B **EFBS**
CFSB
Eidgenössische Fachkommission for biologische Sicherheit
Commission fédérale d'experts pour la sécurité biologique
Commissione federale per la sicurezza biologica
Swiss Expert Committee for Biosafety

Berne, July 2003

2002 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SWISS EXPERT COMMITTEE FOR BIOSAFETY (SECB)

SUBMITTED TO THE FEDERAL COUNCIL AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

c/o Bundesamt for Umwelt, Wald und Landschaft / Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts et du paysage / Ufficio federale dell'ambiente, delle foreste e del paesaggio, 3003 Berne
Tel 031 323 03 55, Fax 031 324 79 78, Email Karoline.Dorsch@buwal.admin.ch

Table of contents

Introduction

The Swiss Expert Committee for Biosafety (SECB) is a permanent federal advisory committee charged with the task of advising the Federal Council and the competent authorities on questions relating to the protection of people and the environment in the areas of biotechnology and gene technology.

The legal base for the SECB is furnished by Article 29h of the Federal Law on the Protection of the Environment (USG) and Article 29e of the Federal Law on Epidemics (EpG), which require the establishment of an expert committee for biosafety, together with Article 22 of the Gene Technology Law (GTG) – following its entry into force. The establishment of the SECB on 1 January 1997 coincided with the entry into force of the Ordinance by which it is governed (the Ordinance on the Swiss Expert Committee for Biosafety).

The SECB advises the Federal Council on the issuing of regulations and the competent authorities on matters of enforcement. It is consulted on applications for permits and can make recommendations in this regard. Before doing so, it can request expert statements and commission studies. It periodically informs the public about important findings and the need for further research and reports to the Federal Council annually.

Composition of the SECB

According to the Ordinance on the SECB, the Committee should be composed of experts possessing specialist knowledge in the fields of gene technology, biotechnology, the environment and health and representing different conservation and user interests (universities, industry, agriculture and forestry, and environmental and consumer organizations). A list of the Committee members appointed by the Federal Council for the second term of office ending 31 December 2004 can be found overleaf. Following the resignation of eight Committee members during the second half of 2001, two further members tendered their resignations in early 2002 (resignation dates are given in parenthesis after the names of the members concerned), forcing the Committee to work with a substantially depleted membership during the year under review. Notices inviting new applications for membership were circulated among interested parties in December 2001 and October 2002. An official consultation will take place early in 2003, whereupon a proposal will be submitted to the Federal Council. As far as the Committee's workload is concerned, besides adding to the workloads of the members still in office and the Secretariat, the vacancies also left gaps in its expertise. Consequently the SECB could only cope with its wide-ranging duties by calling upon various external experts, and several matters had to be postponed.

Secretariat

The SECB Secretariat, which is administratively affiliated to the Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL), supports the members of the Committee in their duties, prepares its meetings and draws up the Statements. The Secretariat also maintains contacts with other committees and public offices (both in Switzerland and abroad) with similar areas of responsibility. The Executive Secretary of the SECB is Dr Karoline Dorsch-Häsler. She is supported by Julia Link (scientific assistant, 40%). The responsibilities of the Secretariat also include public relations activities and reporting on the work of the SECB, as well as attending various international and national meetings (e.g. Karoline Dorsch-Häsler's participation as an invited expert and representative of Switzerland at the Meeting of Technical Experts on Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification of Living Modified Organisms, held in Montreal in March 2002; participation at the International Symposium on the Biosafety of Genetically Modified Organisms, October 2002, Beijing;

Members of the SECB[1]

