

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

October 24th 2006

Tuscany Representative Office in Brussels

Minute

Final version 09/11/2006

Participants:

Name	Region
Aitor Mintegui Etxaleku	Euskadi (ES)
Athanassios Goumas	ENAE (GR)
Daniela Mazzarino	Toscana (IT)
Fabio Boscaleri	Toscana (IT)
Herard Burger	on behalf of Oberösterreich (AT)
Ivana Stella	Umbria (IT)
Justin Amiot	Bretagne (FR)
Le Boulch	Aquitaine (FR)
Martin Williams	Wales (UK)
Paola Simone	Umbria (IT)
Renata Sangiorgi	Lazio (IT)
Renaud Layadi	Bretagne (FR)
Roberto Pagni	Toscana (IT)
Stephen Jackson	Wales (UK)
Vincent Lacarce	Aquitaine (FR)

15 participants from 9 Regions (Full SC)

AGENDA

- A. 5th Conference of the Network – page 2;
- B. planning working groups' activity – page 3;
- C. Tuscany national workshop on coexistence (Florence, 6-7 Nov) – page 4;
- D. meeting with the "International Commission on future of Food" (Florence, 15 Dec) – page 5;
- E. COR opinion – page 6;
- F. multilateral meeting with Commission services – page 7;
- G. network's organization – page 8;
- H. results of the consultation (Net's name) – page 9;
- I. any other business – page 10.

Main outcomes

A. 5th Conference of the Network

Greek representative in Brussels communicates that for the current year Greek Authorities have not yet decided to host the Conference in Greece and, because of the short time to set up a Conference by December, the representative says that next year should be a better target.

Steering Committee decides to ensure a Conference in 2007 (by the beginning of next spring).

The current situation is:

- ?? ENAE is a candidate member to set up the 5th Conference, but cannot ensure a quick decision for the beginning of 2007;
- ?? French Regions cannot host the Conference because the last one was in France (Rennes);
- ?? Wales and Euskadi cannot host the Conference because of 2007 elections.

In this regard, every other net's member that wants to candidate itself to host the 5th Conference is invited to express this intention to the Presidency during year 2006.

If no one can host the Conference, Brussels would be considered as a possible alternative.

B. Planning working groups' activity

After a revision of the state-of-the-art inside the WGs, the situation is:

Item	Member	Notes
WORKING GROUP 1 "GMOs and Agriculture" <u>AQUITAINE</u>	EMILIA-ROMAGNA, TOSCANA, UMBRIA, LIGURIA, BOLZANO, MIDI-PYRÉNÉES, LIMOUSIN, EUSKADI, KÄRNTEN, SALZBURG, PRINCIPADO DE ASTURIA, OBERÖSTERREICH, BRETAGNE, WALES	Inactive Common position (Rennes)
WORKING GROUP 2 "GMOs and legal aspects" <u>DRAMA-KAVALA-XANTHI - ENAE</u>	SARDEGNA, EMILIA-ROMAGNA, AQUITAINE, MIDI-PYRÉNÉES, ILE DE FRANCE, LIMOUSIN, BURGENLAND, KÄRNTEN, TOSCANA, OBERÖSTERREICH, BRETAGNE	Active Common position under revision after the meeting with DG ENV services
WORKING GROUP 3 "Environmental Liability" <u>WALES</u>	POITOU-CHARENTES, ILE DE FRANCE, PRINCIPADO DE ASTURIA, OBERÖSTERREICH, STEIERMARK, HIGHLANDS OF SCOTLAND, DRAMA-KAVALA-XANTHI-ENAE, TOSCANA, AQUITAINE	to be activated Subject: Environmental Liability Directive (EC/35/2004) Wales will develop a working agenda and an input paper (Annex 1).
WORKING GROUP 4 "GMOs and Research" <u>LAZIO</u>	TOSCANA, EMILIA-ROMAGNA, SARDEGNA, CENTRE, BOURGOGNE, BRETAGNE, EUSKADI, UMBRIA, OBERÖSTERREICH, DRAMA-KAVALA-XANTHI-ENAE	Active Common position (Rennes) Next meeting in Rome (24 november 2006)
WORKING GROUP 5 "GMOs and Development" <u>BRETAGNE</u>	EMILIA ROMAGNA, MARCHE, TOSCANA, POITOU-CHARENTES, BURGENLAND, LIMOUSIN, EUSKADI, PRINCIPADO DE ASTURIA, ENAE, LAZIO, NORD PAS DE CALAIS	Active Mission in Brasil (Oct 2005) Business meeting on gm-free soy expected in end of 2007 Next meeting in BXL (28 november 2006)
WORKING GROUP 6 "GMOs and seed" <u>UMBRIA</u>	EMILIA-ROMAGNA, MARCHE, CENTRE, MIDI-PYRÉNÉES, OBERÖSTERREICH, LAZIO, STYRIA, TOSCANA	Inactive Common position (Rennes) A next meeting is foreseen in 2007
WORKING GROUP 7 "Institutional control" <u>EUSKADI</u>	EMILIA-ROMAGNA, MARCHE, TOSCANA, AQUITAINE, KÄRNTEN	to be activated Euskadi is developing an input paper and a first agenda Next meeting in BXL (28 november 2006)

