

---

# GM crops: global socio-economic and environmental impacts 1996- 2011

---

Graham Brookes & Peter Barfoot

PG Economics Ltd, UK

*Dorchester, UK  
April 2013*

## *Table of contents*

Foreword.....	8
Executive summary and conclusions.....	9
1 Introduction.....	19
1.1 Objectives .....	19
1.2 Methodology.....	19
1.3 Structure of report.....	20
2 Global context of GM crops.....	21
2.1 Global plantings .....	21
2.2 Plantings by crop and trait.....	21
2.2.1 By crop.....	21
2.2.2 By trait .....	23
2.2.3 By country.....	23
3 The farm level economic impact of GM crops 1996-2011.....	26
3.1 Herbicide tolerant soybeans .....	28
3.1.1 The US .....	28
3.1.2 Argentina .....	30
3.1.3 Brazil.....	32
3.1.4 Paraguay and Uruguay.....	33
3.1.5 Canada.....	34
3.1.6 South Africa .....	35
3.1.7 Romania .....	35
3.1.8 Mexico .....	37
3.1.9 Bolivia.....	37
3.1.10 Summary of global economic impact.....	38
3.2 Herbicide tolerant maize .....	39
3.2.1 The US .....	39
3.2.2 Canada.....	40
3.2.3 Argentina .....	41
3.2.4 South Africa .....	42
3.2.5 Philippines .....	42
3.2.6 Brazil.....	43
3.2.7 Colombia .....	43
3.2.8 Uruguay .....	43
3.2.9 Summary of global economic impact.....	43
3.3 Herbicide tolerant cotton .....	44
3.3.1 The US .....	44
3.3.2 Other countries.....	45
3.3.3 Summary of global economic impact.....	46
3.4 Herbicide tolerant canola .....	46
3.4.1 Canada.....	46
3.4.2 The US .....	48
3.4.3 Australia.....	49
3.4.4 Summary of global economic impact.....	51
3.5 GM herbicide tolerant (GM HT) sugar beet .....	51
3.5.1 US.....	51

3.5.2 Canada.....	54
3.6 GM insect resistant (GM IR) maize .....	54
3.6.1 US.....	54
3.6.2 Canada.....	55
3.6.3 Argentina .....	56
3.6.4 South Africa .....	56
3.6.5 Spain .....	57
3.6.6 Other EU countries.....	58
3.6.7 Brazil.....	59
3.6.8 Other countries.....	59
3.6.9 Summary of economic impact.....	60
3.7 Insect resistant (Bt) cotton (GM IR).....	60
3.7.1 The US .....	60
3.7.2 China.....	61
3.7.3 Australia.....	62
3.7.4 Argentina .....	63
3.7.5 Mexico .....	64
3.7.6 South Africa .....	65
3.7.7 India.....	66
3.7.8 Brazil.....	67
3.7.9 Other countries .....	68
3.7.10 Summary of global impact.....	69
3.8 Other GM crops.....	69
3.8.1 Maize/corn rootworm resistance .....	69
3.8.2 Virus resistant papaya.....	70
3.8.3 Virus resistant squash .....	70
3.8.4 Other crops .....	70
3.9 Indirect (non pecuniary) farm level economic impacts.....	71
3.10 GM technology adoption and size of farm .....	74
3.11 Production effects of the technology .....	75
3.12 Trade flows and related issues .....	76
4 The environmental impact of GM crops.....	79
4.1 Use of insecticides and herbicides .....	79
4.1.1 GM herbicide tolerant (to glyphosate) soybeans (GM HT).....	81
4.1.2 GM Herbicide tolerant (GM HT) maize.....	92
4.1.3 GM HT Herbicide tolerant (GM HT) cotton.....	98
4.1.4 GM Herbicide tolerant (GM HT) canola.....	103
4.1.5 GM HT sugar beet.....	105
4.1.6 GM IR maize .....	106
4.1.7 GM insect resistant (GM IR) cotton .....	111
4.1.8 Other environmental impacts - development of herbicide resistant weeds and weed shifts.....	118
4.2 Carbon sequestration.....	120
4.2.1 Tractor fuel use.....	121
4.2.2 Soil carbon sequestration .....	124
4.2.3 Herbicide tolerance and conservation tillage.....	128
4.2.4 Herbicide tolerant soybeans .....	129
4.2.5 Herbicide tolerant maize.....	139

4.2.6 Herbicide tolerant canola.....	142
4.2.7 Herbicide tolerant cotton .....	144
4.2.8 Insect resistant cotton .....	144
4.2.9 Insect resistant maize.....	145
4.2.10 Summary of carbon sequestration impact.....	146
Appendix 1: Base yields used where GM technology delivers a positive yield gain.....	148
Appendix 2: Impacts, assumptions, rationale and sources for all trait/country combinations .....	148
Appendix 3: Additional information relating to the environmental impact.....	169
Appendix 4: The Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ): a method to measure the environmental impact of pesticides.....	180
References .....	184

### *Table of tables*

Table 1: Global farm income benefits from growing GM crops 1996-2011: million US \$.....	10
Table 2: GM crop farm income benefits 1996-2011 selected countries: million US \$.....	11
Table 3: GM crop farm income benefits 2011: developing versus developed countries: million US \$ .....	12
Table 4: Cost of accessing GM technology (million \$) relative to the total farm income benefits 2011 .....	12
Table 5: Additional crop production arising from positive yield effects of GM crops .....	13
Table 6: Impact of changes in the use of herbicides and insecticides from growing GM crops globally 1996-2011.....	14
Table 7: GM crop environmental benefits from lower insecticide and herbicide use 1996-2011: developing versus developed countries .....	15
Table 8: Context of carbon sequestration impact 2011: car equivalents .....	17
Table 9: GM share of crop plantings in 2011 by country (% of total plantings).....	25
Table 10: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans (first generation) in the US 1996-2011 .....	29
Table 11: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Argentina 1996-2011 .....	31
Table 12: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Brazil 1997-2011 .....	32
Table 13: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans (first generation) in Canada 1997-2011 .....	34
Table 14: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in South Africa 2001-2011 .....	35
Table 15: Farm level income impact of using herbicide tolerant soybeans in Romania 1999-2006.....	36
Table 16: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Mexico 2004-2011.....	37
Table 17: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Bolivia 2005-2011 .....	38
Table 18: Farm level income impact of using GM HT cotton in the US 1997-2011.....	44
Table 19: Farm level income impact of using GM HT canola in Canada 1996-2011.....	47
Table 20: Farm level income impact of using GM HT canola in Australia 2008-2011 (\$US).....	51
Table 21: Farm level income impact of using GM HT sugar beet in the US 2007-2011.....	53
Table 22: Farm level income impact of using GM IR maize in the US 1996-2011 .....	54
Table 23: Farm level income impact of using GM IR maize in South Africa 2000-2011.....	57
Table 24: Farm level income impact of using GM IR maize in Spain 1998-2011.....	58
Table 25: Farm level income impact of using GM IR maize in other EU countries 2005-2011.....	58
Table 26: Farm level income impact of using GM IR maize in Brazil 2008-2011 .....	59
Table 27: Farm level income impact of using GM IR cotton in the US 1996-2011.....	61

Table 28: Farm level income impact of using GM IR cotton in China 1997-2011.....	62
Table 29: Farm level income impact of using GM IR cotton in Australia 1996-2011.....	63
Table 30: Farm level income impact of using GM IR cotton in Mexico 1996-2011 .....	64
Table 31: Farm level income impact of using GM IR cotton in India 2002-2010.....	67
Table 32: Values of non pecuniary benefits associated with GM crops in the US.....	73
Table 33: Additional crop production arising from positive yield effects of GM crops .....	75
Table 34: Share of global crop trade accounted for GM production 2011/12 (million tonnes).....	77
Table 35: Share of global crop derivative (meal) trade accounted for GM production 2011/12 (million tonnes) .....	78
Table 36: Herbicide usage on soybeans in the US 1996-2011.....	83
Table 37: Herbicide usage on GM HT and conventional soybeans in the US 1996-2011.....	84
Table 38: Average ai use and field EIQs for conventional soybeans 2006-2011 to deliver equal efficacy to GM HT soybeans.....	85
Table 39: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT soybeans in the US 1996-2011 .....	86
Table 40: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT soybeans in Canada 1997-2011 .....	87
Table 41: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT soybeans in Brazil 1997-2011.....	88
Table 42: Herbicide usage on maize in the US 1996-2011 .....	93
Table 43: Average US maize herbicide usage and environmental load 1997-2011: conventional and GM HT.....	93
Table 44: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT maize in the US 1997-2011.....	94
Table 45: Change in herbicide use and environmental load from using GM HT maize in Canada 1999-2011 .....	95
Table 46: Herbicide usage on cotton in the US 1996-2011 .....	98
Table 47: Herbicide usage and its associated environmental load: GM HT and conventional cotton in the US 1997-2011 .....	98
Table 48: Average ai use and field EIQs for conventional cotton 2006-2011 to deliver equal efficacy to GM HT cotton.....	99
Table 49: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT cotton in the US 1997-2011.....	100
Table 50: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT cotton in Australia 2000-2011.....	101
Table 51: Active ingredient and field EIQ differences conventional versus GM HT canola US 1999- 2011 .....	103
Table 52: Average US maize insecticide usage and its environmental load 1996-2011: conventional versus GM IR.....	107
Table 53: National level changes in insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR maize in the US 1996-2011 (targeted at cornborers and rootworm pests).....	108
Table 54: Average US cotton insecticide usage and environmental impact 1996-2011: conventional versus GM IR.....	113
Table 55: National level changes in insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR cotton in the US 1996-2011.....	113
Table 56: National level changes in insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR cotton in China 1997-2011 .....	114

Table 57: Comparison of insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for conventional, Ingard and Bollgard II cotton in Australia.....	115
Table 58: National level changes in insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR cotton in Australia 1996-2011.....	115
Table 59: National level changes in insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR cotton in Argentina 1998-2011 .....	116
Table 60: USA soybean: tractor fuel consumption by tillage method (litres per ha) 2012.....	121
Table 61: Total farm diesel fuel consumption estimate (litres per ha) 2012.....	122
Table 62: Tractor fuel consumption by tillage method (litre/ha) 2012.....	123
Table 63: Summary of the potential of NT cultivation systems (kg of carbon/ha/yr) .....	126
Table 64: USA soybean: tillage practices and the adoption of GM HT cultivars 1996-2011 (million ha).....	129
Table 65: USA soybean: consumption of tractor fuel used for tillage (1996-2011) .....	130
Table 66: USA soybeans: permanent reduction in tractor fuel consumption and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (1996-2011).....	131
Table 67: USA soybeans: potential soil carbon sequestration (1996 to 2011).....	131
Table 68: USA soybeans: potential additional soil carbon sequestration (1996 to 2011).....	132
Table 69: Argentine soybeans: tillage practices and the adoption of GM HT cultivars 1996-2011 (million ha).....	133
Table 70: Argentine soybeans: permanent reduction in tractor fuel consumption and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (1996-2011).....	134
Table 71: Argentine soybeans: potential additional soil carbon sequestration (1996 to 2011) .....	135
Table 72: Southern Brazil (Santa Catarina, Parana and Rio Grande de Sol states) soybeans: tillage practices and the adoption of biotech cultivars 1997-2011 (million ha) .....	136
Table 73: Brazil (3 southernmost states) soybeans: permanent reduction in tractor fuel consumption and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (1997-2011).....	137
Table 74: Brazil (3 southernmost states) soybeans: potential additional soil carbon sequestration (1997 to 2011) .....	138
Table 75: USA maize: tillage practices and the adoption of GM HT cultivars 1998-2011 (million ha).....	139
Table 76: USA maize: consumption of tractor fuel used for tillage (1998-2011) .....	140
Table 77: USA maize: permanent reduction in tractor fuel consumption and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (1998-2011).....	140
Table 78: USA maize: potential soil carbon sequestration (1998 to 2011) .....	141
Table 79: USA maize: potential additional soil carbon sequestration (1998 to 2011) .....	142
Table 80: Canadian canola: permanent reduction in tractor fuel consumption and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (1996-2011).....	143
Table 81: Canadian canola: potential additional soil carbon sequestration (1996 to 2011).....	144
Table 82: Permanent reduction in global tractor fuel consumption and carbon dioxide emissions resulting from the cultivation of GM IR cotton (1996-2011) .....	145
Table 83: Summary of carbon sequestration impact 1996-2011.....	146
Table 84: Context of carbon sequestration impact 2011: car equivalents.....	147