Interim President

Martin T. Küenzi	Dr. sc. techn., *biotechnologist*, Solidago AG, Muttenz

Members still in office

Daniel Ammann	PD Dr. sc. techn., ETHZ, *cellular biologist,* Office for Environmental Chemistry, Zurich
Klaus Ammann	Prof. Dr. phil. nat., *plant ecologist,* Geobotanical Institute and Botanical Gardens, Berne
Angelika Hilbeck	Dr. dipl. agr. biol., *ecologist*, Geobotanical Institute, ETH Zurich, EcoStrat GmbH
Bernadette Oehen	Dipl. phil. II, *biologist*, WWF Switzerland (World Wide Fund For Nature), Zurich
Barbara Oppliger-Frischknecht	Dipl. ing. agr. ETH, *agronomist*, Swiss Consumer Forum (KF)
Jürg E. Schmid	Dr. sc. techn., *researcher in plant breeding*, Institute for Plant Science, ETHZ, Lindau; permanent expert consultant to the SECB

Secretariat

Karoline Dorsch-Häsler (Executive Secretary)	Dr. phil. nat, *microbiologist*, Secretariat SECB c/o Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL), Berne
Julia Link	Lic. phil. nat., *biologist*, Secretariat SECB c/o Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL), Berne

Resigned members

Adriano Aguzzi (August 2001)	Prof. Dr. med., *neuropathologist*, Director of the Institute of Neuropathology, University Hospital of Zurich
Patricia Ahl Goy (November 2001)	Dr. és. sc., *plant physiologist*, Syngenta Seeds AG, Basel
Geneviève Défago (November 2001)	Prof. Dr. sc. nat., *plant pathologist,* Institute for Plant Science, ETHZ, Zurich
Joachim Frey (November 2001)	Prof. dr. ès. sc., b*acteriologist*, Institute of Veterinary Bacteriology, University of Berne, Berne
Jean-Claude Piffaretti (November 2001)	Prof. dr. ès. sc., *microbiologist*, Cantonal Institute of Bacterial Serology, Lugano
Jürg E. Schmid (September 2001)	Dr. sc. techn., *researcher in plant breeding*, Institute for Plant Science, ETHZ, Lindau
Beat Wipf (November 2001)	Dr. sc. nat., *microbiologist*, Pharmaceutical Research, Preclinical Biotechnology, F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG, Basel
Riccardo Wittek (November 2001)	Prof. Dr. phil. II, *virologist*, Institute of Animal Biology, University of Lausanne
Urs Niggli (March 2002)	Dr. sc. techn., *plant ecologist*, Organic Agriculture Research Institute, Frick
Josef Zeyer (March 2002)	Prof. Dr. sc. nat., *microbiologist*, Institute of Terrestrial Ecology, ETHZ, Schlieren

[1] Situation in 2002; the updated list is available at http://www.umwelt-schweiz.ch/buwal/eng/fachgebiete/fg_efbs/rubrik_organisation/org_mitglieder/index.html

and at the OECD Workshop on Biotechnology for Infectious Diseases: Addressing the Global Needs, October 2002, Lisbon).

Meetings

The SECB held six meetings during the period covered by this report. These took place in Berne on 22 January, 5 March, 14 May, 25 June, 2 October and 5 December 2002.

Working methods of the SECB

Since the Committee's members come from different disciplines and represent a range of conservation and user interests, its Statements are not necessarily the result of consensus: votes are often taken and minority positions are recorded as such. However, in view of its reduced membership during the year under review, the Committee endeavoured to avoid putting matters to the vote. The SECB tackled a variety of issues during 2002 and issued a number of Statements, some of which are merely listed in the table (see Appendix).

Biosafety – International events

Two international events took place during the year which are of relevance to biosafety in Switzerland – and also, in a broader sense, to the overall focus of the SECB:

On 26 March 2002 Switzerland became the 8th country to ratify the **Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety** – the first instrument binding under international law to focus specifically on the safety of genetically modified organisms. In accordance with the precautionary approach contained in Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, the objective of the Protocol is: "to contribute to ensuring an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity ". The Protocol will come into force 90 days after the 50th ratification (which will be on 11 September 2003; http://www.biodiv.org/biosafety/ratification.asp).