C. Tuscany national workshop on coexistence (Florence, 6-7 Nov 2006)

The official invitation to Net's partners was sent at the beginning of October.

The workshop aims at draw national political attention to the critical importance of coexistence at the regional level.

3 years of Tuscany research will be presented. A scientific debate will be activated. A political debate will end up the workshop.

Midi-Pyrénées Regional Council Vice-President (M. Alain Faucounnier) will represent the network during the political debate.

Euskadi and Aquitaine representatives have already confirmed their participation.

A professional farmers representative from Aquitaine will present research on gene-flow conducted in that region.

Every Net's partner is invited to attend the workshop.

More info on ARSIA website: <http://www.arsia.toscana.it/forms/formar06112006.htm>

D. Meeting with the "International Commission on future of Food" (Florence, 15 Dec)

At the beginning of September a meeting of the Commission was hosted by Tuscany Region.

During the meeting the Network was introduced to Commission's members (Vandana Shiva – President, Benedikt Hearlin, Bernward Geier and Marcello Buiatti).

On 15 December next, during the Tuscan Regional Agriculture Conference (14 – 15), there will be the occasion to arrange a meeting between the Commission and the Network (information paper in Annex 2).

Defining and jointly signing a sort of common paper is the main goal.

Tuscany Region will send to the SC members a first draft of the common paper.

Région Bretagne and Land Oberösterreich will be present in Florence to attend the Conference.

E. COR opinion

The final paper was discussed on 6 October inside the DEVE Commission.

The Net's amendments have been presented by the Lower Austria representative and included the Upper Austria amendments.

The final paper is expected to be issued in few time.

Lazio Region President (Piero Marrazzo) is happy about the strong collaboration from the network.

F. Multilateral meeting with Commission services

This meeting (originally expected in September) has been postponed due to the internal problems of the DGs involved. Particularly DG Sanco and Trade want to wait for their internal reports before engaging in an external debate.

These reports will not be issued before the end of 2006 (the DG ENV's one maybe at the beginning of 2007). In this light, the multilateral meeting has to be arranged after these dates and, mainly, after an in depth reading of the reports from the Network.

The Working Groups will examine these reports and Tuscany region will get in contact to arrange the meeting.

G. Network's organization

SC adopts a base document to work on the organizational aspects (Annex 3). This document can be revised by the end of 2006.

The organizational aspect has been divided into 2 issue:

- a) Relations and roles of the bodies + adhesion criteria;
- b) Legal status and budget.

Regarding point a), a final proposition will be presented to General Assembly at the next Conference.
Regarding the point b), at the moment there are different positions inside the SC.

The occasion to test a sort of legal status will be the Soy business meeting, when a light form of association has to be set up in order to cover the organizational costs.
After that experience a final decision about the need for legal status will be taken.