### *Table of figures*

Figure 1: GM crop plantings 2011 by crop (base area of the four crops: 148.1 million hectares (ha)) .....	21
Figure 2: 2011's share of GM crops in global plantings of key crops (ha) .....	22

Figure 3: Global GM crop plantings by crop 1996-2011 (ha) .....	22
Figure 4: Global GM crop plantings by main trait and crop: 2011.....	23
Figure 5: Global biotech crop plantings 2010 by country .....	24
Figure 6: National farm income benefit from using GM HT soybeans in Paraguay and Uruguay 1999-2011 (million \$).....	33
Figure 7: Global farm level income benefits derived from using GM HT soybeans 1996-2011 (million \$).....	39
Figure 8: National farm income impact of using GM HT maize in the US 1997-2011 .....	40
Figure 9: National farm income impact of using GM HT maize in Canada 1999-2011 (\$ million) .	41
Figure 10: National farm income impact of using GM HT canola in the US 1999-2011.....	49
Figure 11: National farm income impact of using GM IR maize in Canada 1996-2011 .....	55
Figure 12: National farm income impact of using GM IR cotton in Argentina 1998-2011 .....	64
Figure 13: National farm income impact of using GM IR cotton in South Africa 1998-2011 .....	66
Figure 14: Non pecuniary benefits derived by US farmers 1996-2011 by trait (\$ million).....	74
Figure 15: Average yield gains GM IR crops (cotton and maize) 1996-2011 .....	76
Figure 16: Reduction in herbicide use and the environmental load from using GM HT soybeans in all adopting countries 1996-2011.....	92
Figure 17: Reduction in herbicide use and the environmental load from using GM HT maize in adopting countries 1997-2011 .....	97
Figure 18: Reduction in herbicide use and the environmental load from using GM HT cotton in the US, Australia, Argentina and South Africa 1997-2011 .....	103
Figure 19: Reduction in herbicide use and the environmental load from using GM HT canola in the US, Canada and Australia 1996-2011 .....	105
Figure 20: Reduction in insecticide use and the environmental load from using GM IR maize in adopting countries 1996-2011 .....	111
Figure 21: Reduction in insecticide use and the environmental load from using GM IR cotton in adopting countries 1996-2011 .....	118

## Foreword

This paper is intended for use by a wide range of people with interests in agriculture across the world – farmers, farmer organisations, industry associations, inter-professional bodies, input suppliers, users of agricultural products, government departments, international organisations, non governmental organisations, politicians, academics, researchers, students and interested citizens.

The material contained in the paper, which is the eighth annual report on the global economic and environmental impact of genetically modified (GM) crops, aims to provide insights into the reasons why so many farmers around the world have adopted crop biotechnology and continue to use it in their production systems since the technology first became available on a widespread commercial basis in the mid 1990s.

The paper draws, and is largely based on, the considerable body of peer reviewed literature available that has examined the economic and other reasons behind farm level crop biotechnology adoption, together with the environmental impacts associated with the changes<sup>1</sup>.

Given the controversy that the use of this technology engenders in some debates and for some people, the work contained in this paper has been submitted and accepted for publication in a peer reviewed publication. The length of this paper, at nearly 200 pages, is too long for acceptance for publication as a single document in peer reviewed journals. Therefore the authors submitted two papers focusing separately on the economic and environmental impacts of the technology. These papers have been accepted for publication in the peer reviewed journal, GM crops ([www.landesbioscience.com](http://www.landesbioscience.com)). The economic impact paper (Global income and production effects of GM crops 1996-2001) is available in the 2013 edition of GM Crops, Jan-March 2013, 4.1, 1-10 and the environmental impact paper (Key environmental impacts of global GM crop use 1996-2011) is available in edition April-June 2013, 4.2, 1-11. These papers follow on from 13 previous peer reviewed papers by the authors on the subject of crop biotechnology impact<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data from other sources, including industry, is used where no other sources of (representative) data are available. All sources and assumptions used are detailed in the paper

<sup>2</sup> For example last year's global impact report covering the years 1996-2010 can be found in the GM Crops journal 2012, 3, 1: 265-272 (economic impacts) and 2012, 3 2, 1-9 (environmental impacts). Also, the International Journal of Biotechnology, 2011, vol 12 nos 1 to 2, pp 1-49 (economic impacts 1996-2009) and GM crops 2011, 2:1, 1-16, Jan-March 2011 (environmental impacts). See also [www.pgeconomics.co.uk](http://www.pgeconomics.co.uk) for a full list of these peer review papers



## Executive summary and conclusions

This study presents the findings of research into the global socio-economic and environmental impact of genetically modified (GM) crops in the sixteen years since they were first commercially planted on a significant area. It focuses on the farm level economic effects, the production effects, the environmental impact resulting from changes in the use of insecticides and herbicides, and the contribution towards reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

### Background context

The analysis presented is largely based on the average performance and impact recorded in different crops. The economic performance and environmental impact of the technology at the farm level does, however, vary widely both, between and within regions/countries. This means that the impact of the technology (and any new technology, GM or otherwise) is subject to variation at the local level. Also the performance and impact should be considered on a case by case basis in terms of crop and trait combinations.

Agricultural production systems (how farmers use different and new technologies and husbandry practices) are dynamic and vary with time. This analysis seeks to address this issue, wherever possible, by comparing GM production systems with the most likely conventional alternative, if crop biotechnology had not been available. This is of particular relevance to the case of GM herbicide tolerant (GM HT) soybeans, where prior to the introduction of GM HT technology, production systems were already switching away from conventional to no/low tillage production (in which the latter systems make greater use of, and are more reliant on, herbicide-based weed control systems - the role of GM HT technology in facilitating this fundamental change in production systems is assessed below).

In addition, the market dynamic impact of GM crop adoption (on prices) has been incorporated into the analysis by use of current prices (for each year) for all crops.

### Farm income effects<sup>3</sup>

GM technology has had a significant positive impact on farm income derived from a combination of enhanced productivity and efficiency gains (Table 1). In 2011, the direct global farm income benefit from GM crops was \$19.8 billion. This is equivalent to having added 6.3% to the value of global production of the four main crops of soybeans, maize, canola and cotton. Since 1996, farm incomes have increased by \$98.2 billion.

The largest gains in farm income in 2011 have arisen in the maize sector, largely from yield gains. The \$7.1 billion additional income generated by GM insect resistant (GM IR) maize in 2011 has been equivalent to adding 6.8% to the value of the crop in the GM crop growing countries, or adding the equivalent of 3.3% to the \$214 billion value of the global maize crop in 2011. Cumulatively since 1996, GM IR technology has added \$25.8 billion to the income of global maize farmers.

Substantial gains have also arisen in the cotton sector through a combination of higher yields and lower costs. In 2011, cotton farm income levels in the GM adopting countries increased by \$6.73

---

<sup>3</sup> See section 3 for details

billion and since 1996, the sector has benefited from an additional \$32.5 billion. The 2011 income gains are equivalent to adding 15% to the value of the cotton crop in these countries, or 11.6% to the \$56 billion value of total global cotton production. This is a substantial increase in value added terms for two new cotton seed technologies.

Significant increases to farm incomes have also resulted in the soybean and canola sectors. The GM HT technology in soybeans has boosted farm incomes by \$3.89 billion in 2011, and since 1996 has delivered over \$32.2 billion of extra farm income. In the canola sector (largely North American) an additional \$3.1 billion has been generated (1996-2011).

Table 2 summarises farm income impacts in key GM crop adopting countries. This highlights the important farm income benefit arising from GM HT soybeans in South America (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay), GM IR cotton in China and India and a range of GM cultivars in the US. It also illustrates the growing level of farm income benefits being obtained in South Africa, the Philippines, Mexico and Colombia.

In terms of the division of the economic benefits obtained by farmers in developing countries relative to farmers in developed countries, Table 3 shows that in 2011, 51.2% of the farm income benefits have been earned by developing country farmers. The vast majority of these income gains for developing country farmers have been from GM IR cotton and GM HT soybeans<sup>4</sup>. Over the sixteen years, 1996-2011, the cumulative farm income gain derived by developing country farmers was 50.5% (\$49.63 billion).

Examining the cost farmers pay for accessing GM technology, Table 4 shows that across the four main GM crops, the total cost in 2011 was equal to 21% of the total technology gains (inclusive of farm income gains plus cost of the technology payable to the seed supply chain<sup>5</sup>).

For farmers in developing countries the total cost was equal to 14% of total technology gains, whilst for farmers in developed countries the cost was 28% of the total technology gains. Whilst circumstances vary between countries, the higher share of total technology gains accounted for by farm income gains in developing countries relative to the farm income share in developed countries reflects factors such as weaker provision and enforcement of intellectual property rights in developing countries and the higher average level of farm income gain on a per hectare basis derived by developing country farmers relative to developed country farmers.

