

Explanatory Note supporting the AFBV-WGG Initiative updated July 2022

Suggestions to enable the development of certain categories of products derived from targeted mutagenesis and cisgenesis (NGT) in Europe

A. The challenges facing Agriculture:

Agriculture is facing many challenges, the most important of which are a growing world population (9-10 billion people in 2050), the scarcity of arable land and the risks related to climate change and biodiversity loss. Hence the need for sustainable production using less land and inputs and reduction of its environmental impacts.

B. The need to continue to innovate for crop improvement:

To meet these challenges, all stakeholders must continue to develop innovative and efficient agriculture in France, Germany, Europe, and the rest of the world. Among the innovations which are required at all steps from seed to fork, those related to plant genetics play an important role. It is essential that all technologies available for the creation of new plant varieties can be used without exclusion in principle.

C. New Genomic Techniques (NGT) :

The terminology of New Genomic Techniques (NGT) was introduced by the European Commission during the stakeholder consultation in the first half of 2020 (https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/gmo/modern_biotech/new-genomic-techniques_en). In its study dated 29 April 2021, the Commission proposed a policy action on targeted mutagenesis and cisgenesis. Targeted (or directed) mutagenesis corresponds to what many publications refer to as genome editing, a term that we will use in the rest of this text.

Genome editing is one of the technologies previously referred to as NBT (New Breeding Techniques)¹ (to facilitate reading, notes and references have been grouped together in Annex 1). It brings together a set of technologies enabling the targeted modification of genetic information by addition, deletion, or exchange (replacement) of nucleotides at a specific site of the genome sequence of a recipient organism². The term “genome” covers the different genomes of a cell: nuclear and organellar genomes (chloroplasts, mitochondria).

In the case of plants these technologies have become essential enabling tools for desirable traits, such as, for example, resistance to biotic stresses, pathogens and aggressors, increased tolerance to abiotic stress such as drought or temperature variations; as well as improving sanitary, technological and nutritional qualities of harvested products.

Cisgenesis corresponds to the insertion into the genome of an exact copy of sequences (a cisgene) already present in the natural gene pool of a species.

Genome editing technologies have already demonstrated their strong potential for genetic improvement of crops in research and development, as evidenced by numerous scientific publications. In fact, the first plants bred with the use of such technologies are on the market in North America³ and a limited launch of an edited tomato variety has begun in Japan⁴. See examples of edited and cisgenic plants (based on scientific publications or regulatory files accessible in public databases) in Annex 2.

Various analyses and evaluations of these technologies undertaken by the French High Council of Biotechnologies (HCB), EFSA and the Scientific Advice Mechanism in Europe have concluded that plants developed with the use of such technologies are no different in their effects on health or the environment from those obtained from traditional breeding methods⁵. In 2021 EFSA published a scientific opinion on SDN-1, SDN-2 and ODM⁶ technologies and in April 2022 an updated draft scientific opinion on cisgenesis and intragenesis⁷ which reconfirm the absence of specific risks in comparison with traditional breeding methods.

In response to climate and environmental challenges, in December 2019 the European Commission adopted the European Green Deal with the ambition of transforming its economy and society to put them on a more sustainable path. It considers that European food is famous for being safe, nutritious and of high quality, but that it should now also become the global standard for sustainability⁸. As an extension to the Green Deal, in May 2020 the Commission published its "Farm to Fork" strategy in which it announced that it was studying the potential of targeted mutagenesis technologies to improve the sustainability of the food supply chain⁹. The results of this study published in April 2021 included among the recommendations the proposal to launch a policy action on "targeted mutagenesis" and "cisgenesis"¹⁰. These recommendations were confirmed by the Council of Ministers in May 2021¹¹. In September 2021, the Commission published a preliminary impact study (the final version of which is scheduled for the second quarter of 2023) and organized a public inquiry whether to adapt the regulations in force¹². It has just launched the next stage in the form of a public consultation which will end on 22 July 2022¹³. The Commission's objective is to publish the impact assessment and, potentially, a draft legislative text in the second quarter of 2023 which will then follow the procedures of the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament¹⁴.

Given the potential of these technologies to enable the European Union to reach its sustainability goals, it seems essential for the EU to quickly adapt the GMO legislation for plants derived from genome editing technologies (edited plants) and cisgenesis (cisgenic plants)¹⁵.

For this purpose, we present below our proposal for a revision of that framework.

D. Basis for our approach:

AFBV and the WGG believe that a complete revision of Directive 2001/18 / EC regulating GMOs will take a long time, which is difficult to reconcile with the need to maintain the competitiveness of research teams and seed companies. Pending a complete overhaul of the European Directives and Regulations concerning GMOs, as well as a harmonization with international treaties, our organizations propose an interim solution involving the targeted amendment of Directive 2001/18/EC and related GMO Regulations and Directives, by introducing new provisions that will enable developers rapidly to integrate into their breeding programs certain categories of plants derived from genome editing and cisgenesis.

E. Proposed Additions to Directive 2001/18/EC:

Without affecting the spirit and coherence of the Directive 2001/18/EC, we propose amendments that will reflect the current scientific knowledge and technological progress since the original drafting of the legislation. While these amendments only concern provisions in Directive 2001/18/EC, it is understood that the other GMO-related Directives and Regulations in the EU will have to be amended to incorporate the same changes.

Our proposals have been written specifically with the intention of addressing the regulation of plant products. They may be adapted, if necessary and where appropriate, to animals and microorganisms.