Pros & cons of legal status and of informal structures:

?? *legal status with a budget*

Pros: possibility to share expenses among partners and to maintain a basic office for secretariat duties

Cons: costs of the association and more formal structure, possible difficulties in the adhesion for some of the current members

?? *keeping an informal structure*

Pros: flexibility in the operational phases; easy to collect adhesions

Cons: no budget; initiatives' costs charged on single or few members; difficulty in making payments from Region to Region

H. Results of the consultation (Net's name)

Tuscany informed the SC about the final result with a specific e-mail:

GMO-FREE has the 1st place with 11 votes out of 21.

REASON has the 2nd place with 9 votes.

SEAN has the last position with 1 vote.

Because of the low response to the consultation (21 out of 40 members), the SC, a strong majority, decided to submit the final choice between **GMO-FREE** and **REASON** to the approval of the general assembly during next plenary meeting, where a short introduction to the pros & cons of the 2 names will be presented.

I. Any other business

Welsh representative suggested opening an internal debate to face the upcoming new organic EC Regulation (Note from Welsh Representatives¹).

The SC decided to launch a sort of press after the Florence workshop in order to draw attention to this subject (Annex 4). This press has been reviewed after the Florence workshop by the present Net's members and launched on the main Tuscany newspapers ([Istitutional Press 7/11/2006](#)).

The new organic regulation will be discussed at the EP in December. The Regulation will enter into force on 2009.

2 annexes:

- 1) Annex 1: Note from Wales
- 2) Annex 2: Common paper (Network – Commission on the future of food)
- 3) Annex 3: Organization draft paper
- 4) Annex 4: Network Press on organic farming new EU regulation

¹ The Commission has issued Council Regulation 2092/91 (organic production). They will be discussed in Agriculture Council shortly. One of the most controversial aspects of the Commissions proposals centres on the provision of thresholds for GM presence in organic products. The proposal would allow products to be sold as organic if they have a GM presence of up to 0.9%, provided this presence is adventitious or technically unavoidable. Regardless of whatever GM threshold set for organic products, organic producers will be able to adopt a lower voluntary threshold. Producers who adhere to a lower voluntary threshold may put themselves at an economic disadvantage compared to those who comply with the eventual EU threshold. Given that the interface between organic and potential GM production remains a difficult issue, the Welsh Assembly Government is interested to see Regions reactions to the Commission proposal and discuss whether the Network should lobby EU institutions on the issue.

ANNEX 1

Environmental Liability Directive: Welsh Assembly Government proposal on GMOs

The Welsh Assembly Government considers that Directive 2004/35/CE can be transposed in a way that supports its restrictive GMO policy and would be interested to know if other regions are considering a similar approach.

Directive 2004/35/CE of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 concerns environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage.

It requires operators to **prevent an imminent threat** of environmental damage and to remediate environmental damage where this does occur. The Directive provides that remedying of damage to protected species, natural habitats and water requires restoration of the environment to its baseline condition through primary and complementary remediation. Compensatory remediation may also be required. GMO activities posing an imminent threat, and remediation for environmental damage caused regardless of whether the GMO is released in accordance with the relevant consent fall within the scope of the Directive.

The Directive also allows legislators the discretion to introduce some defences against liability or the costs of remediation.

The case for a permit defence for GMO related activities rests on the principle that an operator should not be held liable for the costs of remediation of environmental damage resulting from an occupational activity when that damage is fully in accordance with the terms of a permit and its conditions. This could apply to the deliberate release of a GMO in line with the conditions imposed under 2001/18 and all the other administrations within the UK are adopting this approach.

The Welsh Assembly on the other hand proposes to disapply the permit defence for GMO-related occupational activities because it considers that such an approach would provide better protection for the environment. This approach is consistent with the ELD.

The deadline for transposition of the ELD into national law is 30 April 2007. There is still time for regions to consider adopting a similar approach to the Welsh Assembly.