**Table 1: Global farm income benefits from growing GM crops 1996-2011: million US \$**

Trait	Increase in farm income 2011	Increase in farm income 1996-2011	Farm income benefit in 2011 as % of total value of production of these crops in GM adopting countries	Farm income benefit in 2011 as % of total value of global production of crop

<sup>4</sup> The authors acknowledge that the classification of different countries into developing or developed country status affects the distribution of benefits between these two categories of country. The definition used in this paper is consistent with the definition used by James (2009)

<sup>5</sup> The cost of the technology accrues to the seed supply chain including sellers of seed to farmers, seed multipliers, plant breeders, distributors and the GM technology providers

GM herbicide tolerant soybeans	3,879.2	32,211.9	3.8	3.2
GM herbicide tolerant maize	1,540.2	4,212.2	1.5	0.7
GM herbicide tolerant cotton	166.9	1,224.1	0.4	0.3
GM herbicide tolerant canola	433.2	3,131.4	1.4	1.2
GM insect resistant maize	7,104.9	25,762.0	6.8	3.3
GM insect resistant cotton	6,559.6	31,263.2	14.7	11.6
Others	83.3	412.0	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>Totals</b>	<b>19,767.3</b>	<b>98,216.8</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.9</b>

Notes: All values are nominal. Others = Virus resistant papaya and squash and herbicide tolerant sugar beet. Totals for the value shares exclude 'other crops' (ie, relate to the 4 main crops of soybeans, maize, canola and cotton). Farm income calculations are net farm income changes after inclusion of impacts on yield, crop quality and key variable costs of production (eg, payment of seed premia, impact on crop protection expenditure)

**Table 2: GM crop farm income benefits 1996-2011 selected countries: million US \$**

	<b>GM HT soybeans</b>	<b>GM HT maize</b>	<b>GM HT cotton</b>	<b>GM HT canola</b>	<b>GM IR maize</b>	<b>GM IR cotton</b>	<b>Total</b>
US	13,835.9	3,110.5	924.8	241.5	21,497.3	3,769.4	<b>43,379.4</b>
Argentina	12,624.6	510.5	89.0	N/a	380.7	362.3	<b>13,967.1</b>
Brazil	4,314.5	431.5	82.6	N/a	1,796.9	19.9	<b>6,645.4</b>
Paraguay	732.4	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	<b>732.4</b>
Canada	231.6	66.7	N/a	2,862.5	820.5	N/a	<b>3,981.3</b>
South Africa	7.0	3.8	3.0	N/a	887.3	31.6	<b>932.7</b>
China	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	13,067.8	<b>13,067.8</b>
India	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	12,579.5	<b>12,579.5</b>
Australia	N/a	N/a	58.4	27.5	N/a	525.4	<b>611.3</b>
Mexico	4.9	N/a	51.4	N/a	N/a	123.9	<b>180.2</b>
Philippines	N/a	88.2	N/a	N/a	176.2	N/a	<b>264.4</b>
Romania	44.6	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	<b>44.6</b>
Uruguay	83.4	N/a	N/a	N/a	11.7	N/a	<b>95.1</b>
Spain	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	139.1	N/a	<b>139.1</b>
Other EU	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	16.2	N/a	<b>16.2</b>
Colombia	N/a	0.9	14.9	N/a	29.2	13.7	<b>58.7</b>
Bolivia	327.0	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	<b>327.0</b>
Burma	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	338.7	<b>338.7</b>
Pakistan	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	334.2	<b>334.2</b>

Notes: All values are nominal. Farm income calculations are net farm income changes after inclusion of impacts on yield, crop quality and key variable costs of production (eg, payment of seed premia, impact on crop protection expenditure). N/a = not applicable. US total figure also includes \$406.1 million for other crops/traits (not included in the table). Also not included in the table is \$5.9 million extra farm income from GM HT sugar beet in Canada

**Table 3: GM crop farm income benefits 2011: developing versus developed countries: million US \$**

	<b>Developed</b>	<b>Developing</b>
GM HT soybeans	1,794.2	2,085.0
GM IR maize	5,710.4	1,394.5
GM HT maize	897.1	643.1
GM IR cotton	650.7	5,908.9
GM HT cotton	80.7	86.2
GM HT canola	433.2	0
GM virus resistant papaya and squash and GM HT sugar beet	83.3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,649.6</b>	<b>10,117.7</b>

Developing countries = all countries in South America, Mexico, Honduras, Burkina Faso, India, China, the Philippines and South Africa

**Table 4: Cost of accessing GM technology (million \$) relative to the total farm income benefits 2011**

	<b>Cost of technology : all farmers</b>	<b>Farm income gain: all farmers</b>	<b>Total benefit of technology to farmers and seed supply chain</b>	<b>Cost of technology : developing countries</b>	<b>Farm income gain: developing countries</b>	<b>Total benefit of technology to farmers and seed supply chain: developing countries</b>
GM HT soybeans	1,647.6	3,879.2	5,526.8	606.4	2,085.0	2,691.4
GM IR maize	1,686.6	1,540.2	3,226.8	433.3	1,394.5	1,827.8
GM HT maize	789.6	166.9	956.5	93.9	643.1	737.0
GM IR cotton	758.5	433.2	1,191.7	536.9	5,908.9	6,445.8
GM HT cotton	313.1	7,104.9	7,418.0	40.5	86.2	126.7
GM HT canola	140.2	6,559.6	6,699.8	N/a	0	0
Others	71.1	83.3	154.4	N/a	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,406.7</b>	<b>19,767.3</b>	<b>25,174</b>	<b>1,711.0</b>	<b>10,117.7</b>	<b>11,828.7</b>

N/a = not applicable. Cost of accessing technology based on the seed premia paid by farmers for using GM technology relative to its conventional equivalents

### **Production effects of the technology**

Based on the yield impacts used in the direct farm income benefit calculations (see Appendix 1) above and taking account of the second soybean crop facilitation in South America, GM crops have added important volumes to global production of maize, cotton, canola and soybeans since 1996 (Table 5).

The GM IR traits, used in maize and cotton, have accounted for 97.3% of the additional maize production and 99.4% of the additional cotton production. Positive yield impacts from the use of

this technology have occurred in all user countries (except for GM IR cotton in Australia<sup>6</sup>) when compared to average yields derived from crops using conventional technology (such as application of insecticides and seed treatments). The average yield impact across the total area planted to these traits over the 16 years since 1996 has been +10.1% for maize and +15.8% for cotton.

As indicated earlier, the primary impact of GM HT technology has been to provide more cost effective (less expensive) and easier weed control, as opposed to improving yields, the improved weed control has, nevertheless, delivered higher yields in some countries. The main source of additional production from this technology has been via the facilitation of no tillage production systems, shortening the production cycle and how it has enabled many farmers in South America to plant a crop of soybeans immediately after a wheat crop in the same growing season. This second crop, additional to traditional soybean production, has added 106.4 million tonnes to soybean production in Argentina and Paraguay between 1996 and 2011 (accounting for 96.6% of the total GM-related additional soybean production).

**Table 5: Additional crop production arising from positive yield effects of GM crops**

	1996-2011 additional production (million tonnes)	2011 additional production (million tonnes)
Soybeans	110.2	12.74
Maize	195.0	34.54
Cotton	15.85	2.48
Canola	6.55	0.44
Sugar beet	0.45	0.13

Note: GM HT sugar beet only in the US and Canada since 2008

#### **Environmental impact from changes in insecticide and herbicide use<sup>7</sup>**

To examine this impact, the study has analysed both active ingredient use and utilised the indicator known as the Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ) to assess the broader impact on the environment (plus impact on animal and human health). The EIQ distils the various environmental and health impacts of individual pesticides in different GM and conventional production systems into a single 'field value per hectare' and draws on key toxicity and environmental exposure data related to individual products. It therefore provides a better measure to contrast and compare the impact of various pesticides on the environment and human health than weight of active ingredient alone. Readers should, however, note that the EIQ is an indicator only (primarily of toxicity) and does not take into account all environmental issues and impacts. In the analysis of GM HT technology we have assumed that the conventional alternative delivers the same level of weed control as occurs in the GM HT production system.

GM traits have contributed to a significant reduction in the environmental impact associated with insecticide and herbicide use on the areas devoted to GM crops (Table 6). Since 1996, the use of pesticides on the GM crop area was reduced by 473.7 million kg of active ingredient (8.9% reduction), and the environmental impact associated with herbicide and insecticide use on these crops, as measured by the EIQ indicator, fell by 18.3%.

<sup>6</sup> This reflects the levels of *Heliothis/Helicoverpa* (boll and bud worm pests) pest control previously obtained with intensive insecticide use. The main benefit and reason for adoption of this technology in Australia has arisen from significant cost savings (on insecticides) and the associated environmental gains from reduced insecticide use

<sup>7</sup> See section 4.1

In absolute terms, the largest environmental gain has been associated with the adoption of GM insect resistant (IR) technology. GM IR cotton has contributed a 24.8% reduction in the volume of active ingredient used and a 27.3% reduction in the EIQ indicator (1996-2011) due to the significant reduction in insecticide use that the technology has allowed, in what has traditionally been an intensive user of insecticides. Similarly, the use of GM IR technology in maize has led to important reductions in insecticide use, with associated environmental benefits.

The volume of herbicides used in GM maize crops also decreased by 193 million kg (1996-2011), a 10.1% reduction, whilst the overall environmental impact associated with herbicide use on these crops decreased by a significantly larger 12.5%. This highlights the switch in herbicides used with most GM herbicide tolerant (HT) crops to active ingredients with a more environmentally benign profile than the ones generally used on conventional crops.

Important environmental gains have also arisen in the soybean and canola sectors. In the soybean sector, herbicide use decreased by 12.5 million kg (1996-2011) and the associated environmental impact of herbicide use on this crop area decreased, due to a switch to more environmentally benign herbicides (-15.5%). In the canola sector, farmers reduced herbicide use by 14.8 million kg (a 17.3% reduction) and the associated environmental impact of herbicide use on this crop area fell by 27.1% (due to a switch to more environmentally benign herbicides).

In terms of the division of the environmental benefits associated with less insecticide and herbicide use for farmers in developing countries relative to farmers in developed countries, Table 7 shows a 55%:45% split of the environmental benefits (1996-2011) respectively in developed (55%) and developing countries (45%). Over three-quarters (76%) of the environmental gains in developing countries have been from the use of GM IR cotton.

**Table 6: Impact of changes in the use of herbicides and insecticides from growing GM crops globally 1996-2011**

Trait	Change in volume of active ingredient used (million kg)	Change in field EIQ impact (in terms of million field EIQ/ha units)	% change in ai use on GM crops	% change in environmental impact associated with herbicide & insecticide use on GM crops	Area GM trait 2011 (million ha)
GM herbicide tolerant soybeans	-12.5	-6,444.2	-0.6	-15.5	73.2
GM herbicide tolerant maize	-193.1	-5,168.0	-10.1	-12.5	35.1
GM herbicide tolerant canola	-14.8	-501.5	-17.3	-27.1	7.3
GM herbicide tolerant cotton	-15.5	-420.9	-6.1	-8.9	4.5
GM insect resistant maize	-50.0	-1,884.2	-45.2	-41.7	37.8
GM insect resistant cotton	-188.7	-8,498.0	-24.8	-27.3	22.2

GM herbicide tolerant sugar beet	+0.87	-3.3	+23.9	-4.1	0.46
<b>Totals</b>	<b>-473.73</b>	<b>-22,920.1</b>	<b>-8.9</b>	<b>-18.3</b>	

**Table 7: GM crop environmental benefits from lower insecticide and herbicide use 1996-2011: developing versus developed countries**

	Change in field EIQ impact (in terms of million field EIQ/ha units): developed countries	Change in field EIQ impact (in terms of million field EIQ/ha units): developing countries
GM HT soybeans	4,805.3	1,638.9
GM HT maize	4,897.7	270.3
GM HT cotton	327.7	93.2
GM HT canola	501.5	0
GM IR maize	1,411.3	472.9
GM IR cotton	745.2	7,752.8
GM HT sugar beet	-3.3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,692.0</b>	<b>10,228.1</b>

It should, however, be noted that in some regions where GM HT crops have been widely grown, some farmers have relied too much on the use of single herbicides like glyphosate to manage weeds in GM HT crops and this has contributed to the development of weed resistance. There are currently 24 weeds recognised as exhibiting resistance to glyphosate worldwide, of which several are not associated with glyphosate tolerant crops ([www.weedscience.org](http://www.weedscience.org)). For example, there are currently 14 weeds recognised in the US as exhibiting resistance to glyphosate, of which two are not associated with glyphosate tolerant crops. In the US, the affected area is currently within a range of 15%-35% of the total area annually devoted to the crops in GM HT technology is available (maize, cotton, canola, soybeans and sugar beet).

