup.org - ph: +55 (41) 88432011

Français / Português: Karine Peschard – karine@etcgroup.org
ph: +55 (41) 88268973

Regional Spokespeople available from Ban Terminator Campaign at COP 8:

International

Lucy Sharrat – Co-ordinator Ban Terminator Campaign (lucy@banterminator.org)

Africa

Mali: Mana Diakite - USC Mali (manausccm@usccanadamali.org)

Ethiopia: Dr. Malaku Worede – Former Director, Ethiopian Gene Bank.

Uganda: Bridget Nabikolo - Centre for Development Initiatives
(bnabikolo@cdi.org.ng)

Asia

Malaysia: Lim Li Lin– Third World Network- (lin@myjaring.net)

Philippines: Ditdit Pelegrina - SEARICE (ditdit_pelegrina@searice.org.ph)

Latin America

Brazil: Maria Jose Guazzelli – Centro Ecologico.

(mariajose.guazzelli@gmail.com)

Chile: Francisca Rodriguez – Via Campesina (internacional@anamuri.cl)

Mexico: Silvia Ribeiro – ETC Group (silvia@etcgroup.org)

North America

Canada: Pat Mooney – ETC Group (etc@etcgroup.org)

Canada: Susan Walsh – USC Canada (swalsh@usc-canada.org)

USA: Hope Shand – ETC Group (hope@etcgroup.org)

USA: Dr Michael Hanson – Consumers Union (hansmi@consumer.org)

Europe

Germany: Ricarda Steinbrecher – Federation of German Scientists

(rsteinbrecher@gn.apc.org)

Germany: Benny Haerlin – Greenpeace International (haerlin@zs-l.de)

Norway: Aksel Nærstad – Norwegian Development Fund (aksel@u-fondet.no)

UK: Patrick Mulvany - UK Food Group (patrickmulvany@clara.co.uk)