ANNEX 2

PREPARATORY NOTE FOR A JOINT STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AND REGIONS AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES OF EUROPE GMO-FREE NETWORK

On 4 and 5 February 2003 the International Commission on the Future of Food and Agriculture was established in Florence, with the support and active participation of the Government of the Region of Tuscany, with the aim of working to ensure that food and agriculture become more socially and ecologically sustainable, more accessible, and putting food quality, food safety and public health above corporate profits.

The principles on which the work of the Commission is based are found in the ‘Florence Declaration on Global Food Rights’ and further elaborated in the ‘Manifesto on the Future of Food’ and the ‘Manifesto on the Future of Seeds’.

On 4 February 2005 the members of the Network of European GMO-free Regions and Local Authorities defined its driving with the “Charter of the Regions and Local Authorities of Europe on the subject of coexistence of genetically modified crops with traditional and organic farming”.

The ‘Manifesto on the Future of Food’, the ‘Manifesto on the Future of Seeds’ and the ‘Charter of the Regions and Local Authorities of Europe on the subject of coexistence of genetically modified crops with traditional and organic farming’ have in common aspects related to the guardianship of GMO farmers and the valorization of agriculture based on localization and the safeguarding of biodiversity.

SALIENT POINTS IN THE THREE DOCUMENTS :

- 1) The principles contained in the ‘Manifesto on the Future of Food’ that specifically relate to the move towards a socially and ecologically sustainable food and agriculture system are the following:

Application of the Precautionary Principle

All human beings have the right to food that is safe and nutritious. No technological interventions in food production should be permitted until proven to meet local standards of safety, nutrition, health and sustainability. The precautionary principle applies in all matters.

Certain Technologies Diminish Food Safety

Some technologies such as genetic engineering, synthetic pesticides and fertilizers, and food irradiation are not consistent with food or environmental safety. They each bring unacceptable threats to public health, irreversible environmental impacts, and/or violate the inherent rights of farmers to protect their local plots from pollutants. As such their use is incompatible with the viability of sustainable agriculture. No international body has the right to make rules that require that any nation accepts any foods or other agricultural imports across its borders that have been produced in this manner, or that the nation considers detrimental to public health, environment, local agriculture or cultural traditions, or for any other reason.

Imperative to Protect Biodiversity and Ecosystem Health

All healthy food and agricultural systems are dependent upon the protection of the natural world, with all its biodiversity intact. This protection must be a priority for all governments and communities and all rules should be aligned with this purpose, even where this implies changes in land tenure and farm size. No commercial or trade considerations, or any other values, may supercede this one. The principles of reduced “food miles” (distance food travels from source to plate), emphasis upon local and regional production and consumption of foods, and reduced industrial high-input technological interventions, are all derivative of the larger goal of environmental health and the vitality of natural systems.

The Right to Know and to Choose

All individuals, communities and national entities have an inherent right to all relevant information about the foods they consume, the processes used to produce them, and where the food comes from. This recognizes the sovereign right of people to make informed choices about risks they are willing to take regarding safety and health, both in terms of human welfare and the environment. This right notably applies to foods subjected to such technical interventions as pesticides, other chemicals, biotechnology and food irradiation. No governmental entity including international bodies has the right to withhold information or to deny mandatory labeling and other disclosure of all risks, including those of malnutrition. Denying such rights should be prosecuted as a crime.

No Patents or Monopolies on Life

We oppose the commercial patenting and/or monopolization of life forms. All international or national rules that permit such practices are violations of the inherent dignity and “sanctity” of all life, the principles of biodiversity, and of the legitimate inheritance of indigenous peoples and of farmers worldwide. This applies to all plant life, animal life, and human life.

Safety Standards Floor, Not Ceiling

All laws and rules concerning food agreed upon in bilateral/multilateral agreements among nations, must reverse prior WTO priorities by creating a floor for safety standards, rather than a ceiling. No international body should make rules that require any nation or community to lower their own standards for trade, or for any other reason. Such standards may include export and import controls, labeling, certification and other matters. Any country or community with standards higher than international bodies agreed-upon should experience positive discrimination in terms of trade. Poorer countries for whom such standards are at present too expensive should receive financial aid to help improve their standards.