Our proposal addresses the following two points: (1) the regulatory status and conditions of use of technologies grouped under the term “genome editing” and “cisgenesis”, (2) the regulatory status of null segregants, as follows:

1. **Define targeted mutagenesis and cisgenesis.** Include these definitions in the Directive (addition of a new point (4) to Annex I A, Part 1).
2. **Remove from the scope of Directive certain categories of plants derived from genome editing.** As genome-editing technologies can be used to obtain a broad range of modifications in the genome, going from a change in one nucleotide up to the incorporation of whole genes, we are proposing to establish different categories of plants based on the type of edit that has been obtained. At this stage, we are proposing four categories of plants derived from genome-editing technologies which should be excluded from the scope of the Directive. Following confirmation of compliance of a proposed plant with an excluded category, in accordance with a confirmation process described below, such plant would then be regulated in the same way as plants derived from traditional breeding methods¹⁶. The four categories will be described in a new Annex I C to the Directive and would include the following:
 - **Category 1:** A plant having a native allele that has been edited¹⁷ to reproduce a functionality associated with a known allele present in its natural gene pool¹⁸.
Making such a change would be equivalent, for instance, to the transfer of a known allele from a wild counterpart to a cultivated variety of the same species accomplished through traditional breeding methods.
 - **Category 2:** A plant having a native allele that has been edited to reproduce a functionality associated with a known allele present in a plant species that is outside the plant’s natural gene pool.
Since the donor plant and the recipient plant are sexually incompatible, this category is an extension of Category 1 based on phylogenetic filiation (common ancestor between these two alleles).
 - **Category 3:** A plant having a native allele that has been edited to reproduce a new functionality, of which the sequence modifications obtained by genome editing are of the same type as those which can be obtained by spontaneous or induced mutagenesis.
Using traditional breeding methods, such changes would be equivalent to those obtained by selecting a plant having a new allele due to a spontaneous or an induced mutation, which plant is then crossed with a cultivated plant in order to select the mutation of interest.
 - **Category 4:** A plant in which a cisgene has been inserted into its genome either randomly or at a chosen locus, and in the latter case in the form of an extra copy or a swap.
Amongst genotypes of a species there exists a variation in the number (from zero to N) of copies of certain genes (this may be due, for example, by duplication at the locus, uneven cross-overs or translocation via transposons). Using traditional breeding methods, one can select for “copy number” as a criterion. The addition of allelic copies by genome editing directly reproduces this breeding process.

With respect to all the above categories, it is possible, through genome editing, to have in the same plant several edited alleles (or inserted cisgenes). These alleles (or cisgenes) can correspond to the same allele (or gene) present on the copies of a chromosome (in diploid or polyploid plants) or to alleles of different genes, or to different genes. Multiple copies of the same allele or cisgene do not require individual analysis. Only the different edited alleles or the different inserted cisgenes should be analyzed independently according to the criteria defined above. In such cases each edited allele (or inserted cisgene) shall be analysed independently according to the above-defined criteria. If all of the edited alleles or inserted cisgenes fall under the same category, the plant belongs to such category. If the edited alleles or inserted cisgenes belong to different categories, the plant must comply with each relevant category in order to be excluded. If a new edit is undertaken upon a different allele of a plant which has previously been determined to be

excluded, or a new cisgene inserted in such excluded plant, only confirmation of exclusion for the new allele or new cisgene shall be required of the notifier. In the case of Category 3 plants, there may be a large edited zone corresponding to a chromosomal fragment, as may occur following a spontaneous mutation or exposure to radiation.

As scientific knowledge and technical progress evolve, additional new categories can be added to Annex I C to the Directive (see also point 4 below).

3. Create a new, predictable regulatory pathway for the above categories of genome-edited plants.

Confirmation of the exclusion of an edited plant must be obtained by the notifier. The confirmation process is adapted to the exclusion category.

- **Procedure for submitting the confirmation request:**

- The notifier shall file its confirmation request with the competent authority of the Member State in charge of GMO regulations (in France, the Ministry of Agriculture, and in Germany the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture) who will rely on its existing internal departments capable of evaluating GMOs (in France, ANSES or the CESE, and in Germany the BVL [Bundesamt für Verbraucherschutz und Lebensmittelsicherheit - Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food Safety]). A structure at the EU level could play this role if deemed preferable;
- The request for confirmation is made by the notifier whenever it wishes to benefit from the exclusion and remove its plant from the scope of Directive 2001/18 / EC, REGULATIONS (EC) No 1829/2003, No 1830/2003 as well as any other GMO regulations of the EU. In any case, the request for exclusion must be made before any marketing occurs.
- The exclusion decision for an edited plant shall be valid for all progeny of such plant containing the same edit and binding upon all Member States.
- Once the confirmation of exclusion is obtained, any variety obtained using the edited plant shall be subject to seed and plant variety regulations applicable to relevant crop species in the same manner as any variety obtained through traditional breeding techniques, including registration in the common catalogues of varieties of agricultural plant and vegetable species which can be marketed in the EU¹⁹.
- These varieties will be subject to labeling and traceability regulations applicable to conventional varieties. Information on the nature of these plants as well as confirmation of their exclusion will be provided to the authorities in charge of applying seed and plant variety regulations. As is the case in some countries, a publicly accessible database of these plants could be set up (see examples of databases in Annex 2).

- **Contents of the confirmation request application**

The information requirements to be supplied by the notifier shall be adapted to the plant category:

- *Standard requirements for all categories:*
 - (i) Name of the notifier and contact information;
 - (ii) Taxonomic description of the plant which has been edited or in which a gene has been inserted;
 - (iii) Technique used and main steps that have been followed, including, if applicable, whether or not an intermediate GMO was produced in the editing process, and the modalities of elimination of any inserted recombinant nucleic acid sequence, and confirmation of the elimination of any such inserted sequence (null segregant);
- *Requirements that are Category specific:*

- *For Categories 1 et 2:*
 - (i) Taxonomic description of the plant containing the model allele and a description of the model allele;
 - (ii) Description of the edit realized in the final plant (addition, deletion or replacement); confirmation that the resulting edited sequence has been obtained and comparison of the functionality of the model and edited alleles;
- *For Category 3 :*
 - (i) Description of the new allele and its functionality obtained after genome editing and available background information on the reasons that led to editing such allele and its origin (research work, for example);
 - (ii) Description of the edit realized in the final plant (addition, deletion or replacement) and confirmation that the resulting edited sequence and its functionality have been obtained.
- *For Category 4 :*
 - (i) Taxonomic description of the donor plant containing the inserted cisgene and a description of such cisgene;
 - (ii) Confirmation of the sequence of the cisgene in the receiving plant in comparison to the original gene in the natural gene pool;
 - (iii) Confirmation that the inserted or swapped cisgene is located at the targeted site, in the case of a chosen site, or a description of the site where the random insertion occurred.

Any information supplied by the notifier for which it wishes to claim confidentiality must be marked "Confidential".

The processing time by the competent authority of a Member State to determine whether or not an edited plant falls under one of the four Categories for exclusion should be no more than ninety days.