In recent years, there has also been a growing consensus among weed scientists of a need for changes in the weed management programmes in GM HT crops, because of the evolution of these weeds towards populations that are resistant to glyphosate. Growers of GM HT crops are increasingly being advised to be more proactive and include other herbicides (with different and complementary modes of action) in combination with glyphosate in their integrated weed management systems, even where instances of weed resistance to glyphosate have not been found.

This proactive, diversified approach to weed management is therefore the principal strategy for avoiding the emergence of herbicide resistant weeds in GM HT crops. A proactive weed management programme also generally requires less herbicide, has a better environmental profile and is more economical than a reactive weed management programme.

At the macro level, the adoption of both reactive and proactive weed management programmes in GM HT crops has already begun to influence the mix, total amount and overall environmental profile of herbicides applied to GM HT soybeans, cotton, maize and canola and this is reflected in the data presented in this paper.

### Impact on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions<sup>8</sup>

The scope for GM crops contributing to lower levels of GHG emissions comes from two principle sources:

- Reduced fuel use from less frequent herbicide or insecticide applications and a reduction in the energy use in soil cultivation. The fuel savings associated with making fewer spray runs (relative to conventional crops) and the switch to conservation, reduced and no-till farming systems, have resulted in permanent savings in carbon dioxide emissions. In 2011 this amounted to about 1,886 million kg (arising from reduced fuel use of 706 million litres). Over the period 1996 to 2011 the cumulative permanent reduction in fuel use is estimated at 14,610 million kg of carbon dioxide (arising from reduced fuel use of 5,472 million litres);
- The use of 'no-till' and 'reduced-till'<sup>9</sup> farming systems. These production systems have increased significantly with the adoption of GM HT crops because the GM HT technology has improved growers ability to control competing weeds, reducing the need to rely on soil cultivation and seed-bed preparation as means to getting good levels of weed control. As a result, tractor fuel use for tillage is reduced, soil quality is enhanced and levels of soil erosion cut. In turn more carbon remains in the soil and this leads to lower GHG emissions. Based on savings arising from the rapid adoption of no till/reduced tillage farming systems in North and South America, an extra 5,751 million kg of soil carbon is estimated to have been sequestered in 2011 (equivalent to 21,107 million tonnes of carbon dioxide that has not been released into the global atmosphere). Cumulatively, the amount of carbon sequestered may be higher than these estimates due to year-on-year benefits to soil quality, however it is equally likely that the total cumulative soil sequestration gains have been lower because only a proportion of the crop area will have remained in no-till and reduced tillage. It is, nevertheless, not possible to confidently estimate cumulative soil sequestration gains that take into account reversions to conventional tillage because of a lack of data. Consequently, our estimate of 170,961 million tonnes of carbon dioxide not released into the atmosphere should be treated with caution.

Placing these carbon sequestration benefits within the context of the carbon emissions from cars, Table 8 shows that:

- In 2011, the permanent carbon dioxide savings from reduced fuel use were the equivalent of removing 0.84 million cars from the road;
- The additional probable soil carbon sequestration gains in 2011 were equivalent to removing 9.38 million cars from the roads;
- In total, in 2011, the combined GM crop-related carbon dioxide emission savings from reduced fuel use and additional soil carbon sequestration were equal to the removal from the roads of 10.2 million cars, equivalent to 36% of all registered cars in the UK;
- It is not possible to confidently estimate the probable soil carbon sequestration gains since 1996. If the entire GM HT crop in reduced or no tillage agriculture during the last sixteen years had remained in permanent reduced/no tillage then this would have

<sup>8</sup> See section 4.2

<sup>9</sup> No-till farming means that the ground is not ploughed at all, while reduced tillage means that the ground is disturbed less than it would be with traditional tillage systems. For example, under a no-till farming system, soybean seeds are planted through the organic material that is left over from a previous crop such as corn, cotton or wheat



resulted in a carbon dioxide saving of 170,961 million kg, equivalent to taking 76 million cars off the road. This is, however, a maximum possibility and the actual levels of carbon dioxide reduction are likely to be lower.

**Table 8: Context of carbon sequestration impact 2011: car equivalents**

Crop/trait/country	Permanent carbon dioxide savings arising from reduced fuel use (million kg of carbon dioxide)	Permanent fuel savings: as average family car equivalents removed from the road for a year ('000s)	Potential additional soil carbon sequestration savings (million kg of carbon dioxide)	Soil carbon sequestration savings: as average family car equivalents removed from the road for a year ('000s)
US: GM HT soybeans	205	91	4,141	1,840
Argentina: GM HT soybeans	699	310	7,081	3,147
Brazil GM HR soybeans	363	161	3,676	1,634
Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay: GM HT soybeans	141	62	1,425	633
Canada: GM HT canola	177	78	891	396
Global GM IR cotton	40	18	0	0
US: GM HT maize	204	91	3,894	1,731
Brazil IR maize	58	26	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,886</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>21,107</b>	<b>9,381</b>

Notes: Assumption: an average family car produces 150 grams of carbon dioxide per km. A car does an average of 15,000 km/year and therefore produces 2,250 kg of carbon dioxide/year

### Concluding comments

Crop biotechnology has, to date, delivered several specific agronomic traits that have overcome a number of production constraints for many farmers. This has resulted in improved productivity and profitability for the 15.4 million adopting farmers who have applied the technology, to 148 million hectares in 2011.

During the last sixteen years, this technology has made important positive socio-economic and environmental contributions. These have arisen even though only a limited range of GM agronomic traits have so far been commercialised, in a small range of crops.

The crop biotechnology has delivered economic and environmental gains through a combination of their inherent technical advances and the role of the technology in the facilitation and evolution of more cost effective and environmentally friendly farming practices. More specifically:

- the gains from the GM IR traits have mostly been delivered directly from the technology (yield improvements, reduced production risk and decreased the use of insecticides). Thus farmers (mostly in developing countries) have been able to both,

- improve their productivity and economic returns, whilst also practicing more environmentally-friendly farming methods;
- the gains from GM HT traits have come from a combination of direct benefits (mostly cost reductions to the farmer) and the facilitation of changes in farming systems. Thus, GM HT technology (especially in soybeans) has played an important role in enabling farmers to capitalise on the availability of a low cost, broad-spectrum herbicide (glyphosate) and in turn, facilitated the move away from conventional to low/no-tillage production systems in both North and South America. This change in production system has made additional positive economic contributions to farmers (and the wider economy) and delivered important environmental benefits, notably reduced levels of GHG emissions (from reduced tractor fuel use and additional soil carbon sequestration);
  - both IR and HT traits have made important contributions to increasing world production levels of soybeans, corn, cotton and canola.

In relation to GM HT crops, however, over reliance on the use of glyphosate by some farmers, in some regions, has contributed to the development of weed resistance. As a result, farmers are increasingly adopting a mix of reactive and proactive weed management strategies incorporating a mix of herbicides. Despite this, the overall environmental and economic gain from the use of GM crops has been, and continues to be, substantial.

Overall, there is a considerable body of evidence, in peer reviewed literature, and summarised in this paper, that quantifies the positive economic and environmental impacts of crop biotechnology. The analysis in this paper therefore provides insights into the reasons why so many farmers around the world have adopted and continue to use the technology. Readers are encouraged to read the peer reviewed papers cited, and the many others who have published on this subject (and listed in the references section) and to draw their own conclusions.

# 1 Introduction

This study<sup>10</sup> examines specific global socio-economic impact on farm income and environmental impacts in respect of pesticide usage and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, of crop biotechnology, over the sixteen year period 1996-2011<sup>11</sup>. It also quantifies the production impact of the technology on the key crops where it has been used.

## 1.1 Objectives

The principal objective of the study was to identify the global socio-economic and environmental impact of genetically modified (GM) crops over the first sixteen years of widespread commercial production. This was to cover not only the impacts for the latest available year but to quantify the cumulative impact over the fifteen year period.

More specifically, the report examines the following impacts:

*Socio-economic impacts on:*

- Cropping systems: risks of crop losses, use of inputs, crop yields and rotations;
- Farm profitability: costs of production, revenue and gross margin profitability;
- Indirect (non pecuniary) impacts of the technology;
- Production effects;
- Trade flows: developments of imports and exports and prices;
- Drivers for adoption such as farm type and structure

*Environmental impacts on:*

- Insecticide and herbicide use, including conversion to an environmental impact measure<sup>12</sup>;
- Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

## 1.2 Methodology

The report has been compiled based largely on desk research and analysis. A detailed literature review<sup>13</sup> has been undertaken to identify relevant data. Primary data for impacts of commercial cultivation were, of course, not available for every crop, in every year and for each country, but all representative, previous research has been utilised. The findings of this research have been used as the basis for the analysis presented<sup>14</sup>, although where relevant, primary analysis has been undertaken from base data (eg, calculation of the environmental impacts). More specific information about assumptions used and their origins are provided in each of the sections of the report.

<sup>10</sup> The authors acknowledge that funding towards the researching of this paper was provided by Monsanto. The material presented in this paper is, however, the independent views of the authors – it is a standard condition for all work undertaken by PG Economics that all reports are independently and objectively compiled without influence from funding sponsors

<sup>11</sup> This study updates earlier studies produced in 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, covering the first nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen and fifteen years of GM crop adoption globally. Readers should, however, note that some data presented in this report are not directly comparable with data presented in the earlier papers because the current paper takes into account the availability of new data and analysis (including revisions to data applicable to earlier years)

<sup>12</sup> The Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ), based on Kovach J et al (1992 & annually updated) – see references

<sup>13</sup> See References

<sup>14</sup> Where several pieces of research of relevance to one subject (eg, the impact of using a biotech trait on the yield of a crop) have been identified, the findings used have been largely based on the average

### **1.3 Structure of report**

The report is structured as follows:

- Section one: introduction;
- Section two: overview of biotech crop plantings by trait and country;
- Section three: farm level profitability impacts by trait and country, intangible (non pecuniary) benefits, structure and size, prices, production impact and trade flows;
- Section four: environmental impacts covering impact of changes in herbicide and insecticide use and contributions to reducing GHG emissions.

## 2 Global context of GM crops

This section provides a broad overview of the global development of GM crops over the sixteen year period 1996-2011.

### 2.1 Global plantings

Although the first commercial GM crops were planted in 1994 (tomatoes), 1996 was the first year in which a significant area of crops containing GM traits were planted (1.66 million hectares). Since then there has been a dramatic increase in plantings and by 2010/11, the global planted area reached over 148.5 million hectares. This is equal to 76% of the total utilised agricultural area of the European Union or close to two and a half times the EU 27 area devoted to cereals.


In terms of the share of the main crops in which GM traits have been commercialised (soybeans, maize/corn, cotton and canola), GM traits accounted for 44% of the global plantings to these four crops in 2011.