Furthermore, the **World Summit on Sustainable Development** took place in Johannesburg from 2-4 September 2002. This is regarded as the follow-up summit to the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, at which common objectives had been adopted for the future in the form of "Agenda 21" (http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/english/agenda21toc.htm). The programme for this year's conference included sustainable development in the areas of water, energy, agriculture, health, global poverty and biodiversity, the question of industry responsibility, and the equivalence between the multilateral agreements and WTO rules. In a joint declaration, the international community reaffirms its commitment to sustainable development and commits itself to the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (www.un.org/jsummit/html/documents/summit_docs/1009wssd_pol_declaration.htm).

Biosafety – Issues covered by the SECB

The SECB decided during the year that it would like to extend its central area of responsibility – i.e. advising the Federal Council and the authorities on the protection of people and the environment in the areas of biotechnology and gene technology – and that it would increasingly like to tackle general issues relating to biosafety, such as the precautionary principle, pollen dispersal and antibiotics resistance.

Precautionary principle

The concept of the precautionary principle dates back to the environmental debate that took place in Germany in the 1970s. Its aim is to broaden the overall remit of risk management to include the factor of "unknown risk" alongside classical, scientific risk assessments, thus paving the way for sustainable environmental policy. However, no one has yet produced a definitive definition of the precautionary principle (PP). Since the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the precautionary principle has found acceptance in various laws and ordinances around the globe, including Switzerland's own Environmental Protection Law (USG). True to the spirit of the PP, impacts that may become harmful or constitute a nuisance are to be limited at an early stage (USG, Article 1, para. 2). Both the definition and the application of the precautionary principle are currently the subject of numerous studies. Although the underlying principle is undisputed, even ten years on the PP is still much in need of fleshing out.

The SECB has commissioned a study into the precautionary principle, part one of which introduces various aspects of the PP and its applications, focusing in particular on the present legal situation, various definitions and current national and international activities, as well as methodological approaches. Part two of the project is to examine various aspects in greater depth. This study is intended to lay the foundations for a proposed SECB Statement on the subject of the precautionary principle.

Pollen dispersal

The SECB has repeatedly addressed the question of windblown pollen in relation to the placing on the market of genetically modified plants and the resultant possibility of horizontal or vertical gene transfer. Further questions that might be considered when examining this topic are the application of the precautionary principle and the use of the terms "risk" and "damage".

In the course of 2002 the SECB was informed of the status of the three-year study that is being conducted by the ETH Zurich - financed by SAEFL - (commenced in 2001) on the subject of pollen dispersal (project leader: Prof. P. Stamp, Institute of Plant Science). The aim of this study is to investigate the phenomenon of pollen dispersal in maize under the conditions prevailing in Switzerland – where, for example, location (high- or low-lying) and wind direction are important facts. In particular, it will be necessary to verify the validity of the previously recommended isolation distances under the specific conditions encountered in Switzerland. The study employs a system of two equivalent maize lines that are distinguishable by the colour of the grains. The SECB will continue to track the progress of the study and, based on the results, decide what action (if any) needs to be taken.

Advice relating to legislation

Gen-Lex

In submitting the “Gen-Lex” Motion in 1996, the National Council and Council of States (the lower and upper chambers of the Swiss Parliament) called for the remaining gaps in the existing legislation on non-human gene technology to be filled, thus setting in motion the (still ongoing) Gen-Lex procedure.

In 2001 the Council of States agreed to create an all-encompassing "Gene Technology Law". In doing so it deviated from the original proposal of the Federal Council, which wanted gene technology to be regulated within the framework of the existing Environmental Protection Law. The National Council held a debate on the Bill in 2002 and likewise approved the Gene Technology Law. By the end of 2002, some of the outstanding differences between the National Council and Council of States had still to be resolved. Information on the par-

liamentary debate can also be found (in German) on the following webpage: http://www.parlament.ch/homepage/do-dossiers-az/do-gen-lex.htm.