- 2) The **Manifesto on the Future of Seeds** specifies that diversity, freedom and unfolding the potential of future evolution of agriculture and humanity are core principles of the law of seed.

Seeds are a gift of nature and diverse cultures, not a corporate invention. To pass them on from generation to generation is man’s duty and responsibility. Seeds are a common property resource, to be shared for the well being of all and saved for the well being of future generations and hence cannot be owned and patented. Seed saving and sharing is an ethical duty that cannot be interfered with by any national or international law which makes seed saving and seed sharing a crime.

The law of the seed must protect the freedom of seed and the freedom of farmers based on the following principles:

Freedom of Farmers To Save Seeds

The first duty and right of farmers is to protect and rejuvenate biodiversity. The conservation of biodiversity needs the saving of seed. Laws of compulsory registration and policies for “seed replacement” undermine the freedom of farmers to save farmers varieties. “Intellectual Property” laws, patent laws and breeders rights laws violate the “law of the seed” by making it illegal to save seeds.

Freedom of Farmers to Exchange and Trade Seeds

Since seeds are a “commons”, freedom to exchange seeds among farming communities must be an inalienable part of the law of the seed. This also includes the right to sell and to share seeds on a non-exclusive basis. Any rewards paid for seeds should be calculated as a fraction of the value of the products they yield.

Freedom from Genetic Contamination and GMO’s

Farmers freedom includes freedom from genetic contamination and biopollution. The introduction of new varieties and plants must take into account the potential environmental risks as well as other potential detrimental agricultural effects.

Freedom of Seed to Reproduce

“Terminator” technology to produce sterile and suicide seed violates the freedom of seed to reproduce. The production of seed that cannot reproduce is an assault to the fundamental nature of seed as the source of reproduction of life and to the fundamental freedom of farmers. The introduction of such traits is designed to create a monopoly on the seed and food of the world and must be banned on a global level.

3) **In the “Charter of the Regions and Local Authorities of Europe on the subject of coexistence of genetically modified crops with traditional and organic farming” the Regions and Local Authorities undertake to:**

- pursue the process started with the Brussels declaration of the 4th November 2003, confirmed by the Linz conference of the 27th April 2004, with the signature of a document that engaged themselves to ask the European Commission to give assurances to avoid the GMO presence in the traditional and organic farm;
- promote the implementation at the regional level of specific plan and/or technical rules, with the possibility to foresee a protection to the conventional and organic crops against GMOs on large areas, including a whole region;
- devise specific plan and/or technical rules on the basis of thorough feasibility studies involving the analysis of the environmental, socio-economic and cultural impact of growing GMO crops; to provide within the plans for: supervision of the agricultural areas basing their production on certified-quality standards, such as products of designated origin and organic produce, and of the areas subject to current European rules or national/regional rules for special protection and constraints for safeguarding biodiversity, specific local produce and environmental heritage, from possible genetic contamination, preventing or discouraging growing of GMO crops in those areas;
- propose a system of sanctions able to attribute the costs and responsibilities for direct and indirect damage to operators causing it and an appropriate system of taxation ensuring that the Regions can cover the costs of coexistence and/or to establish a fund to guarantee covering of damages whose liability is not identifiable;
- support the principle of reproductive seeds being GMO-free and hence to support as a threshold for determining GMOs the minimum level detectable with the instrumental methods in current use (“zero tolerance”);
- promote the conclusion of international agreements intended to guarantee supplies of high- quality raw materials certified as GMO-free;
- protect the biodiversity of the Regions by means of measures to encourage the registration of native varieties and species in biodiversity conservation catalogues and to exploit these varieties and species in the farming industry, so preventing this heritage becoming patented;
- arrange with the European Union and National Institutions so that the procedures for authorising new GMO varieties are subject, not only to compliance with the principles of precaution, prevention and ethics, but also to the existence of positive effects for consumers and the community in general.