### 2.2 Plantings by crop and trait

#### 2.2.1 By crop

Almost all of the global GM crop area derives from soybeans, maize/corn, cotton and canola (Figure 1)<sup>15</sup>. In 2011, GM soybeans accounted for the largest share (49%), followed by corn (32%), cotton (14%) and canola (5%).

**Figure 1: GM crop plantings 2011 by crop (base area of the four crops: 148.1 million hectares (ha))**




Sources: Various including ISAAA, Canola Council of Canada, CropLife Canada, USDA, CSIRO, ArgenBio, National Ministries of Agriculture (Mexico, Philippines, Spain), Grains South Africa

<sup>15</sup> In 2011 there were also additional GM crop plantings of papaya (390 hectares), squash (2,000 hectares), sugar beet (457,000 ha) and alfalfa (about 200,000 ha) in the USA. There were also 5,000 hectares of papaya in China and 13,000 of sugar beet in Canada

In terms of the share of total global plantings to these four crops, GM traits accounted for the majority of soybean plantings (72%) in 2011. For the other three main crops, the GM shares in 2011 were 28% for maize/corn, 56% for cotton and 23% for canola (Figure 2).


**Figure 2: 2011's share of GM crops in global plantings of key crops (ha)**



Sources: Various including ISAAA, Canola Council of Canada, CropLife Canada, USDA, CSIRO, ArgenBio, National Ministries of Agriculture (Mexico, Philippines, Spain), Grains South Africa

The trend in plantings to GM crops (by crop) since 1996 is shown in Figure 3.

**Figure 3: Global GM crop plantings by crop 1996-2011 (ha)**




Sources: Various including ISAAA, Canola Council of Canada, CropLife Canada, USDA, CSIRO, ArgenBio, National Ministries of Agriculture (Mexico, Philippines, Spain), Grains South Africa

## 2.2.2 By trait

Figure 4 summarises the breakdown of the main GM traits planted globally in 2011. GM herbicide tolerant (HT) soybeans dominate, accounting for 38% of the total, followed by insect resistant (IR: largely Bt) maize, HT maize and IR cotton with respective shares of 25%, 19% and 12%<sup>16</sup>. In total, HT crops account for 63%, and insect resistant crops account for 37% of global plantings.

**Figure 4: Global GM crop plantings by main trait and crop: 2011**




Sources: Various including ISAAA, Canola Council of Canada, CropLife Canada, USDA, CSIRO, ArgenBio, National Ministries of Agriculture (Mexico, Philippines, Spain), Grains South Africa

## 2.2.3 By country

The US had the largest share of global GM crop plantings in 2011 (42%), followed by Brazil (21%). The other main countries planting GM crops in 2011 were Argentina, India, Canada and China (Figure 5).

<sup>16</sup> The reader should note that the total plantings by trait produces a higher global planted area (191.5 million ha) than the global area by crop (149.5 million ha) because of the planting of some crops containing the stacked traits of herbicide tolerance and insect resistance

**Figure 5: Global GM crop plantings 2011 by country**

Sources: Various including ISAAA, Canola Council of Canada, CropLife Canada, USDA, CSIRO, ArgenBio, National Ministries of Agriculture (Mexico, Philippines, Spain), Grains South Africa

In terms of the GM share of production in the main adopting countries, Table 9 shows that, in 2011, the technology accounted for important shares of total production of the four main crops, in several countries. More specifically:

- *USA*: was one of the first countries to adopt the technology in 1996 for traits in soybeans, maize and cotton, and from 1999 in canola, hence the very high adoption levels that have been reached in 2011. Almost all of the US sugar beet crop (93%) also used GM HT technology in 2011;
- *Canada and Argentina*: like the US were early adopters, with the technology now dominating production in the three crops of soybeans, maize and canola in Canada, and maize, cotton and soybeans in Argentina;
- *South Africa*: was the first, and remains the primary African country<sup>17</sup> to embrace the technology, which was first used commercially in 2000. The technology is widely used in the important crops of maize and soybeans, and now accounts (in 2010) for all of the small cotton crop (about 9,400 ha in 2011);
- *Australia*: was an early adopter of GM technology in cotton (1996), with GM traits now accounting for almost all cotton production. Extension of the technology to other crops did, however, not occur until 2008 when HT canola was allowed in some Australian states;
- In *Asia*, five countries used GM crops in 2011. China was the first Asian country to use the technology commercially back in 1997 when GM IR technology was first used. This technology rapidly expanded to about two thirds of the total crop within five years and has remained at this level ever since. GM virus resistant papaya has also been used in China since 2008. In India, IR cotton was first adopted in 2002, and its use increased

<sup>17</sup> The only other African country where commercial GM crops grew in 2011 was Burkina Faso. First used commercially in 2008, IR cotton now accounts for about 60% (232,000 ha) of the total crop (2011)



rapidly in subsequent years, so that by 2011 this technology dominates total cotton production (88% of the total). IR cotton is also grown in Pakistan and Burma. Lastly, in the Philippines, IR maize was first used commercially in 2003, with HT maize also adopted from 2006;

- In *South America*, there are interesting country examples where the adoption of GM technology in one country resulted in a spread of the technology, initially illegally, across borders into countries which were first reluctant to legalise the use of the technology. Thus GM HT soybeans were first grown illegally in the southernmost states of Brazil in 1997, a year after legal adoption in Argentina. It was not until 2003 that the Brazilian government legalised the commercial growing of GM HT soybeans, when more than 10% of the country's soybean crop had been using the technology illegally (in 2002). Since then, GM technology use has extended to cotton in 2006 and maize in 2008. A similar process of widespread illegal adoption of GM HT soybeans occurred in Paraguay and Bolivia before the respective governments authorised the planting of soybean crops using this GM trait.

**Table 9: GM share of crop plantings in 2011 by country (% of total plantings)**

	Soybeans	Maize	Cotton	Canola
USA	94	88	90	100
Canada	72	90	N/a	96
Argentina	99	90	95	N/a
South Africa	85	68	100	N/a
Australia	N/a	N/a	100	9
China	N/a	N/a	72	N/a
Philippines	N/a	25	N/a	N/a
Paraguay	97	N/a	N/a	N/a
Brazil	82	65	39	N/a
Uruguay	99	92	N/a	N/a
India	N/a	N/a	88	N/a
Colombia	N/a	11	72	N/a
Mexico	17	N/a	56	N/a
Bolivia	92	N/a	N/a	N/a
Burkina Faso	N/a	N/a	60	N/a
Pakistan	N/a	N/a	81	N/a
Burma	N/a	N/a	79	N/a

Note: N/a = not applicable

### 3 The farm level economic impact of GM crops 1996-2011

This section examines the farm level economic impact of growing GM crops and covers the following main issues:

- Impact on crop yields;
- Effect on key costs of production, notably seed cost and crop protection expenditure;
- Impact on other costs such as fuel and labour;
- Effect on profitability;
- Other impacts such as crop quality, scope for planting a second crop in a season and impacts that are often referred to as intangible impacts such as convenience, risk management and husbandry flexibility;
- Production effects.

The analysis is based on an extensive examination of existing farm level impact data for GM crops. Whilst primary data for impacts of commercial cultivation were not available for every crop, in every year and for each country, a substantial body of representative research and analysis is available and this has been used as the basis for the analysis presented.

As the economic performance and impact of this technology at the farm level varies widely, both between and within regions/countries (as applies to any technology used in agriculture), the measurement of performance and impact is considered on a case by case basis in terms of crop and trait combinations. The analysis presented is based on the average performance and impact recorded in different crops by the studies reviewed; the average performance being the most common way in which the identified literature has reported impact. Where several pieces of relevant research (eg, on the impact of using a GM trait on the yield of a crop in one country in a particular year) have been identified, the findings used have been largely based on the average of these findings.

This approach may both, overstate, or understate, the real impact of GM technology for some trait, crop and country combinations, especially in cases where the technology has provided yield enhancements. However, as impact data for every trait, crop, location and year is not available, the authors have had to extrapolate available impact data from identified studies for years for which no data are available. Therefore the authors acknowledge that this represents a weakness of the research. To reduce the possibilities of over/understating impact, the analysis:

- Directly applies impacts identified from the literature to the years that have been studied. As a result, the impacts used vary in many cases according to the findings of literature covering different years<sup>18</sup>. Hence, the analysis takes into account variation in the impact of the technology on yield according to its effectiveness in dealing with (annual) fluctuations in pest and weed infestation levels as identified by research;
- Uses current farm level crop prices and bases any yield impacts on (adjusted – see below) current average yields. In this way some degree of dynamic has been introduced into the

<sup>18</sup> Examples where such data is available include the impact of GM (IR cotton: in India (see Bennett et al (2004), IMRB (2006) and IMRB (2007)), in Mexico (see Traxler et al (2001) and Monsanto Mexico (annual reports to the Mexican government)) and in the US (see Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 and 2006), Mullins & Hudson (2004))

- analysis that would, otherwise, be missing if constant prices and average yields identified in year-specific studies had been used;
- Includes some changes and updates to the impact assumptions identified in the literature based on consultation with local sources (analysts, industry representatives) so as to better reflect prevailing/changing conditions (eg, pest and weed pressure, cost of technology);
  - Adjusts downwards the average base yield (in cases where GM technology has been identified as having delivered yield improvements) on which the yield enhancement has been applied. In this way, the impact on total production is not overstated (see Appendix 1 for examples).

Appendix 2 also provides details of the impacts, assumptions applied and sources.

Other aspects of the methodology used to estimate the impact on direct farm income are as follows:

- Impact is quantified at the trait and crop level, including where stacked traits are available to farmers. Where stacked traits have been used, the individual trait components were analysed separately to ensure estimates of all traits were calculated;
- All values presented are nominal for the year shown and the base currency used is the US dollar. All financial impacts in other currencies have been converted to US dollars at prevailing annual average exchange rates for each year;
- The analysis focuses on changes in farm income in each year arising from impact of GM technology on yields, key costs of production (notably seed cost and crop protection expenditure, but also impact on costs such as fuel and labour<sup>19</sup>), crop quality (eg, improvements in quality arising from less pest damage or lower levels of weed impurities which result in price premia being obtained from buyers) and the scope for facilitating the planting of a second crop in a season (eg, second crop soybeans in Argentina following wheat that would, in the absence of the GM herbicide tolerant (GM HT) seed, probably not have been planted). Thus, the farm income effect measured is essentially a gross margin impact (impact on gross revenue less variable costs of production) rather than a full net cost of production assessment. Through the inclusion of yield impacts and the application of actual (average) farm prices for each year, the analysis also indirectly takes into account the possible impact of biotech crop adoption on global crop supply and world prices.

The section also examines some of the more intangible (more difficult to quantify) economic impacts of GM technology. The literature in this area is much more limited and in terms of aiming to quantify these impacts, largely restricted to the US-specific studies. The findings of this research are summarised<sup>20</sup> and extrapolated to the cumulative biotech crop planted areas in the US over the period 1996-2011.