In the course of the discussions on Gen-Lex in the Council of States' Committee for Science, Education and Culture, SECB Executive Secretary Karoline Dorsch-Häsler was invited to the hearing on 24 January 2002 as the Committee's representative. Among the various experts that took part in this and subsequent hearings as representatives of their respective organizations were several members of the SECB (D. Ammann, A. Hilbeck, K. Ammann and B. Oehen).

Since the SECB endeavours to ensure biosafety in the handling of pathogenic and genetically modified organisms, the differentiation of genetically modified organisms from pathogenic organisms is not a prime concern. Although the Committee is able to endorse an all-encompassing Gene Technology Law, it would like to see both genetically modified and natural organisms subjected to appropriate forms of assessment. Furthermore, it should be possible for innovations in the fields of gene technology and biotechnology to be efficiently registered and regulated by the Gene Technology Law. The SECB has already, at an earlier stage, voiced its opposition to a moratorium on the commercial release of genetically modified organisms, rejecting this approach by a majority vote. A minority of the Committee would have welcomed such a moratorium.

Amendments to the Patent Law and the Plant Variety Protection Law

The revision of the ***Patent Law*** is intended to bring it into line with both the EU Directive 98/44/EC on the Legal Protection of Biotechnological Inventions and other international agreements. It also sets out to define more closely the boundaries of patentability, to specify the protective effect of a patent on biological material and to grant a so-called "farmers' privilege". The principal aim of the amendments to the ***Plant Variety Protection Law*** is to provide for the ratification of the Convention of the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants. The SECB issued a Statement on both Bills, making a number of fundamental observations which do not confine themselves to the issue of biosafety.

The SECB proposed that biosafety should be included both in the Patent Law and in the Plant Variety Protection Law. As far as the patentability of genes and gene sequences is concerned, a majority of the Committee members were of the opinion that, for various reasons, native genes are not patentable. They emphasized, however, that modified genes and partial gene sequences – and also methods that result in modification – are procedures that merit protection. Moreover, the Committee members pronounced themselves in favour of a comprehensive researchers' privilege and farmers' privilege and stressed that consideration must be given to the preservation and protection of biodiversity and the sustainable use of genetic and biological resources (see http://www.umwelt-schweiz.ch/imperia/md/content/efbs/39.pdf for the full SECB Statement [in German]).

Advice relating to the Release Ordinance (RO)

The Ordinance on the Release of Organisms into the Environment (RO), which has been in force since 1999, regulates two key aspects of the use of genetically modified and pathogenic organisms in the environment, namely: the release of such organisms for experimental purposes and the question of placing on the market. Both types of permit application are forwarded to the SECB for consideration.

Experimental releases

Section 2 of the Release Ordinance governs releases of genetically modified or pathogenic organisms for experimental purposes. According to Article 7 of the Release Ordinance, such experimental releases must be authorized by SAEFL.

Statement on the appeal lodged by ETH Zurich against SAEFL's ruling on the release application entitled "Field performance of transgenic KP4 varieties"

In 2001 the SECB had issued a Statement on the ETHZ release application, which had in the first instance been rejected by SAEFL. This trial set out to test transgenic wheat plants containing a gene for resistance to stinking smut (*Tilletia tritici*, also known as common bunt), which encodes the so-called killer protein 4 (KP4), under field conditions and to investigate various aspects of biosafety and interactions with non-target organisms.

The ETH Zurich lodged an appeal against the SAEFL ruling. The SECB was one of several bodies requested to give an opinion on the notice of appeal. However, the Committee members ultimately decided to stand by the earlier Statement rather than issuing a detailed opinion on the notice of appeal, merely adding a few minor comments. A clear majority continued to hold the view that any risk to people and the environment from the planned experimental release was so slight that the trial could be allowed to go ahead (see also http://www.umwelt-schweiz.ch/imperia/md/content/efbs/15.pdf [in German]).