International Commission on the Future of Food and Agriculture

A joint initiative of

Claudio Martini, *President of the Region of Tuscany, Italy*
and

Vandana Shiva, *Executive Director, Research Foundation for
Technology, Science And Ecology/Navdanya, India*

Commission composition:

Vandana Shiva, Chair

Miguel Altieri, *Professor, Department of Environmental Science Policy and Management,
University of California at Berkeley*

Debi Barker, *Co-Director and Chair of the Agricultural Committee of the
International Forum on Globalization, (IFG)*

Aleksander Baranoff, *President, ALL, National Association of Genetic Safety, Moscow*

Wendell Berry, *conservationist, farmer, author and poet*

Marcello Buiatti, *Consultant on GMO issues to Tuscany, Professor University of Florence*

Peter Einarsson, *Swedish Ecological Farmers Association, IFOAM EU Group*

Elena Gagliasso, *Scientific Coordinator for the ' Lega Ambient'e, Professor, University of Rome*

Bernward Geier, *Director, International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM)*

Edward Goldsmith, *Author, Founder and Editor of the Ecologist*

Benny Haerlin, *Foundation of Future Farming, Germany, Former International Coordinator of GMO campaign for
Greenpeace*

Colin Hines, *Author of Localisation: A Global Manifesto; Fellow, International Forum on Globalization*

Vicki Hird, *Policy Director, Sustain: The alliance for better food and farming*

Andrew Kimbrell, *President, International Center for Technology Assessment*

Tim Lang, *Professor of Food Policy, Institute of Health Science, City University, London*

Frances Moore Lappe, *Author, Founder, Small Planet Institute*

Caroline Lucas, *Member of the European Parliament, Green Party UK*

Alberto Pipo Lernoud, *Vice President, IFOAM*

Jerry Mander, *President of the Board of the International Forum on Globalization*

Samuel K. Muhunyu, *Coordinator, NECOFA (Network for Ecofarming for Africa)*

Helena Norberg-Hodge, *International Society for Ecology and Culture*

Carlo Petrini, *Slow Food*

Assétou Founé Samake, *Biologist, Geneticist, Professor, Faculty of Sciences, University of Mali*

Sandra Sumane, *Sociologist at the University of Latvia, Riga*

Percy Schmeiser, *Farmer and GMO activist, Canada*

Alice Waters, *Founder, Chez Panisse*

Associates:

Kristen Corselius, *Institute for Agriculture & Trade Policy, Raj Patel, Food First*

Co-ordinator: Caroline Lockhart, *Consultant, ARSIA, Region of Tuscany, Italy*

ANNEX 3

CRITERIA FOR THE ORGANIZATION AND PARTICIPATION TO THE NETWORK'S ACTIVITY

DRAFT

1. NETWORK'S ORGANIZATION

DECISIONAL AND REPRESENTATIVE BODIES

General Assembly	Steering Committee	Presidency
<p>Composition Associates and Affiliates. Every Local Authority can express one vote.</p> <p>Duties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elects the President and Vice-President; - Approves the candidature to Group Leader of the various Working Group; - Proposes initiatives; - Approves Budgets; - Defines annual adhesion quotes; - It's called at least 1 time/year. <p>Duration Permanent</p>	<p>Composition President, Vice-President, Working Groups' Leaders and at least 1 member from every Member State represented in the Network</p> <p>Duties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinates Net's activity; - Defines annual program of activities; - Puts in place the initiatives promoted by the Assembly; - Authorises expenses; - Calls the Assembly; - It's called at least 1 time/year. <p>Duration Redefined every 2 years (within February)</p>	<p>Composition President and Vice-President</p> <p>Duties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Represents the Net during official Ceremonies; - Takes in charge the secretariat's activity; - Calls and directs the Directive Committee; - Promotes initiatives. <p>Duration Redefined every 2 years (within February)</p>

BUDGET REVISER

?? Budgets are yearly certificated by a Reviser, inscribed in an Enterprises Revisers Institutes.
?? The Reviser must show to the Assembly (called to decide on the Budget) a written report regarding the operations of revision.
?? The Budget Reviser cannot possess any roles inside the Network.