<sup>19</sup> Inclusion of impact on these categories of cost are, however, more limited than the impacts on seed and crop protection costs because only a few of the papers reviewed have included consideration of such costs in their analysis. Therefore in most cases the analysis relates to impact of crop protection and seed cost only

<sup>20</sup> Notably relating to the US - Marra and Piggott (2006)

Lastly, the paper includes estimates of the production impacts of GM technology at the crop level. These have been aggregated to provide the reader with a global perspective of the broader production impact of the technology. These impacts derive from the yield impacts (where identified), but also from the facilitation of additional cropping within a season (notably in relation to soybeans in South America).

The section is structured on a trait and country basis highlighting the key farm level impacts.

### **3.1 Herbicide tolerant soybeans**

#### **3.1.1 The US**

##### *First generation GM HT soybeans*

In 2011, 94% (28.3 million ha) of the total US soybean crop was planted to GM HT cultivars. Of this, 21.4 million ha were first generation GM HT soybeans. The farm level impact of using this technology since 1996 is summarised in Table 10.

The key features are as follows:

- The primary impact has been to reduce the cost of production. In the early years of adoption these savings were between \$25/ha and \$34/ha. In more recent years, estimates of the cost savings have been in the range of \$30/ha and \$85/ha (based on a comparison of conventional herbicide regimes in the early 2000s that would be required to deliver a comparable level of weed control to the GM HT soybean system). In recent years, the cost savings declined relative to earlier years, mainly because of the significant increase in the global price of glyphosate relative to increases in the price of other herbicides (commonly used on conventional soybeans). In addition, growers of GM HT soybean crops are increasingly being advised to include other herbicides (with different and complementary modes of action) in combination with glyphosate to address weed resistance (to glyphosate) issues. At the macro level, these changes have already begun to influence the mix, total amount, cost and overall profile of herbicides applied to GM HT crops like soybeans and is shown here by the annually changing levels of cost savings associated with the adoption of GM HT technology. Overall, the main savings have come from, and continue to be, lower herbicide costs<sup>21</sup> plus a \$6/ha to \$10/ha saving in labour and machinery costs;
- Against the background of underlying improvements in average yield levels over the 1996-2011 period (via improvements in plant breeding), the specific yield impact of the first generation of GM HT technology used up to 2011 has been neutral<sup>22</sup>;
- The annual total national farm income benefit from using the technology rose from \$5 million in 1996 to \$1.42 billion in 2007. Since then the aggregate farm income gains have

<sup>21</sup> Whilst there were initial cost savings in herbicide expenditure, these increased when glyphosate came off-patent in 2000. Growers of GM HT soybeans initially applied Monsanto's Roundup herbicide but over time, and with the availability of low cost generic glyphosate alternatives, many growers switched to using these generic alternatives (the price of Roundup also fell significantly post 2000)

<sup>22</sup> Some early studies of the impact of GM HT soybeans in the US suggested that GM HT soybeans produced lower yields than conventional soybean varieties. Where this may have occurred it applied only in early years of adoption, when the technology was not present in all leading varieties suitable for all of the main growing regions of the USA. By 1998/99 the technology was available in leading varieties and no statistically significant average yield differences have been found between GM and conventional soybean varieties

fluctuated, with the 2011 gain being \$737 million. The cumulative farm income benefit over the 1996-2011 period (in nominal terms) was \$12.64 billion;

- In added value terms, the recent increase in farm income has been equivalent to an annual increase in production of between +1% and +7%.

**Table 10: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans (first generation) in the US 1996-2011**

Year	Cost savings (\$/ha)	Net cost saving/increase in gross margins, inclusive of cost of technology (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1996	25.2	10.39	5.0	0.03
1997	25.2	10.39	33.2	0.19
1998	33.9	19.03	224.1	1.62
1999	33.9	19.03	311.9	2.5
2000	33.9	19.03	346.6	2.69
2001	73.4	58.56	1,298.5	10.11
2002	73.4	58.56	1,421.7	9.53
2003	78.5	61.19	1,574.9	9.57
2004	60.1	40.33	1,096.8	4.57
2005	69.4	44.71	1,201.4	6.87
2006	57.0	32.25	877.1	4.25
2007	85.2	60.48	1,417.2	6.01
2008	57.1	32.37	899.5	3.04
2009	54.7	15.90	437.2	1.38
2010	66.2	28.29	761.9	2.12
2011	67.1	34.45	757.18	1.99

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data 1996-1997 based on Marra et al (2002), 1998-2000 based on Carpenter and Gianessi (1999) and 2001 onwards based on Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006), Johnson and Strom (2008) plus updated 2008 onwards to reflect recent changes in herbicide prices and weed control programmes
2. Cost of technology: \$14.82/ha 1996-2002, \$17.3/ha 2003, \$19.77/ha 2004, \$24.71/ha 2005-2008, \$38.79/ha 2009, \$37.95/ha 2010, \$32.64 2011
3. The higher values for the cost savings in 2001 onwards reflect the methodology used by Sankala & Blumenthal, which was to examine the conventional herbicide regime that would be required to deliver the same level of weed control in a low/reduced till system to that delivered from the GM HT no/reduced till soybean system. This is a more robust methodology than some of the more simplistic alternatives used elsewhere. In earlier years the cost savings were based on comparisons between GM HT soy growers and/or conventional herbicide regimes that were commonplace prior to commercialisation in the mid 1990s when conventional tillage systems were more important

#### *Second generation GM HT soybeans*

A second generation of GM HT soybeans became available to commercial soybean growers in the US in 2009. It was planted on nearly 6.9 million ha in 2011. The technology offered the same tolerance to glyphosate as the first generation (and the same cost saving) but with higher yielding potential. Pre-launch trials of the technology suggested that average yields would increase by between +7% and +11%. In assessing the impact on yield of this new generation of GM HT soybeans since 2009, it is important to recognise that only limited seed was initially available for

planting in 2009 and the trait was not available in many of the leading (best performing) varieties. As a result, reports of performance<sup>23</sup> were varied when compared with the first generation of GM HT soybeans (which was available in all leading varieties), with some farmers reporting no improvement in yield relative to first generation GM HT soybeans whilst others found significant improvements in yield, of up to +10%. In 2010, when the trait was available in many more of the leading varieties, farmer feedback to the seed/technology providers reports average yield improvements of about +5%. In 2011, the average yield gains reported were higher, at over 10% relative to first generation GM HT and conventional soybean crops. For the purposes of this analysis, we have applied a yield improvement assumption of +5% for 2010 and +10.4% for 2011. Applying the same cost saving assumptions as applied to first generation GM HT soybeans, but with a seed premium of \$65.21/ha for 2009, \$50.14/ha for 2010 and \$48.01 for 2011, the net impact on farm income in 2011, inclusive of yield gain, was +\$143.8/ha. Aggregated to the national level this was equal to an improvement in farm income of \$989.7 million in 2011 and over the three years the total farm income gain was \$1.19 billion. The technology also increased US soybean production by 1.95 million tonnes since 2009.

### 3.1.2 Argentina

As in the US, GM HT soybeans were first planted commercially in 1996. Since then, use of the technology has increased rapidly and almost all soybeans grown in Argentina are GM HT (99%). Not surprisingly, the impact on farm income has been substantial, with farmers deriving important cost saving and farm income benefits both similar and additional to those obtained in the US (Table 11). More specifically:

- The impact on yield has been neutral (ie, no positive or negative yield impact);
- The cost of the technology to Argentine farmers has been substantially lower than in the US (about \$1/ha-\$4/ha compared to \$15/ha-\$38/ha in the US) mainly because the main technology provider (Monsanto) was not able to obtain patent protection for the technology in Argentina. As such, Argentine farmers have been free to save and use GM seed without paying any technology fees or royalties (on farm-saved seed) for many years;
- The savings from reduced expenditure on herbicides, fewer spray runs and machinery use have been in the range of \$24-\$30/ha, although since 2008, savings fell back to \$16/ha-\$18/ha because of the significant increase in the price of glyphosate relative to other herbicides in 2008-09 and additional expenditure on complementary herbicide use to address weed resistance (to glyphosate) issues. Net income gains have been in the range of \$21-\$29/ha up to 2007<sup>24</sup> and \$14/ha-\$16/ha since 2008;
- The price received by farmers for GM HT soybeans in the early years of adoption was, on average, marginally higher than for conventionally produced soybeans, because of lower levels of weed material and impurities in the crop. This quality premia was equivalent to about 0.5% of the baseline price for soybeans (not applied in the analysis in recent years);
- The net income gain from use of the GM HT technology at a national level was \$275 million in 2011. Since 1996, the cumulative benefit (in nominal terms) has been \$4.89 billion;

<sup>23</sup> The authors are not aware of any survey-based assessment of performance in 2009

<sup>24</sup> This income gain also includes the benefits accruing from the fall in real price of glyphosate, which fell by about a third between 1996 and 2000

- An additional farm income benefit that many Argentine soybean growers have derived comes from the additional scope for second cropping of soybeans. This has arisen because of the simplicity, ease and weed management flexibility provided by the (GM) technology which has been an important factor facilitating the use of no and reduced tillage production systems. In turn the adoption of low/no tillage production systems has reduced the time required for harvesting and drilling subsequent crops and hence has enabled many Argentine farmers to cultivate two crops (wheat followed by soybeans) in one season. As such, 25% of the total Argentine soybean crop was second crop in 2011<sup>25</sup>, compared to 8% in 1996. Based on the additional gross margin income derived from second crop soybeans (see Appendix 1), this has contributed a further boost to national soybean farm income of \$1.18 billion in 2011 and \$8.2 billion cumulatively since 1996;
- The total farm income benefit inclusive of the second cropping was \$1.46 billion in 2011 and \$12.62 billion cumulatively between 1996 and 2011;
- In added value terms, the increase in farm income from the direct use of the GM HT technology (ie, excluding the second crop benefits) in the last three years has been equivalent to an annual increase in production of between +2% and +7%. The additional production from second soybean cropping facilitated by the technology in 2010 was equal to 25% of total output.

**Table 11: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Argentina 1996-2011**

Year	Cost savings (\$/ha)	Net saving on costs (inclusive of cost of technology: \$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in farm income from facilitating additional second cropping (\$ millions)
1996	26.10	22.49	0.9	0
1997	25.32	21.71	42	25
1998	24.71	21.10	115	43
1999	24.41	20.80	152	118
2000	24.31	20.70	205	143
2001	24.31	20.70	250	273
2002	29.00	27.82	372	373
2003	29.00	27.75	400	416
2004	30.00	28.77	436	678
2005	30.20	28.96	471	527
2006	28.72	26.22	465	699
2007	28.61	26.11	429	1,134
2008	16.37	13.87	230	754
2009	16.60	14.10	256	736
2010	18.30	15.80	285	1,134
2011	17.43	14.93	275	1,184

Sources and notes:

1. The primary source of information for impact on the costs of production is Qaim & Traxler (2002 & 2005). This has been updated in recent years to reflect changes in herbicide prices and weed control practices
2. All values for prices and costs denominated in Argentine pesos have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

<sup>25</sup> The second crop share was 4.6 million ha in 2011

3. The second cropping benefits are based on the gross margin derived from second crop soybeans multiplied by the total area of second crop soybeans (less an assumed area of second crop soybeans that equals the second crop area in 1996 – this was discontinued from 2004 because of the importance farmers attach to the GM HT system in facilitating them remaining in no tillage production systems). The source of gross margin data comes from Grupo CEO and the Argentine Ministry of Agriculture
4. Additional information is available in Appendix 1
5. The net savings to costs understate the total gains in recent years because 70%-80% of GM HT plantings have been to farm-saved seed on which no seed premium was payable (relative to the \$3-\$4/ha premium charged for new seed)

### 3.1.3 Brazil

GM HT soybeans were probably first planted in Brazil in 1997. Since then, the area planted has increased to 82% of the total crop in 2011<sup>26</sup>.