The appeal by the ETH Zurich was upheld and the application was referred back to SAEFL. In its ruling of 20 December 2002, SAEFL approved the application under certain conditions (see http://www.umwelt-schweiz.ch/imperia/md/content/buwalcontent/14.pdf [in German]).

Placing on the market

Section 3 of the Release Ordinance regulates the placing on the market of genetically modified or pathogenic organisms. Depending on the intended use of the organisms, the permit is issued either by the Federal Office for Public Health (SFOPH), the Federal Office for Agriculture (SFOA), the Federal Veterinary Office (FVO) or the Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL).

Although the SECB has given detailed consideration to various applications for placing on the market, only one of these application procedures (Soya line 40-3-2) was concluded during the year under review. Since the other applications relate to ongoing procedures and the competent regulatory authority has yet to reach a decision, the SECB is unable to provide more details on its recommendations and must therefore confine itself merely to presenting the application itself.

Placing on the market of the genetically modified Soya line 40-3-2 for food and animal feed

Due to the insertion of the so-called 5-enolpyruvyl shikimate-3-phosphate synthetase (EPSPS) gene, this soya line is resistant to the herbicide, glyphosate. The variety was approved in Switzerland in 1996 and on 31 October 2002 the authorization was extended for five years by the SFOPH (SFOPH Ruling, see http://www.bag.admin.ch/verbrau/lebensmi/gvo/d/Monsanto_Roundup_okt02.pdf [in German]).

Since there are no plans for cultivation in Switzerland, the SECB Statement largely confined itself to an assessment of possible environmental impacts if seeds were accidentally to get mixed up with animal feed or as a result of unintentional losses in transit. The Committee

came to the conclusion that the possibility of a mix-up can virtually be disregarded and also that there is scarcely any risk of horizontal gene transfer, since soya is an obligate self-pollinator and no wild relatives occur in Switzerland. The risk of persistence in the wild was also classed as low. The Committee approved the extension of the permit, but noted that whilst this particular soya line might bring about a short-term improvement in cultivation methods, it was not a sustainable option in the long term. The full text of the SECB Statement is available at http://www.umwelt-schweiz.ch/imperia/md/content/efbs/56.pdf.

Placing on the market of three genetically modified maize varieties and one genetically modified rapeseed variety for food and animal feed

Common to all four applications is the fact that the varieties used have been genetically modified in such a way that they exhibit tolerance to the herbicidal active ingredients, glufosinate and glyphosate. The aim is to allow herbicides to be used more selectively and in reduced quantities. Two of the maize varieties are additionally resistant to such pests as the European corn borer (*Ostrinia nubilalis*). It is envisaged that this resistance counteracts the use of insecticides and minimizes the risk of crop failure. Neither the three maize varieties nor the rapeseed variety are intended for cultivation in Switzerland, but may only be used for food and animal feed. The applications have been published in the Federal Gazette, where the relevant announcement appears in parenthesis after the varietal names.

T25xMON810 maize (http://www.bk.admin.ch/ch/d/ff/2002/4213.pdf [in German])

The T25xMON810 maize variety was developed by conventional crossing of two transgenic parental lines. Genetic modifications:

- tolerance to broad-band glufosinate herbicides;
- resistance to the European corn borer and several other Lepidoptera (Bt toxin).

1507 maize (http://www.bk.admin.ch/ch/d/ff/2001/3843.pdf [in German])

Genetic modifications:

- tolerance to broad-band glufosinate herbicides;
- resistance to the European corn borer and several other Lepidoptera (Bt toxin); broader host spectrum than T25.

GA21 maize (http://www.bk.admin.ch/ch/d/ff/2002/4213.pdf [in German])

Genetic modification:

- tolerance to the broad-band herbicide, glyphosate (e.g. Roundup Ready).

GT73 oilseed rape (http://www.bk.admin.ch/ch/d/ff/2002/437.pdf [in German])

Genetic modification:

- tolerance to the broad-band herbicide, glyphosate (e.g. Roundup Ready).