NETWORK'S TOOLS

Type	Aims and Field of action
Secretariat	The Network's interface with third parties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holds the List of Adhesion. - Updates & Records incomes and outcomes of the Network - Informs Members of ongoing activities. - Keeps documents on biotechnology themes. - Writes reports of the Assembly and Directive Committee's meeting.
Internet site	It's administrated by the Secretariat to communicate the Network's initiatives.
Working Groups	They independently study and promote initiatives on the subjects of their competence.
Projects	Network can realize, promote and support projects proposed by Working Groups, after an assessment from Directive Committee and a decision of the Assembly.
Conferences	Presidency warrants at least one time per year the organization of a Network's Conference.

2. ADHESION PROCEDURE

There are three levels of adhesion (table 1). To advance a candidature as one of the possible type of membership it's necessary:

- 1) to be a Regional or Local Authority with Political decisional Organs recognized by its Member State;
- 2) to possess a clear political will, shown in written form, i.e. a resolution of declaration (or anything adequate and comparable) of the regional parliament and/or regional government and/or the responsible minister and/or any other political competent authority body;
- 3) to inform beforehand the secretariat of the Network sending a letter/fax with the political will (i.e. resolution);
- 4) to sign the appropriate form (in English, French and native language) sending the adhesion package to the Network's Secretariat;
- 5) to sign the Statute.

The final decision in order to accept the request of adhesion is submitted to the Steering Committee that decides at (strong majority or unanimity).

TABLE 1

Type	Characteristics
ASSOCIATES	<p>Institution type Regions or Local Authorities (<u>or other sub-regional institutions</u>) or their Associations</p> <p>Complete participation Express a member in the Assembly Participate to the Assembly voting Can candidate their selves as member of the Directive Committee Can participate to the Working Groups' activities Can assume the leadership of a Working Group Can participate to technical initiatives</p> <p>Obligation Full adhesion fee + possible increments (i.e. President extra fee)</p>
AFFILIATES	<p>Institution type Regions or Local Authorities (<u>or other sub-regional institutions</u>) or their Associations</p> <p>Reduced participation Express a member in the Assembly Participate to the Assembly voting Can participate to the Working Groups' activities Can participate to technical initiatives</p> <p>Obligation Reduced adhesion fee</p>
PARTNER	<p>Institution type Sub-regional Local Authorities (or their Association)</p> <p>Reduced participation Can attend to Assembly meetings Can attend to Working Groups' activities Can participate to technical initiatives promoted by Working Groups (paying a quote)</p>

3. BUDGET

Network possesses an annual budget consisting of the adhesion fees and other possible financings and donations. Every year, within December, it's defined a Provisional Budget for the following year. Within February it's approved the Final Budget of the previous year.

The Budget is classified in expenses chapters, adequately distinct in at least three macro-categories:

- a) secretariat costs;
- b) representation costs;
- c) costs for financing projects, researches and other initiatives.

The expenses for the Secretariat cannot exceed the 30% of the annual budget.

The adhesion quotes are equal to: 2.000 €/year for Associates; 1.000 €/year for Affiliates

President and Vice-President must pay an extra fee equal to 1.000 €/year.

Working Group's Leader must pay an extra fee equal to 500 €/year.

Rough draft evaluation of annual budget:

Type	Quantity	Quota (€/year)	Total (€/year)
ASSOCIATE	18	2.000,00	36.000,00
AFFILIATE	20	1.000,00	20.000,00
PARTNER	2	0	-
EXTRA		5.500,00	5.500,00
			61.500,00

4. VOTING

The Steering Committee can deliberate when the majority is reached. In case of parity, the vote of the President prevails.

The Assembly can deliberate when the majority is reached. In case of parity, the vote of the President prevails.

In any case the voting is valid if the President and 1/3 of the representatives are present.