4. **Introduce a regular review and updating process for the Directive to ensure it reflects the advances of scientific knowledge and technical progress.** As indicated above, these proposals are based on the current state of scientific knowledge and technical progress achieved based upon that knowledge. As scientific knowledge and technical progress evolve rapidly in this field, we propose that every five years, after consulting the relevant stakeholders and in collaboration with the competent authorities of the Member States, the Commission reports to the European Parliament on developments in scientific knowledge and technical technological progress and, if necessary, proposes a revision of the annexes.
5. **Address the status of null segregants (progeny of a GMO plant from which the GMO feature has been eliminated).** As part of this revision of the Directive, we propose that null segregants be confirmed as being excluded from the scope of the Directive²⁰.
 - **Define negative segregants:** Include a definition of negative segregants in the Directive (addition in new paragraph (4) of Annex I A, Part 1)
 - **Remove negative segregants from the scope of the Directive:** The status of these plants is ambiguous in the Directive. We propose to take advantage of the adaptation of this Directive to clarify the status of these plants. These negative segregants are descendants of genetically modified (GM) plants in which the inserted (modified) DNA has been eliminated (most often by crossing). These GM plants are either plants in which one or more sequences have been

inserted to provide a trait of interest or to allow the realization of a desired modification, such as targeted mutagenesis. These plants will be excluded from the scope of GMO legislation.

It should be noted that a negative segregant which is obtained after the use of genome editing and which is also an edited plant will be subject to the process of confirming the exclusion, in relation to the editing, according to the process below.

- The developer may obtain confirmation of the negative segregant status by consulting the competent authority of the Member State in charge of GMO regulations, according to a process similar to that described in Section 3 above for edited plants. It will be sufficient for the developer to describe the pedigree of the negative segregant and confirm that any foreign DNA insertions, excluding one or more cisgenes if applicable, have indeed been eliminated.

A null segregant that is obtained after genome editing and that is also an edited plant is subject to the confirmation process to confirm exclusion under one of the four Categories above.

These proposals can be incorporated into Directive 2001/18/EC in the form of an amendment. A draft amendment was prepared by the AFBV and the WGG in 2020. It can be provided on request.

Other alternative legal mechanisms can be chosen to implement the principles described in this note.

Frankfurt and Paris, January 2020
Updated with notes and references, July 2022

Annex 1

Notes and References

- (1) NBT (New Breeding Techniques: NBT is an umbrella term that captures a range of different technologies deployed in plant research and breeding, such as: genome editing, epigenetic modification (RNA-directed DNA methylation), grafting on GM rootstock, reverse breeding, agro-infiltration, intragenesis and cisgenesis. Van Der Meer *et al.* (2020) p. 7; SAM (2017) – p. 56-70. For plant applications the acronym NPBT (New Plant Breeding Techniques) is sometimes used. The EU Commission suggested using the term NGT (New Genomic Techniques) in its consultation with stakeholders which occurred in the first half of 2020. The term includes “techniques, which are capable to alter the genetic material of an organism and which have emerged or have been developed since 2001”. In addition to genome editing technologies² (also described as targeted mutagenesis by the Commission) and oligonucleotide-directed mutagenesis (ODM²) the Commission includes epigenetic modification (RNA-directed DNA methylation) and cisgenesis. https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/gmo/modern_biotech/new-genomic-techniques_en.
- (2) Our definition does not restrict the list of genome-editing technologies in a rapidly evolving field and is consistent with the definition used by SAM. SAM (2018), p. 7. Without limitation, these technologies include, for example, site-directed nuclease-1 (SDN-1), site-directed nuclease-2 (SDN-2), site-directed nuclease-3 (SDN-3), oligonucleotide-directed mutagenesis (ODM), base editing and prime editing. EFSA (2020), p. 7. The nucleases can be of different types such as Meganucleases; TALEN (Transcription Activator-Like Effector Nuclease) or, more often mentioned or cited, CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats). Other technologies may be added to this list as technologies further develop in the field of genome editing.
- (3) Gene-edited high oleic soybeans have been commercialized in the United States since 2019. <https://calyxt.com/first-commercial-sale-of-calyxt-high-oleic-soybean-oil-on-the-u-s-market/>.
- (4) A gene-edited tomato with a higher content of γ -aminobutyric acid (GABA), developed by Sanatech Ltd in collaboration with the University of Tsukuba, is being marketed to Japanese gardeners. <https://sanatech-seed.com/en/20201211-1-2/>; <http://p-e-s.co.jp/tomato/high-gaba-tomatoes-monitor/>.
- (5) In its 2020 opinion (EFSA (2020) – p. 11) EFSA’s GMO panel concluded that it “did not identify any additional hazard associated with the use of the SDN-1, SDN-2 or ODM approaches as compared with both SDN-3 and conventional breeding techniques which include conventional mutagenesis. The SDN-1 and SDN-2 approaches can induce off-target changes but, like for SDN3, these would be fewer than those occurring with classical mutagenesis techniques, decreasing the risk of alteration or interruption of genes.” In addition, for many species, field crops and vegetables in particular, the breeder is used to backcrossing to return to the elite variety containing only the new genomic fragment which provides the desired trait, the edited allele in this case. In its 2020 opinion EFSA recalled that in its 2012 opinion on SDN-3 it had pointed out that “backcrossing steps which follow the transformation process would likely remove off-target mutations from the genome of the final product [...] The GMO Panel considers this aspect still applicable to plants generated via SDN-1, SDN-2 and ODM approaches.” EFSA (2020) p. 10. See also SAM (2017) at pp. 87-91, Haut Conseil des Biotechnologies (2017), at pp. 48-55 (French version), 46-51 (English translation).
- (6) Applicability of the EFSA Opinion on site-directed nucleases type 3 for the safety assessment of plants developed using site-directed nucleases type 1 and 2 and oligonucleotide-directed mutagenesis: doi: 10.2903/j.efsa.2020.6299.
- (7) 2012 EFSA Opinion on cisgenesis and intragenesis (<https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2561>) and EFSA (2022) “Draft updated opinion on plants developed through cisgenesis and intragenesis” (<https://connect.efsa.europa.eu/RM/s/publicconsultation2/a017U0000011Zb2/pc0176>).
- (8) Communication from the European Commission: “The European Green Deal”, 11 December 2019, p. 11. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1576150542719&uri=COM%3A2019%3A640%3AFIN>.
- (9) Communication from the European Commission : A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food system, 20 May 2020, p. 8. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/FR/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0381>.
“Climate change brings new threats to plant health. The sustainability challenge calls for measures to protect plants better from emerging pests and diseases, and for innovation. The Commission will adopt rules to

reinforce vigilance on plant imports and surveillance on Union territory. New innovative techniques, including biotechnology and the development of bio-based products, may play a role in increasing sustainability, provided they are safe for consumers and the environment while bringing benefits for society as a whole. They can also accelerate the process of reducing dependency on pesticides. In response to the request of Member States, the Commission is carrying out a study which will look at the potential of new genomic techniques to improve sustainability along the food supply chain.”