Placing on the market of a vaccine containing organisms genetically modified to protect against feline leukaemia (EURIFEL â FeLV)

This application relates to a recombinant vaccine against feline leukaemia, one of the most widespread diseases of domestic cats, which in the absence of vaccination often takes a fatal course. This vaccine is designed to provide an alternative to existing products, including a vaccine employing a genetically engineered protein as an antigen.

Advice relating to the Containment Ordinance (CO)

Permit applications

According to Article 9 of the CO, authorization is required for any activity assigned to class 3 (activities posing a moderate risk to people and the environment) or class 4 (activities posing a high risk to people and the environment) that involves genetically modified or pathogenic organisms. For exclusively diagnostic activities assigned to classes 3 and 4 that involve pathogenic, non-genetically modified organisms, it is sufficient to obtain a permit for the first activity.

In the course of 2002, the SECB once again received various permit applications for consideration pursuant to Article 15, para. 2c of the CO. A list of these applications is appended to this Report. The receipt of permit applications is published in the Federal Gazette (Article 15, para. 2d, CO) and the permit is issued by the relevant federal agencies (SFOPH or SAEFL, Article 16, CO) following examination of the risk assessment and taking into account the Statements received (Article 18, CO). The SECB examines and assesses all class-3 and 4 applications. Class-2 applications are only forwarded to the SECB in special cases. In connection with these applications, Karoline Dorsch-Häsler is at the disposal of SAEFL in an advisory capacity, acting on behalf of the SECB, and she regularly takes part in meetings held by SFOPH, SAEFL and the Federal Coordination Centre for Biotechnology on biosafety-related issues.

Risk assessments

Besides issuing Statements on various permit applications, the SECB also fulfilled its advisory function by addressing other issues pertaining to the Containment Ordinance.

List of Parasites

While compiling lists for the classification of organisms according to their risk for people and the environment, the SECB confined itself to making only minor comments on the List of Parasites. Although the assignment of the parasites is broadly in line with other European classifications, new classifications have, on occasions, been undertaken (especially at those points where refinements were required).

Oncogene- and cytokine-encoding sequences

The SECB has commissioned a study entitled *Oncogene- and cytokine-encoding sequences: Risk analysis and safety measures*. The aim of this study is to compare classifications undertaken in various European countries – and notably in France, which has adopted a strict classification. This is intended to create a platform on which Switzerland can – if necessary – base its own classifications.

Gene therapy

Regulation of gene therapy as of 2002

The new Federal Law on Medicinal Products and Medical Devices (known as the Law on Therapeutic Products, SR 812.21) has been in force since 1 January 2002. This Act governs the handling of therapeutic products (medicinal products and medical devices), narcotics and therapeutic procedures including those involving gene therapy (Law on Therapeutic Products, Article 2). Not covered are gene therapy trials involving the use of cells (*ex vivo*, xenocells); such trials fall under the Transplantation Law and require a permit from

SFOPH. A series of subsidiary Ordinances came into force at the same time as the Law on Therapeutic Products. Of direct relevance to gene therapy is the Ordinance on Clinical Trials with Therapeutic Products. In Article 17 of this Ordinance it is stipulated that the Swiss Agency for Therapeutic Products (Swissmedic) should seek the opinions of the SECB, SAEFL and SFOPH prior to the issue of the permit. The SECB is to issue a Statement on the biosafety of the preparation for trial subjects and for human health and the environment (e.g. nursing staff). The competent Ethics Committee gives an opinion on ethical aspects of the trial and ascertains whether the trial subject is afforded protection.

The applications had previously been assessed by the Gene Therapy working group of the Swiss Interdisciplinary Committee for Biosafety in Research and Technology (SCBS). Between 1993 and 2001, 35 applications were approved, some of which have been subjected to extremely rigorous conditions. No incidents have occurred. Since 2001, it is the SECB which formally issues a statement on such applications.