The impact of using GM HT soybeans has been similar to that identified in the US and Argentina. The net savings on herbicide costs have been larger in Brazil, due to higher average costs of weed control. Hence, the average cost savings arising from a combination of reduced herbicide use, fewer spray runs, labour and machinery savings, were between \$30/ha and \$81/ha in the period 2003 to 2011 (Table 12). The net cost saving after deduction of the technology fee (assumed to be about \$24.8/ha in 2011) has been between \$9/ha and \$61/ha in recent years. At a national level, the adoption of GM HT soybeans increased farm income levels by \$426 million in 2011. Cumulatively over the period 1997 to 2011, farm incomes have risen by \$4.3 billion (in nominal terms).

In added value terms, the increase in farm income from the use of the GM HT technology in 2011 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of +1.25% (0.8 million tonnes).

**Table 12: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Brazil 1997-2011**

Year	Cost savings (\$/ha)	Net cost saving after inclusion of technology cost (\$/ha)	Impact on farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1997	38.8	35.19	3.8	0.06
1998	42.12	38.51	20.5	0.31
1999	38.76	35.15	43.5	0.96
2000	65.32	31.71	43.7	0.85
2001	46.32	42.71	58.7	1.02
2002	40.00	36.39	66.7	1.07
2003	77.00	68.00	214.7	1.62
2004	76.66	61.66	320.9	2.95
2005	73.39	57.23	534.6	5.45
2006	81.09	61.32	730.6	6.32
2007	29.85	8.74	116.3	0.68
2008	64.07	44.44	591.9	2.63
2009	47.93	27.68	448.4	1.73
2010	57.28	37.8	694.1	2.19

<sup>26</sup> Until 2003 all plantings were technically illegal



2011	45.57	20.76	426.2	1.25
------	-------	-------	-------	------


Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on 2004 comparison data from the Parana Department of Agriculture (2004)  
Cost of production comparison: biotech and conventional soybeans, in USDA GAIN report BR4629 of 11 November 2004. [www.fas.usad.gov/gainfiles/200411/146118108.pdf](http://www.fas.usad.gov/gainfiles/200411/146118108.pdf) for the period to 2006.  
From 2007 based on Galvao (2009, 2010, 2012)
2. Cost of the technology from 2003 is based on the royalty payments officially levied by the technology providers. For years up to 2002, the cost of technology is based on costs of buying new seed in Argentina (the source of the seed). This probably overstates the real cost of the technology and understates the cost savings
3. All values for prices and costs denominated in Brazilian Real have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.1.4 Paraguay and Uruguay

GM HT soybeans have been grown since 1999 and 2000 respectively in Paraguay and Uruguay. In 2011, they accounted for 97% of total soybean plantings in Paraguay and 99% of the soybean plantings in Uruguay<sup>27</sup>. Using the farm level impact data derived from Argentine research and applying this to production in these two countries together with updating that reflects changes in herbicide usage and cost data (source AMIS Global)<sup>28</sup>, Figure 6 summarises the national farm level income benefits that have been derived from using the technology. In 2011, the respective national farm income gains were \$34.1 million in Paraguay and \$13 million in Uruguay.

**Figure 6: National farm income benefit from using GM HT soybeans in Paraguay and Uruguay 1999-2011 (million \$)**



<sup>27</sup> As in Argentina, the majority of plantings are to farm saved or uncertified seed

<sup>28</sup> Qaim & Traxler (2002 & 2005). The authors are not aware of any specific impact research having been conducted and published in Paraguay or Uruguay. Cost of herbicide data for recent years has been updated to reflect price and weed control practice changes (source: AMIS Global)

### 3.1.5 Canada

#### *First generation GM HT soybeans*

GM HT soybeans were first planted in Canada in 1997. In 2011, the share of total plantings accounted for by first generation GM HT soybeans was 43% (0.67 million ha).

At the farm level, the main impacts of use have been similar to the impacts in the US. The average farm income benefit has been within a range of \$14/ha-\$40/ha and the increase in farm income at the national level was \$12.3 million in 2011 (Table 13). The cumulative increase in farm income since 1997 has been \$155.5 million (in nominal terms). In added value terms, the increase in farm income from the use of the first generation GM HT technology in 2011 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 0.7% (27,700 tonnes).

**Table 13: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans (first generation) in Canada 1997-2011**

Year	Cost savings (\$/ha)	Net cost saving/increase in gross margin (inclusive of technology cost: \$/ha)	Impact on farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1997	64.28	41.17	0.041	0.01
1998	56.62	35.05	1.72	0.3
1999	53.17	31.64	6.35	1.29
2000	53.20	31.65	6.71	1.4
2001	49.83	29.17	9.35	3.4
2002	47.78	27.39	11.92	2.79
2003	49.46	14.64	7.65	1.47
2004	51.61	17.48	11.58	1.48
2005	55.65	18.85	13.30	2.26
2006	59.48	23.53	17.99	2.22
2007	61.99	24.52	16.87	1.57
2008	56.59	18.28	16.08	1.45
2009	55.01	12.02	10.46	0.87
2010	43.93	17.75	13.11	0.68
2011	44.65	18.55	12.35	0.65

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on George Morris Centre Report 2004 and updated in recent years to reflect changes in herbicide prices and weed control practices
2. All values for prices and costs denominated in Canadian dollars have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

#### *Second generation GM HT soybeans*

As in the US, 2009 was the first year of commercial availability of second generation GM HT soybeans. This trait was planted on 0.44 million ha in 2010, equal to 29% of the total crop. In the absence of Canadian-specific impact data, we have applied the same cost of technology and yield impact assumptions as used in the analysis of impact in the US. On this basis, the net impact on farm income was +\$124/ha in 2011, with an aggregate increase in farm income of +\$55.1 million. Since 2009, the total farm income gain has been \$76 million.

### 3.1.6 South Africa

The first year GM HT soybeans were planted commercially in South Africa was 2001. In 2011, 401,000 hectares (85%) of total soybean plantings were to varieties containing the GM HT trait. In terms of impact at the farm level, net cost savings of between \$5/ha and \$9/ha have been achieved through reduced expenditure on herbicides (Table 14), although since 2008, this has fallen back to a range of +\$1/ha to +\$5/ha. At the national level, the increase in farm income was \$0.8 million in 2011. Cumulatively the farm income gain since 2001 has been \$7 million<sup>29</sup>.

**Table 14: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in South Africa 2001-2011**

Year	Cost savings (\$/ha)	Net cost saving/increase in gross margin after inclusion of technology cost (\$/ha)	Impact on farm income at a national level (\$ millions)
2001	26.72	7.02	0.042
2002	21.82	5.72	0.097
2003	30.40	7.90	0.24
2004	34.94	9.14	0.46
2005	36.17	9.12	1.42
2006	33.96	5.17	0.83
2007	32.95	5.01	0.72
2008	25.38	1.77	0.32
2009	26.33	0.54	0.14
2010	33.64	5.56	1.97
2011	26.62	1.95	0.78

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data (source: Monsanto South Africa)
2. All values for prices and costs denominated in South African Rand have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.1.7 Romania

In 2011, farmers in Romania are not permitted to plant GM HT soybeans, having joined the EU at the start of 2007 (the EU regulatory authorities have not completed the process of evaluating past applications for the approval for planting GM HT soybeans and currently there is no ongoing application for approval for planting first generation GM HT soybeans in the EU). The impact data presented below therefore covers the period 1999-2006.

The growing of GM HT soybeans in Romania had resulted in substantially greater net farm income gains per hectare than any of the other countries using the technology:

- Yield gains of an average of 31%<sup>30</sup> have been recorded. This yield gain has arisen from the substantial improvements in weed control<sup>31</sup>. In recent years, as fields have been

<sup>29</sup> This possibly understates the beneficial impact because it does not take into consideration any savings from reduced labour for hand weeding

<sup>30</sup> Source: Brookes (2005)

<sup>31</sup> Weed infestation levels, particularly of difficult to control weeds such as Johnson grass, have been very high in Romania. This is largely a legacy of the economic transition during the 1990s which resulted in very low levels of farm income, abandonment of land and very low levels of weed control. As a result, the weed bank developed substantially and has subsequently been very difficult to control, until the GM HT soybean system became available (glyphosate has been the key to controlling difficult weeds like Johnson grass)

cleaned of problem weeds, the average yield gains have decreased and were reported at +13% in 2006<sup>32</sup>;

- The cost of the technology to farmers in Romania tended to be higher than other countries, with seed being sold in conjunction with the herbicide. For example, in the 2002-2006 period, the average cost of seed and herbicide per hectare was \$120/ha to \$130/ha. This relatively high cost, however, did not deter adoption of the technology because of the major yield gains, improvements in the quality of soybeans produced (less weed material in the beans sold to crushers which resulted in price premia being obtained<sup>33</sup>) and cost savings derived;
- The average net increase in gross margin in 2006 was \$59/ha (an average of \$105/ha over the eight years of commercial use: Table 15);
- At the national level, the increase in farm income amounted to \$7.6 million in 2006. Cumulatively in the period 1999-2006 the increase in farm income was \$44.6 million (in nominal terms);
- The yield gains in 2006 were equivalent to a 9% increase in national production<sup>34</sup> (the annual average increase in production over the eight years was equal to 10.1%);
- In added value terms, the combined effect of higher yields, improved quality of beans and reduced cost of production on farm income in 2006 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 9.3% (33,230 tonnes).

**Table 15: Farm level income impact of using herbicide tolerant soybeans in Romania 1999-2006**

Year	Cost saving (\$/ha)	Cost savings net of cost of technology (\$/ha)	Net increase in gross margin (\$/ha)	Impact on farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1999	162.08	2.08	105.18	1.63	4.0
2000	140.30	-19.7	89.14	3.21	8.2
2001	147.33	-0.67	107.17	1.93	10.3
2002	167.80	32.8	157.41	5.19	14.6
2003	206.70	76.7	219.01	8.76	12.7
2004	63.33	8.81	135.86	9.51	13.7
2005	64.54	9.10	76.16	6.69	12.2
2006	64.99	9.10	58.79	7.64	9.3

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data (sources: Brookes (2005) and Monsanto Romania (2008)). Average yield increase 31% applied to all years to 2003 and reduced to +25% 2004, +19% 2005 and +13% 2006. Average improvement in price premia from high quality 2% applied to years 1999-2004
2. All values for prices and costs denominated in Romanian Lei have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year
3. Technology cost includes cost of herbicides
4. The technology was not permitted to be planted from 2007 – due to Romania joining the EU

<sup>32</sup> Source: Farmer survey conducted in 2006 on behalf of Monsanto Romania

<sup>33</sup> Industry sources report that price premia for cleaner crops were no longer payable by crushers from 2005 and hence this element has been discontinued in the subsequent analysis

<sup>34</sup> Derived by calculating the yield gains made on the GM HT area and comparing this increase in production relative to total soybean production

### 3.1.8 Mexico

GM HT soybeans were first planted commercially in Mexico in 1997 (on a trial basis), and in 2011, a continued 'trial area' of 14,880 ha (out of total plantings of 85,500 ha) were varieties containing the GM HT trait.