- (10) European Commission study on new genomic techniques, 29 April 2021: https://ec.europa.eu/food/plants/genetically-modified-organisms/new-techniques-biotechnology/ec-study-new-genomic-techniques_en.
- (11) Council of Ministers meeting of May 26-27, 2021: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/agrifish/2021/05/26-27/>.
- (12) Commission consultation regarding the need to propose a new legal framework for plants obtained by targeted mutagenesis and cisgenesis and for their food and feed products: https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/13119-Legislation-for-plants-produced-by-certain-new-genomic-techniques_en.
- (13) Public consultation on targeted mutagenesis and cisgenesis (to be completed 22 July 2022): https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/13119-Legislation-for-plants-produced-by-certain-new-genomic-techniques/public-consultation_fr.
- (14) https://ec.europa.eu/food/system/files/2022-04/sc_modif-genet_pub-cons-factsheet.pdf.
- (15) SAM declared in 2018 “new scientific knowledge and recent technical developments have made the GMO Directive no longer fit for purpose.” SAM (2018) at p. 2. In addition, Julien Denormandie, French Minister of Agriculture, interviewed in *L’Opinion* in September 2020, answered a question on NBTs: “What is your position on new genome editing technologies, which make it possible to speed up variety selection? It is a complex, legal subject. There is a red line in Europe that must not be crossed: that of GMOs. That said, plant innovation techniques are evolving. The European framework which regulates them dates from the beginning of the 21st century, it is undoubtedly unsuitable for these new technologies which make it possible to sift through what nature would undoubtedly offer, of itself, at a given moment, and present an agronomic interest. It should be made to evolve without crossing the red line.” <https://www.lopinion.fr/edition/politique/julien-denormandie-il-faut-remettre-souverainete-alimentaire-coeur-224872>. This topic was followed up by Reuters (Paris): France backs non-GMO regulation for crop gene-editing in EU. 18 January 2021. <https://www.reuters.com/article/france-agriculture-gmo/france-backs-non-gmo-regulation-for-crop-gene-editing-in-eu-idINL8N2JT4A3>.
- (16) For each of our four exclusion categories we have provided an example of equivalent genetic modification that can be obtained using traditional breeding methods. A few traditional breeding methods that have been compared to genome editing technologies are mentioned in SAM (2017) - pp. 29-36 and 94-100, EFSA (2012a) - pp. 13-18, EFSA (2012b) - pp. 7-8, and EFSA (2020) - note 7, p. 8.
- (17) The terms ‘Editing’ or ‘edited’ refer to the application of ‘genome editing’ techniques.
- (18) The term ‘natural gene pool’ refers to the gene pool of a plant species defined as all of the genes and alleles (i.e., different versions of the same gene) obtained from plants which can exchange genes by sexual crossing as well as from distantly related plant species with which genes can be exchanged by sexual crosses using methods of conventional breeding.
- (19) In the EU, for plant species concerned by the “catalogue” regulation, any new variety offered for marketing must first be registered in the official catalogue of species and varieties of cultivated plants in at least one Member State. All the national catalogues constitute the Community catalogue. In France, registration in the Official Catalog is issued by order of the Ministry of Agriculture on the proposal of the Permanent Technical Committee for the Selection of Cultivated Plants (CTPS). As explained by France’s Scientific Committee of the HCB: “In France, marketing of varietal seed requires authorisation. This is provided through registration with the Official French Catalogue, the purpose of which is to guarantee users seed that is of sound and fair merchantable quality. Once a new variety has been produced, it must undergo a series of tests to check that it meets the three requirements of distinctness, uniformity and stability (DUS), as well as the requirements of value for cultivation, use and the environment (VCUE). Thus, for some species, assessment of cultivation

covers yield and growth characteristics, while assessment of use may cover protein and antinutrient content, and environmental assessment may cover resistance to certain pests to reduce pesticide use and resistance to abiotic stresses to reduce use of resources (water, nitrogen, phosphorus, etc.). The VCUE tests are specific to each species". Haut Conseil des Biotechnologies (2017), p. 57 (French version), p. 52 (English translation).

⁽²⁰⁾ In 2016 the Scientific Committee of the Haut Conseil des Biotechnologies concluded "In plant breeding, using negative segregation to remove a genetic modification event, of whatever origin (conventional crossbreeding, transgenesis, SDN-3, cisgenesis or intragenesis, agro-infiltration, etc.), is standard procedure. After molecular confirmation that the modification has been removed, the resulting plant should be exempt from risk assessment and could be considered to be a plant obtained by conventional breeding." Haut Conseil des biotechnologies (2016) at pp. 13-14 (French), p. 97 (English).

References mentioned in the notes above:

EFSA (2012a) "Scientific opinion addressing the safety assessment of plants developed using Zing Finger Nuclease 3 and other Site-Directed Nucleases with similar function". EFSA Journal 2012;10(10):2943. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2943>.

EFSA (2012b) "Scientific opinion addressing the safety assessment of plants developed through cisgenesis and intragenesis. EFSA Journal 2012;10(10):2561. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2561>.

EFSA (2020) "Applicability of the EFSA Opinion on site-directed nucleases type 3 for the safety assessment of plants developed using site-directed nucleases type 1 and 2 and oligonucleotide directed mutagenesis". EFSA Journal 2020;18(11)/6299. <https://doi.org:10.2903/j.efsa.2020.6299>.

EFSA (2022) "Draft updated opinion on plants developed through cisgenesis and intragenesis", (<https://connect.efsa.europa.eu/RM/s/publicconsultation2/a0I7U0000011Zb2/pc0176>).

Haut Conseil des Biotechnologies (2016). Comité Scientifique, Note sur les « Nouvelles Techniques », Paris, le 19 janvier 2016, http://www.hautconseildesbiotechnologies.fr/fr/system/files/file_fields/2016/03/30/cs_1.pdf.