Dissolution of the SCBS

Since the entry into force of the Law on Therapeutic Products on 1 January 2002, the SECB has also been issuing statements on the biosafety of gene-therapy trials involving human beings (as mentioned above). In doing so, it has taken over the last remaining major task of the SCBS. Consequently, in December 2002 a formal request to dissolve this Committee was made to the three sponsoring bodies of the SCBS – the Swiss Academies of Natural Sciences (SANS), Medical Sciences (SAMS) and Engineering Sciences (SAES).

Events

Meeting with the ECNH

This year's joint meeting of the SECB and the Federal Ethics Committee on Non-Human Gene Technology (ECNH) was held in conjunction with the SECB meeting on 25 June and took the form of a joint lunch.

Meeting for Biosafety Coordinators

The Meeting for Biosafety Coordinators, organized by the SECB, SAEFL and SFOPH, took place in Berne on 30 October 2002. Alongside presentations by the Federal Coordination Centre for Biotechnology, various topics relating to risk assessment were addressed and information was provided about past inspections and the tasks of the biosafety coordinators. On behalf of the SECB, Interim President Martin Küenzi presented an overview of general issues relating to biosafety, while Executive Secretary Karoline Dorsch-Häsler focused on the topic of risk analysis.

Public relations activities

Since the SECB is engaged in highly specific matters pertaining to biosafety – as is reflected in its Statements and events (the Meeting for Biosafety Coordinators, etc.) – the public relations activities are also geared more towards professionals than towards the lay public.

Presentations

- Podium discussion on the basic principles of toxicology, February 2002 (Karoline Dorsch-Häsler and Barbara Oppliger, representing the Swiss Consumer Forum)
- Expert meeting on biotechnology, November 2002 (Karoline Dorsch-Häsler)

Internet

The internet presence of the SECB was redesigned during the year under review, though the address (www.efbs.ch) remains unchanged. Most of the Statements and Recommendations issued by the SECB can be downloaded from the internet. In addition, the SECB website contains dates and agendas of meetings, annual reports and other topical information.

Swiss Expert Committee for Biosafety

Interim President	Executive Secretary
Dr Martin Küenzi	Dr Karoline Dorsch-Häsler

Appendix: Overview of SECB Statements

Advice relating to legislation	
Amendments to the Plant Variety Protection Law and the Patent Law	April 2002
Advice relating to the Release Ordinance (RO)	
Placing on the market	
Placing on the market of the genetically modified Soya line 40-3-2 for food and animal feed	March 2002
Placing on the market of genetically modified maize (T25xMON810 maize) for food and animal feed	June 2002
Placing on the market of GT73 oilseed rape for food and animal feed	September 2002
Placing on the market of transgenic maize (1507 maize) for food and animal feed	July 2002
Placing on the market of genetically modified maize (GA21 maize) for food and animal feed	August 2002
Placing on the market of a vaccine containing organisms genetically modified to protect against feline leukaemia (EURIFEL)	December 2002
Experimental releases	
Statement on the ETH appeal regarding the SAEFL ruling on: Field performance of transgenic KP4 varieties	February 2002
Advice relating to the Containment Ordinance (CO)	
Permit applications	
A010222/2: Molecular genetic studies of intestinal pathogens	October 2002
A020106/3: Antimicrobial Resistance in Bacilli, Transfer and Detection	July 2002
A020121/3: Isolation and use of peripheral blood leukocytes of HIV-infected patients in the analysis of HIV-specific cellular immune responses	October 2002
A020138/3: Analysis of the virulence factors of *Salmonella enterica*	October 2002
A020132/3: Evaluation and validation of detection methods; evaluation of typisation methods; organisation of challenge tests	December 2002
A020193/3D: Diagnosis of prion diseases/BSE	December 2002
Risk assessments	
List of Parasites	March 2002
Cytokine- and oncogene-encoding sequences	