5. SECRETARIAT

The secretariat office is in (?brussels?) and it's warranted by network's presidency.

It communicates network's ongoing initiatives and constitutes the interface for the network's official communications, internal and external.

The Secretariat warranties the translation into the official languages of the networks (EN and FR).

6. WORKING GROUPS

Working Groups can be individuated and activated every time it's judged necessary.

In addition to the 8 base working Group (Organization and internet site, Coexistence, Rules analysis and revision, Biodiversity, Research, International agreements, Seeds, Control), could be set up specifics working groups on special themes (e.g. European Announcements, Research programmes, local initiatives, etc.).

Every working group is leaded by a Leader (Associate).

Leaders of the 8 base working groups constitute, joint with the Presidency, the Directive Committee.

7. INTERNET SITE

The Web Site is the communicational instrument of the Network. The up-dating is in charge to the secretariat.

Documents produced further to Conferences and working groups' works are automatically inserted on the site. It's necessary the Directive Committee's authorization to insert further documentation that comes from network's members or third parties.

The internet site is in English.

8. PROJECTS

The Network can participate to projects of different kind. Projects can be financed (in consequence of an authorization on the annual budget) with funds that come from Network's budget, within a maximum of ...€

9. CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS

Conferences and Meetings can be financed, (further to approval on the annual budget, with funds that come from Network's budget.

10. NETWORK'S LOGO

... (to be defined)

11. EXCLUSION CLAUSE

A member can be excluded from the Network when its political representative acts against the scope of the Network. The decision is taken by the Steering Committee. (Other ethic clause?)

ANNEX 4

Press Release: European Network of GM Free Regions

The rights of consumers and organic farmers must not be ignored by EU Agriculture Ministers – debate over GM contamination of organic food rages

The Finnish EU presidency is seeking to reach final agreement on the amount of GM contamination allowable in organic products at the December Agriculture and Fisheries Council meeting.

Current EU legislation prohibits the use of GMOs in organic production but the Commission has proposed that an adventitious or technically unavoidable GM presence of up to 0.9% should be allowed in organic products.

All 40 members of the European Network of GM Free Regions are extremely concerned at this development and call on Agriculture Ministers to act responsibly by keeping GM out of the growing EU organic sector.

Tuscany Region Minister for Agriculture and current President of the Network, Susanna Cenni said: *“Introducing GM contamination into organic systems is irresponsible and cannot be in the best interest of the sector. Surveys show that European consumers do not want to eat genetically modified food* and this proposal runs contrary to their wishes. The Network of GM Free Regions believes that Agriculture Ministers have the ideal opportunity reflect the consistent views of EU consumers when they vote at the Agriculture Council meeting in December. Ministers must safeguard consumers’ rights to eat GM free food and recognise the years of investment that have created our thriving European organic industry”*.

Further Information

Contact the Secretariat of the Network of GM Free Regions on:

?? + 32/2/28.68.563 (Brussels Tuscany Region delegation) or

?? +39/055/43.83.730 – fabio.boscaleri@regione.toscana.it (Network Secretariat in Tuscany)

Notes for Editors

?? * <http://www.ec.europa.eu/research/press/2006/pr1906en.cfm>

?? The European Network of GM Free Regions was established in November 2003 in response to the European Commission’s recommendation of 23 July 2003 on guidelines for the development of national strategies and best practice for the development of national strategies for the coexistence of GM crops with conventional and organic farming.

?? The European Network of GM Free Regions aims to preserve farmers’ rights to grow organic and non-GM crops and consumers rights to reject GM food.

?? Minimum standards for organic production are laid down in EU Regulation 2092/91. This Regulation prohibits the use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in the organic process, except in the case of veterinary medicinal products. Buying organic food is the only way consumers can currently avoid eating GM food.

?? Conventionally produced food and animal feed may contain up to 0.9% GM material without being labelled as a GM product. By encouraging organic producers to rely on the labels on their inputs the European Commission proposal would allow organic food to contain up to 0.9% accidental GM contamination – almost one in a hundred mouthfuls – without being labelled.