Haut Conseil des Biotechnologies (2017). Comité Scientifique, Avis sur les Nouvelles Techniques d'Obtention de Plantes (New Plant Breeding Techniques -NPBT), Paris le 2 novembre 2017 (adopté par le CS le 26 avril 2016). <http://www.hautconseildesbiotechnologies.fr/fr/avis/avis-sur-nouvelles-techniques-dobtention-plantes-new-plant-breeding-techniques-npbt>.

http://www.hautconseildesbiotechnologies.fr/sites/www.hautconseildesbiotechnologies.fr/files/file_fields/2018/01/11/publicationtraductionanglaise-171201aviscsnpbtfinale.pdf.

SAM (2017) "New Techniques in Agriculture Biotechnology". <https://doi.org/10.2777/17902>.

SAM (2018) "A Scientific Perspective on the Regulatory Status of Product Derived from Gene Editing and the Implications for the GMO Directive". <https://doi.org/10.2777/407732>.

Van Der Meer *et al.*, The Status under EU Law of Organisms Developed through Novel Genomic Techniques, European Journal of Risk Regulation (2020), doi:10.1017/err.2020.105.

Annex 2

Examples of plants falling under excluded categories, based upon scientific publications or regulatory files accessible in public databases

These examples are taken from the literature or from regulatory files. We tried to find, from available public information, the origin of the model alleles. Thus, for each example, and when available, the first reference discloses the edited plant, and the other references describe the probable origin of the model alleles. Except for the plants already marketed in North America, these examples do not prejudice the fate of these edited plants and their commercial opportunities.

Methodology and criteria used:

- The example must describe an edited plant that has been achieved;
- For the examples of Categories 1 and 2, a model allele is identified in a plant that is sexually compatible (Category 1) or non-sexually compatible (Category 2);
- For the examples of Category 3, information is provided on the approaches used to obtain the edited gene, including results in transgenic plants (RNAi experiments for example);
- For category 4, information is provided on the inserted gene;
- For the edited plants we tried to use the original publication; for the model alleles we sought to find them in the publications cited by the inventors of the edited plant.

Category 1:

- An edited, salt-tolerant rice plant, following inactivation of the *OsRR22* gene (known allele). Zhang *et al.*, 2019; Takagi *et al.*, 2015.
- A potato plant edited by inactivating the *StGBSSI* gene (known allele), leading to the accumulation of amylopectin (waxy starch) in the tuber. Based on the availability of potato mutants rich in amylopectin and on knowledge of the synthesis of amylopectin in cassava, corn and wheat. Veillet *et al.*, 2019; Hovenkamp-Hermelink *et al.*, 1987.
- A rice plant in which the promoter of three genes coding for sucrose transporters, *SWEET11*, *SWEET13* and *SWEET14* has been edited (modification of nucleotides) to no longer be sensitive to the transcription factor produced by *Xanthomonas oryzae pv. Oryzae*. There are rice mutants for these genes; several have been associated in this edited plant. Oliva *et al.*, 2019; Zaka *et al.*, 2018.
- A pink-fruited tomato plant following inactivation of the *SIMYB12* gene (known allele). Deng *et al.*, 2018; Fernandez-Moreno *et al.*, 2016.
- A maize plant tolerant to *Setosphaeria turcica* (*Helminthosporium turcicum*) following the replacement, by edition, of the sensitive allele of the *NLB 18* gene coding for a membrane kinase and responsible for the interaction with the fungus by the resistant allele identified in a corn tolerant to this fungus (known allele). Schmidt 2018; Hurni *et al.*, 2015; Li & Wilson 2006.
- A maize plant accumulating only amylopectin in the seed following inactivation of the waxy (*Wx1*) gene coding for the Granule Bound Starch Synthase (*GBSS*) (known allele). Based upon the waxy maize mutant which has been marketed for many years. Schmidt 2016.
- A soybean plant with a high oleic acid content following inactivation of two fatty acid desaturase genes (*FAD2-1A* and *FA D2-1B*) (known alleles). Haun *et al.*, 2014; Pham *et al.*, 2010.
- Two Korean tomato BN-86 varieties made resistant either to powdery mildew by inactivating the *SIPelo* gene or to the TYLC virus by inactivating the *SIMlo1* gene. Pramanik *et al.*, 2021.
- A *Japonica* rice variety in which the *NRT1.1B* gene has been edited to reproduce an elite allele of an *Indica* variety, in order to improve nitrogen use efficiency. Li *et al.*, 2018.
- A cucumber plant whose *elf4E* gene has been inactivated, exhibiting immunity to Cucumber vein yellowing virus (Ipomovirus) infection and resistance to the potyviruses Zucchini yellow mosaic virus and Papaya ring spot mosaic virus-W. Chandrasekaran *et al.* 2016.

Category 2:

- A tomato plant whose gene *SlJAZ2*, orthologue of the *AtJAZ2* gene of *Arabidopsis*, has been edited (modification of the nucleotide sequence) to reproduce the dominant mutant version of *Arabidopsis* (absence of the C-terminal - jas motif) to obtain the resistance to bacterial spot disease (*Pseudomonas syringae* pv. tomato (Pto) DC3000). This modified receptor, *SlJAZ2Δjas*, no longer fixes the coronatine synthesized by the bacteria and as a result the stomata do not open. Ortigosa *et al.*, 2019; Gimenez-Ibanez *et al.*, 2017.
- An edited grape cultivar in which (i) the *Mlo* gene has been suppressed to obtain powdery mildew resistance and (ii) the *VvDMR6* gene has been suppressed based upon knowledge of the suppression of the analogous gene in *Arabidopsis thaliana* resulting in downy mildew resistance. Giacomelli *et al.*, 2019; van Damme *et al.*, 2008.
- A cassava plant resistant to potyvirus [Cassava brown streak disease (CBSD)] obtained by editing (modification of the nucleotide sequence) of the gene coding for the translation initiation factor eIF4E. Many isoforms of this factor giving potyvirus resistance are known in many plants: chilli, tomato, pea, *Arabidopsis* mutants. Gomez *et al.*, 2019; Bastet *et al.* 2019.
- An edited wheat plant in which the three genes corresponding to the Mildew resistance Locus (*Mlo*) called *TaMlo-A1*, *TaMlo-B1* and *TaMlo-D1*, located on chromosomes 5AL, 4BL and 4DL, are simultaneously inactivated to reproduce a phenotype resistant to powdery mildew, based upon the knowledge of *Mlo* alleles naturally present in barley. Wang *et al.*, 2014; Büschges *et al.*, 1997.
- A cotton plant in which the *GhFAD2-1A* and *GhFAD2-1D* genes, homologs of the *FAD2* gene in *Arabidopsis*, have been inactivated to increase significantly oleic acid content. Chen *et al.*, 2020.
- A wheat plant in which the *Tamlo-R32* gene has undergone a targeted deletion of 304k bp in the *MLO-B1* locus, enabling powdery mildew resistance without growth or yield penalties. Li *et al.*, 2022.

