









# Procedure file

Basic information		
RSP - Resolutions on topical subjects	<a href="#">2016/2683(RSP)</a>	Procedure completed
Resolution on the draft Commission implementing decision as regards the placing on the market of a genetically modified carnation ( <i>Dianthus caryophyllus</i> L., line SHD-27531-4)		
Subject 3.10.09.06 Agro-genetics, GMOs		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	 <a href="#">Environment, Public Health and Food Safety</a>		22/04/2016
			22/04/2016
		<a href="#">PIETIKÄINEN Sirpa</a>	22/04/2016
			22/04/2016
			
		<a href="#">BALAS Guillaume</a>	
			
		<a href="#">STAES Bart</a>	
			
		<a href="#">EVI Eleonora</a>	
		Shadow rapporteur	
			
		<a href="#">FJELLNER Christofer</a>	
			
		<a href="#">HUITEMA Jan</a>	
European Commission	Commission DG <a href="#">Health and Food Safety</a>	Commissioner ANDRIUKAITIS Vytenis Povilas	

Key events			
08/06/2016	Results of vote in Parliament		
08/06/2016	Decision by Parliament	<a href="#">T8-0272/2016</a>	Summary
08/06/2016	End of procedure in Parliament		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2016/2683(RSP)
Procedure type	RSP - Resolutions on topical subjects
Procedure subtype	Resolution on implementing act or powers
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 112-p2

Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	ENVI/8/06358

### Documentation gateway

Motion for a resolution		<a href="#">B8-0731/2016</a>	08/06/2016	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		<a href="#">T8-0272/2016</a>	08/06/2016	EP	Summary
Commission response to text adopted in plenary		<a href="#">SP(2016)612</a>	18/11/2016	EC	

## Resolution on the draft Commission implementing decision as regards the placing on the market of a genetically modified carnation (*Dianthus caryophyllus* L., line SHD-27531-4)

The European Parliament adopted by 430 votes to 188, with 33 abstentions, a resolution on the draft Commission implementing decision as regards the placing on the market of a genetically modified carnation (*Dianthus caryophyllus* L., line SHD-27531-4).

Parliament considered that the draft Commission implementing decision does not fulfil the objective of health and environment protection provided for in [Directive 2001/18/EC](#) and therefore exceeds the implementing powers provided for in this Directive.

It called on the Commission to withdraw its draft implementing decision.

To recall, in March 2013, a notification (reference C/NL/13/01) concerning the placing on the market of a genetically modified carnation (*Dianthus caryophyllus* L., line SHD-27531-4), sulfonylurea-resistant plants, was submitted by Suntory Holdings Limited, Osaka, Japan, to the competent authority of the Netherlands.

Members stressed that sulfonylureas are common second-line options for management of type 2 diabetes and are associated with a higher risk of cardiovascular events compared with other antidiabetic drugs. They are highly toxic to plants at very low doses. Creating a market for sulfonylurea-resistant plants will encourage the worldwide use of this medicine against diabetes as a herbicide. Using a medicine for a purpose other than public health which leads to its uncontrolled spread in the ecosystems can have worldwide detrimental effects on biodiversity and cause chemical contamination of drinking water.

Experts have warned that the wide-spread use of sulfonylureas could have a devastating impact on the productivity of non-target crops and the make-up of natural plant communities and wildlife food chains.

Moreover, Members stated that the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) opinion states that the EFSA GMO Panel is aware of a food habit in certain populations to intentionally consume carnation petals as garnish. The GMO Panel did not, however, assess the possible consequences of the intentional consumption of GM carnations by humans. Both intentional and accidental oral intake of GM carnation flowers by animals were excluded from the EFSA opinion.