Category 3:

- A tomato plant where the *SIGAD3* gene has been inactivated to obtain three to five times higher content of γ -aminobutyric acid (GABA), useful in the prevention of life-style diseases (hypertension, diabetes). Although the *SIGAD3* gene has been identified in tomato since 2008, its role in bioaccumulation of GABA in tomato fruits was discovered in transgenic experiments. Nonaka *et al.*, 2017; Lee, 2018.
- An apple cultivar where the *MdDIPM4* gene (a kinase receptor) is inactivated by editing to obtain resistance to scab (*Erwinia amylovora*). By analogy with *Arabidopsis* mutants and studies of receptor interaction with the bacterium effector (DspA / E) a sequence of *MdDIPM4* was deleted in the apple gene. Pompili *et al.*, 2019 ; Degraeve *et al.*, 2013; Borejsza-Wysocka *et al.*, 2004.
- A petunia plant with prolonged flowering by inactivation of the *Ph ACO1* gene which codes for a 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate oxidase involved in the production of ethylene (reduced quantity in the edited plant). By analogy with the results obtained by expressing antisense in petunia. Xu *et al.*, 2019; Huang *et al.*, 2007.
- A durum wheat plant that has been edited to inactivate up to 35 of the 45 α -gliadin genes (known alleles) on three chromosomes, causing a reduction in the production of α -gliadins and a drop in immunoreactivity by 85%. Sanchez Leon *et al.*, 2018.
- A tomato plant of which the promoter of the *SlCLV3* allele (new allele) has been edited in order to increase fruit size. Rodriguez-Leal *et al.*, 2017.
- In several citrus species, the promoter of the *CsLOB1* gene (LATERAL ORGAN BOUNDARIES 1) has been edited by deletion of the sequence *EBEP_{thA4}* (which fixes the effector produced by the bacteria) conferring resistance to citrus canker [*Xanthomonas citri* subsp. *citri* (Xcc)]. Based on knowledge of the interactions between the promoter and the effector of the bacteria and on similar works on

rice. Jia *et al.*, 2016a (grapefruit tree); Jia *et al.*, 2016b (lemon tree); Peng *et al.*, 2017 (orange tree). In order for these edited plants to benefit from the exclusion provided by this Category 3, the recombinant DNA used for the editing will need to be removed (null segregants).

- A maize variety in which the promoter of the ARGOS8 gene has been replaced by the promoter of the maize GOS2 gene, providing constitutive expression of ARGOS8 which improves yield under drought stress conditions. Previous field experiments of transgenic plants overexpressing the ARGOS8 gene had demonstrated increased yields under drought stress conditions without yield loss in non-stress environments. Shi *et al.*, 2017.

Category 4:

We were only able to find plants in which one or more cisgenes were inserted randomly. did not find any plants that met the criteria for this category. In the four examples below the cisgenes were introduced into the plants using transgenesis.

- A potato plant in which several mildew resistant genes identified exclusively in wild potato species have been inserted using *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*, selected on the criteria that (i) all R genes are expressed and (ii) conformity to the varietal type is maintained. Haverkort *et al.*, 2016. Jo *et al.*, 2014.
- An apple cultivar made resistant to scab by inserting the cisgene *FB_MR5* from the wild variety *Malus × robusta 5 (Mr5)* in chromosome 16. Kost *et al.*, 2015.
- A barley variety exhibiting higher yield and better nitrogen use efficiency following the insertion of an additional copy the native gene *HvGS1-1*. Gao *et al.*, 2019.
- A cisgenic barley variety exhibiting increased phytase activity following insertion of one to six copies of the *HvPAPhy_a* gene. Holme *et al.*, 2020.

Examples of edited plants having alleles in different categories:

As indicated earlier in this Explanatory Note, the same edited plant may contain alleles which correspond to different categories. Two examples are presented below:

- A tomato plant that has been edited by inactivating (1) the *SIER* gene (which regulates tomato stem length), (2) the *SP5G* gene (linked to rapid flowering) and (3) the *SP* gene (linked to precocious growth termination), all three genes having known mutant alleles, to make it compact and early yielding, suitable for urban agriculture. This plant contains edited genes corresponding to Category 1 for the alleles of the *SIER* and *SP* genes and to Category 3 for the allele of the *SP5G* gene. Kwon *et al.* 2019; Xu *et al.*, 2015; Soyk *et al.*, 2017, and Menda *et al.*, 2004.
- An edited cassava plant accumulating amylopectin (waxy starch) instead of amylose following inactivation of the *PTST1* gene encoding the Protein Targeting to STarch and the *GBSS1* gene encoding the Granule Bound Starch Synthase. Based on the availability of cassava mutants rich in amylopectin and knowledge of the synthesis of amylopectin in potatoes, corn and wheat. This plant contains two edited genes, the allele of the *GBSS1* gene corresponds to Category 1 and the allele of the *PTST1* gene to Category 3. Bull *et al.*, 2018; Morante *et al.*, 2016

References cited in the above examples:

- Bastet *et al.* 2019. Mimicking natural polymorphism in eIF4E by CRISPR-Cas9 base editing is associated with resistance to potyviruses. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **17**: 1736–1750- doi: 10.1111/pbi.13096
- Borejsza-Wysocka *et al.*, 2004. Silencing of apple proteins that interact with DspE, a pathogenicity effector from *Erwinia amylovora*, as a strategy to increase resistance to fire blight. *Acta Horticulturae* **663**: 469–474 - doi:10.17660/ActaHortic.2004.663.81
- Bull *et al.*, 2018. Accelerated *ex situ* breeding of GBSS- and PTST1-edited cassava for modified starch. *Science Advances* **4** - doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aat6086
- Büschges *et al.*, 1997. The barley Mlo gene: A novel control element of plant pathogen resistance. *Cell* **88**: 695–705.
- Chandrasekaran *et al.*, 2016. Development of broad virus resistance in non-transgenic cucumber using CRISPR/Cas9 technology. *Molecular Plant Pathology* **17**: 1140-1153
- Chen *et al.*, 2020. High-oleic acid content, nontransgenic allotetraploid cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) generated by knockout of GhFAD2 genes with CRISPR/Cas9 system. *Plant Biotechnology Journal*, **19**: 424-426.
- Degrave *et al.*, 2013. The bacterial effector DspA/E is toxic in *Arabidopsis thaliana* and is required for multiplication and survival of fire blight pathogen. *Molecular Plant Pathology* **14**: 506–517 - DOI: 10.1111/mpp.12022.
- Deng *et al.*, 2018. Efficient generation of pink-fruited tomatoes using CRISPR/Cas9 system. *Journal of Genetics and Genomics* **45**: 51-54 - doi.org/10.1016/j.jgg.2017.10.002.
- Fernandez-Moreno *et al.* 2016. Characterization of a new pink-fruited tomato mutant results in the identification of a null allele of the SIMYB12. *Plant Physiology* **171**: 1821-1826.
- Gao *et al.*, 2019. Cisgenic overexpression of cytosolic glutamine synthetase improves nitrogen utilization efficiency in barley and prevents grain protein decline under elevated CO₂. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **17**: 1209-1221
- Giacomelli *et al.*, 2019. Generation of mildew-resistant grapevine clones via genome editing, ISHS Acta Horticulturae 1248: XII International Conference on Grapevine Breeding and Genetics - DOI: 10.17660/ActaHortic.2019.1248.28.
- Gimenez-Ibanez *et al.*, 2017. JAZ2 controls stomata dynamics during bacterial invasion. *New Phytologist* **213**: 1378–1392 - doi: 10.1111/nph.14354.
- Gomez *et al.*, 2019. Simultaneous CRISPR/Cas9-mediated editing of cassava *eIF4E* isoforms *nCBP-1* and *nCBP-2* reduces cassava brown streak disease symptom severity and incidence. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **17**: 421–434 - doi: 10.1111/pbi.1298.
- Haun *et al.*, 2014. Improved soybean oil quality by targeted mutagenesis of the fatty acid desaturase 2 gene family. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **12**: 934–940 - doi: 10.1111/pbi.12201.
- Haverkort *et al.*, 2016. Durable Late Blight Resistance in Potato Through Dynamic Varieties Obtained by Cisgenesis: Scientific and Societal Advances in the DuRPh Project. *Potato Research* - DOI 10.1007/s11540-015-9312-6.
- Holme *et al.*, 2020. Horizontal Stacking of *PAPhy_a* Cisgenes in Barley Is a Potent Strategy for Increasing Mature Grain Phytase Activity. *Frontiers in Plant Science* - doi: 10.3389/fpls.2020.592139.
- Hovenkamp-Hermelink *et al.*, 1987. Isolation of an amylose-free starch mutant of the potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.). *Theoretical Applied Genetics* **75**: 217–221 - https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00249167.
- Huang *et al.*, 2007. Delayed flower senescence of *Petunia hybrida* plants transformed with antisense broccoli ACC synthase and ACC oxidase genes. *Postharvest Biology and Technology* **46**: 47–53.
- Hurni *et al.*, 2015. The maize disease resistance gene Htn1 against northern corn leaf blight encodes a wall associated receptor-like kinase. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**: 8780-8785 - doi/10.1073/pnas.1502522112.

Jia *et al.*, 2016a. Modification of the PthA4 effector binding elements in Type I CsLOB1 promoter using Cas9/sgRNA to produce transgenic Duncan grapefruit alleviating XccDpthA4:dCsLOB1.3 infection. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **14**: 1291–1301.

Jia *et al.*, 2016b. Genome editing of the disease susceptibility gene CsLOB1 in citrus confers resistance to citrus canker. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* - doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12677.

Jo *et al.*, 2014. Development of late blight resistant potatoes by cisgene stacking. *BMC Biotechnology* - www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6750/14/50.

Kwon *et al.*, 2019. Rapid customization of Solanaceae fruits crops for urban agriculture. *Nature Biotechnology* - doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0361-2.

Kost *et al.*, 2015. Development of the first cisgenic apple with Increased Resistance to Fire Blight. *PLoS ONE* - DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0143980.

Lee, 2018. Utilization of High GABA Tomato via CRISPR/Cas9 for Hybrid Breeding, A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate School of Life and Environmental Sciences, the University of Tsukuba in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Agricultural Science (Doctoral Program in Biosphere Resource Science and Technology), February 2018, https://tsukuba.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_uri&item_id=48214&file_id=17&file_no=1.

Li & Wilson, 2006. Composition and methods for enhancing resistance to northern leaf blight in maize. World Intellectual Property Organization, Application No. PCT/US2011/041822.

Li *et al.*, 2018. Efficient allelic replacement in rice by gene editing: A case study of the NRT1.1B gene. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology* **60**: 536-540.

Li *et al.*, 2022. Genome-edited powdery mildew resistance in wheat without growth penalties. *Nature* **602**: 455-460.

Menda *et al.*, 2004. In silico screening of a saturated mutation library of tomato. *Plant Journal* **38**: 861–872.

Morante *et al.*, 2016. Discovery of new spontaneous sources of amylose-free cassava starch and analysis of their structure and techno-functional properties. *Food Colloids* **56**: 303-395 - doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2015.12.025.

Nonaka *et al.*, 2017. Efficient increase of γ -aminobutyric acid (GABA) content in tomato fruits by targeted mutagenesis. *Scientific Reports* - DOI:10.1038/s41598-017-06400-y

Oliva *et al.*, 2019. Broad-spectrum resistance to bacterial blight in rice using genome editing. *Nature Biotechnology* **37**: 1344-1350.

Ortigosa *et al.*, 2019. Design of a bacterial speck resistant tomato by CRISPR/Cas9-mediated editing of SIJAZ2. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **17**: 665–673 - doi: 10.1111/pbi.13006.

Peng *et al.*, 2017. Engineering canker-resistant plants through CRISPR/Cas9-targeted editing of the susceptibility gene CsLOB1 promoter in citrus, *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **15**: 1509–1519 - doi: 10.1111/pbi.12733.

Pham *et al.*, 2010. Mutant alleles of *FAD2-1A* and *FAD-1B* combine to produce soybeans with the high oleic acid seed oil trait. *BMC Plant Biology* **10**: 195-206 - biomedcentral.com/1471-2229/10/195.

Pompili *et al.*, 2019. Reduced fire blight susceptibility in apple cultivars using a high-efficiency CRISPR/Cas9-FLP/FRT-based gene editing system. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* - doi: 10.1111/pbi.13253.

Pramanik *et al.*, 2021. CRISPR/Cas9-Mediated Generation of Pathogen-Resistant Tomato against Tomato Yellow Leaf Curl Virus and Powdery Mildew. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* - doi.org/10.3390/ijms22041878.

Rodriguez-Leal *et al.*, 2017. Engineering Quantitative Trait Variation for Crop Improvement by Genome Editing, *Cell* **171**, 470–480 - <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2017.08.030>.

Sanchez Leon *et al.*, 2018. Low-gluten, non-transgenic wheat engineered with CRISPR-Cas9. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **16**: 902–910 - doi: 10.1111/pbi.12837.

Schmidt 2016. Corn with high content of amylopectin developed by CRISPR/Cas technology. 15-352-01_air_inquiry_cbidel Pioneer. https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/biotechnology/am-i-regulated/regulated_article_letters_of_inquiry/regulated_article_letters_of_inquiry.

Schmidt 2018. Corn with Improved Resistance to Northern Leaf Blight developed by CRISPR-Cas technology. 17-076-018_air_inquiry_a1_cbidel revised Pioneer, https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/biotechnology/am-i-regulated/regulated_article_letters_of_inquiry/regulated_article_letters_of_inquiry.

Shi *et al.*, 2017. ARGOS8 variants generated by CRISPR-Cas9 improve maize grain yield under field drought stress conditions. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* - <https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12603>.

Soyk *et al.*, 2017. Variation in the flowering gene *SELF PRUNING 5G* promotes day-neutrality and early yield in tomato. *Nature Genetics* **49**: 162–168.

Takagi *et al.*, 2015. MutMap accelerates breeding of a salt-tolerant rice cultivar. *Nature Biotechnology* **33**: 445–449.

van Damme *et al.*, 2008. Arabidopsis DMR6 encodes a putative 2OG-Fe(II) oxygenase that is defense-associated but required for susceptibility to downy mildew. *The Plant Journal* **54**:785-793 - doi: 10.1111/j.1365-313X.2008.03427.x.

Veillet *et al.*, 2019. The *Solanum tuberosum* GBSSI gene: a target for assessing gene and base editing in tetraploid potato, *Plant Cell Reports* **38**:1065–1080, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00299-019-02426-w>

Wang *et al.*, 2014. Simultaneous editing of three homoeoalleles in hexaploid bread wheat confers heritable resistance to powdery mildew. *Nature Biotechnology* **32**: 947-952 - doi:10.1038/nbt.2969.

Xu *et al.*, 2020. CRISPR/Cas9-mediated editing of 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate oxidase1 enhances Petunia flower longevity. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **18**: 287-297 - doi: 10.1111/pbi.13197.

Xu *et al.*, 2015. A cascade of arabinosyltransferases controls shoot meristem size in tomato. *Nature Genet.* **47**, 784–792.

Zaka *et al.*, 2018. Natural variations in the promoter of OsSWEET13 and OsSWEET14 expand the range of resistance against *Xanthomonas oryzae pv.* PLoS ONE 13(9): e0203711 - doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0203711.

Zhang *et al.*, 2019. Enhanced rice salinity tolerance via CRISPR/Cas9-targeted mutagenesis of the OsRR22 gene. *Molecular Breeding* **39**: 47-56 - doi.org/10.1007/s11032-019-0954-y.

A few published reviews - For additional information on the production of plants by genome editing:

- Cao *et al.*, 2020. Control of Plant Viruses by CRISPR/Cas System-Mediated Adaptive Immunity. *Frontiers in Microbiology* - doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2020.593700.
- Chen *et al.*, 2019. CRISPR/Cas genome editing and precision plant breeding in Agriculture. *Annual Review of Plant Biology* **70**: 28.1-28.31 – doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-050718-100049.
- Jaganathan *et al.*, 2018. CRISPR for crop improvement. An update review. *Frontiers in Plant Science* - doi:10.3389/fpls.2018.00985.
- Metje *et al.*, 2020. Genome edited plants in the field. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology* **61**: 1-6 - doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2019.08.007.
- Modrzejewski *et al.*, 2019. Environmental Evidence - What is available evidence for the range of application of genome-editing as a new tool? *Environmental Evidence* 8- <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13750-019-0171-5>.
- Parsaeimehr *et al.*, 2022. CRISPR-Cas technology a new era in genomic engineering. *Plant Physiology* – doi.org/10.1093/plphys/kiac032
- Sharma *et al.*, 2019. Recent advances in developing disease resistance in plants, *F1000Research*, 8(F1000 Faculty Rev):1934 Last updated: 19 NOV 2019, doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.20179.1.
- Soda *et al.*, 2018. CRISPR-Cas9 based plant genome editing: significance, opportunities and recent advances. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry* **131**: 2-11 – dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2017.10.024.

- Tabassum *et al.*, 2021. Applications and potential of genome-editing systems in rice improvement: Current and future perspectives. *Agronomy* – doi.org/10.3390/agronomy11071359.
- Zhang *et al.*, 2018. Applications and potential of genome editing in crop improvement. *Genome Biology* – doi.org/10.1186/s13059-018-1586-y.

Data Bases :

Data bases have been put in place to describe edited plants. See, for example:

- The EU-SAGE data base for genome-edited plants: <https://www.eu-sage.eu/genome-search>;
- The data bases put in place by USDA (Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service): https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/biotechnology/am-i-regulated/regulated_article_letters_of_inquiry/regulated_article_letters_of_inquiry, <https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/biotechnology/permits-notifications-petitions/confirmations/responses/cr-table>
- The Health Canada data base: <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/food-nutrition/genetically-modified-foods-other-novel-foods/transparency-initiative.html>