At the farm level, the main impacts of use have been a combination of yield increase (+9.1% in 2004 and 2005, +3.64% in 2006, +3.2% 2007, +2.4% 2008, +13% in 2009 and +4% in 2010 and 2011) and (herbicide) cost savings. The average farm income benefit has been within a range of \$9/ha-\$89/ha (inclusive of yield gain, cost savings and after payment of the technology fee/seed premium (\$24/ha in 2011)) and the increase in farm income at the national level was \$0.19 million in 2011 (Table 16). The cumulative increase in farm income since 2004 has been \$4.9 million (in nominal terms). In added value terms, the increase in farm income from the use of the GM HT technology in 2011 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of about 0.4%.

**Table 16: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Mexico 2004-2011**

Year	Cost savings after inclusion of seed premium (\$/ha)	Net cost saving/increase in gross margin (inclusive of technology cost & yield gain: \$/ha)	Impact on farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
2004	49.44	82.34	1.18	3.07
2005	51.20	89.41	0.94	2.13
2006	51.20	72.98	0.51	1.05
2007	51.05	66.84	0.33	0.9
2008	33.05	54.13	0.54	0.7
2009	-12.79	59.55	1.01	2.3
2010	-12.84	9.29	0.19	0.5
2011	-12.25	12.71	0.19	0.4

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on Monsanto, 2005, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010. Reportes final del programa Soya Solución Faena en Chiapas. Monsanto Comercial
2. All values for prices and costs denominated in Mexican pesos have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.1.9 Bolivia

GM HT soybeans were officially permitted for planting in 2009, although 'illegal' plantings have occurred for several years. For the purposes of analysis in this section, impacts have been calculated back to 2005, when an estimated 0.3 million ha of soybeans used GM HT technology. In 2011, an estimated 966,000 ha (92% of total crop) used GM HT technology.

The main impacts of the technology<sup>35</sup> have been (Table 17):

<sup>35</sup> Based on Fernandez et al (2009)

- An increase in yield arising from improved yield control. The research work conducted by Fernandez et al (2009) estimated a 30% yield difference between GM HT and conventional soybeans, although some of the yield gain reflected the use of poor quality conventional seed by some farmers. In our analysis, we have used a more conservative yield gain of +15% (based on industry views);
- GM HT soybeans are assumed to trade at a price discount to conventional soybeans of 2.7%, reflecting the higher price set for conventional soybeans by the Bolivian government in 2011;
- The cost of the technology to farmers has been about \$3.3/ha and the cost savings equal to about \$9.3/ha, resulting a change of +\$6/ha to the overall cost of production;
- Overall in 2011, the average farm income gain from using GM HT soybeans was about \$107/ha, resulting in a total farm income gain of \$103 million. Cumulatively since 2005, the total farm income gain is estimated at \$327 million.

**Table 17: Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Bolivia 2005-2011**

Year	Net cost saving/increase in gross margin (inclusive of technology cost & yield gain: \$/ha)	Impact on farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
2005	39.73	12.08	4.09
2006	36.60	15.55	6.35
2007	44.40	19.45	7.37
2008	79.97	36.27	7.24
2009	89.91	59.61	8.88
2010	103.13	80.15	8.86
2011	106.68	103.0	10.36

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on Fernandez et al (2009). Average yield gain assumed +15%, cost of technology \$3.32/ha


### 3.1.10 Summary of global economic impact

In global terms, the farm level impact of using GM HT technology in soybeans was \$2.65 billion in 2011 (Figure 9). If the second crop benefits arising in Argentina are included this rises to \$3.9 billion. Cumulatively since 1996, the farm income benefit has been (in nominal terms) \$23.6 billion (\$32.2 billion if second crop gains in Argentina and Paraguay are included).

In terms of the total value of soybean production from the countries growing GM HT soybeans in 2010, the additional farm income (inclusive of Argentine second crop gains) generated by the technology is equal to a value added equivalent of 4.2%. Relative to the value of global soybean production in 2010, the farm income benefit added the equivalent of 3.8%.

These economic benefits should be placed within the context of a significant increase in the level of soybean production in the main GM adopting countries since 1996 (a 75% increase in the area planted in the leading soybean producing countries of the US, Brazil and Argentina).

**Figure 7: Global farm level income benefits derived from using GM HT soybeans 1996-2011 (million \$)**




These economic benefits mostly derive from cost savings although farmers in Mexico, Bolivia and Romania also obtained yield gains (from significant improvements in weed control levels relative to levels applicable prior to the introduction of the technology). In addition, the availability of second generation GM HT soybeans in North America is also delivering yield gains since 2009. If it is also assumed that all of the second crop soybean gains are effectively additional production that would not otherwise have occurred without the GM HT technology (the GM HT technology facilitated major expansion of second crop soybeans in Argentina and to a lesser extent in Paraguay), then these gains are *de facto* 'yield' gains. Under this assumption, of the total cumulative farm income gains from using GM HT soybeans, \$10.58 billion (33%) is due to yield gains/second crop benefits and the balance, 67%, is due to cost savings.

## 3.2 Herbicide tolerant maize

### 3.2.1 The US

Herbicide tolerant maize<sup>36</sup> has been used commercially in the US since 1997, and in 2011 was planted on 72% of the total US maize crop. The impact of using this technology at the farm level is summarised in Figure 8. As with herbicide tolerant soybeans, the main benefit has been to reduce costs, and hence improve profitability levels. Average profitability improved by \$20/ha-\$25/ha in most years, although in 2008-09 this fell to a range of \$12/ha-\$16/ha, largely due to the significant increase in glyphosate prices relative to other herbicides. The net gain to farm income in 2011 was \$885 million and cumulatively, since 1997, the farm income benefit has been \$3.11 billion. In added value terms, the effect of reduced costs of production on farm income in 2011 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 1.2% (3.6 million tonnes).

<sup>36</sup> Tolerant to glufosinate ammonium or to glyphosate, although cultivars tolerant to glyphosate have accounted for the majority of plantings


**Figure 8: National farm income impact of using GM HT maize in the US 1997-2011 (million \$)**

Source and notes: Impact analysis based on Carpenter & Gianessi (2002), Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006), Johnson & Strom (2008) and updated from 2008 to reflect changes in herbicide prices and typical weed control programmes. Estimated cost of the technology \$14.83/ha in years up to 2004, \$17.3/ha in 2005, \$24.71/ha 2006-2008, \$26.35/ha in 2009, \$29.35/ha in 2010 and \$21.84/ha in 2011. Cost savings (mostly from lower herbicide use) \$33.47/ha in 2004, \$38.61/ha 2005, \$29.27/ha 2006, \$42.28/ha 2007, \$39.29/ha 2008, \$39.18 in 2009, \$41.12/ha in 2010 and \$57.64/ha in 2012

### 3.2.2 Canada

In Canada, GM HT maize was first planted commercially in 1999. In 2011, the proportion of total plantings accounted for by varieties containing a GM HT trait was 53%. As in the US, the main benefit has been to reduce costs and to improve profitability levels. Average annual profitability has improved by between \$12/ha and \$18/ha up to 2007, but fell in 2008-09 to under \$10/ha due mainly to the higher price increases for glyphosate relative to other herbicides. In 2011, the net increase in farm income was \$11.6 million and cumulatively since 1999 the farm income benefit has been \$66.7 million. In added value terms, the effect of reduced costs of production on farm income in 2011 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 0.5% (nearly 50,000 tonnes: Figure 9).



**Figure 9: National farm income impact of using GM HT maize in Canada 1999-2011 (\$ million)**

Source and notes: Impact analysis based on data supplied by Monsanto Canada. Estimated cost of the technology \$18-\$34/ha, cost savings (mostly from lower herbicide use) \$31-\$45/ha

### 3.2.3 Argentina

GM HT maize was first planted commercially in Argentina in 2004, and in 2011 varieties containing a GM HT trait were planted on 2.4 million ha (67% of the total maize area). It has been adopted in two distinct types of area, the majority (80%) in the traditional 'corn production belt' and 20% in newer maize-growing regions, which have traditionally been known as more marginal areas that surround the 'Corn Belt'. The limited adoption of GM HT technology in Argentina up to 2006 was mainly due to the technology only being available as a single gene, not stacked with the GM IR trait, which most maize growers have also adopted. Hence, faced with either a GM HT or a GM IR trait available for use, most farmers have chosen the GM IR trait because the additional returns derived from adoption have tended to be (on average) greater from the GM IR trait than the GM HT trait (see below for further details of returns from the GM HT trait). Stacked traits became available in 2007 and contributed to the significant increase in the GM HT maize area in subsequent years. In 2011, stacked traited seed accounted for 83% of the total GM HT area.

In relation to impact on farm income this can be examined from two perspectives; as a single GM HT trait and as a stacked trait. This differential nature of impact largely reflects the locations in which the different (single or stacked traited seed) has tended to be used:

#### *Single GM HT traited seed*

- In all regions the cost of the technology (about \$20/ha) has been broadly equal to the saving in herbicide costs, although since 2008 this became a net increase in costs of \$2/ha-\$5/ha ;

- In the 'Corn Belt' area, use of the single trait technology has resulted in an average 3% yield improvement via improved weed control. In the more marginal areas, the yield impact has been much more significant (+22%) as farmers have been able to significantly improve weed control levels;
- In 2011, the additional farm income at a national level, from using single traited GM HT technology, has been +\$39.2 million, and cumulatively since 2004, the income gain has been \$150 million.

#### *Stacked traited GM HT seed*

- The average yield gain identified since adoption has been +15.75%<sup>37</sup>. Given the average yield impact identified for the early years of adoption of the single traited GM IR maize was +5.5% (see section 3.6), our analysis has applied this level of impact to the GM IR component of the study (section 3.6), with the balance attributed to the GM HT trait. Hence, for the purposes of this analysis, the assumed yield effect of the GM HT trait on the area planted to GM stacked maize seed is +10.25%;
- The cost of the technology (seed premium) applied to GM HT component has been in a range of \$35/ha to \$41/ha, with the impact on costs of production (other than seed) assumed to be the same as for single traited seed;
- Based on these assumptions, the net impact on farm income in 2011 was +\$77.8/ha, giving an aggregated national level farm income gain of \$155.7 million. Cumulatively since 2007, the farm income gain has been \$360.7 million.

### **3.2.4 South Africa**

Herbicide tolerant maize has been grown commercially in South Africa since 2003, and in 2011, about 1 million hectares out of total plantings of 2.71 million hectares used this trait. Farmers using the technology have found that small net savings in the cost of production have occurred (ie, the cost saving from reduced expenditure on herbicides has been greater than the cost of the technology), although in 2008 and 2009, due to the significant rise in the global price of glyphosate relative to other herbicides, the net farm income balance has been negative, at about -\$2/ha. In 2011, as the price for glyphosate has fallen relative to others, the net impact of use of the technology was a small gain of \$0.61/ha. At the national level, this is equivalent to a net gain of about \$0.61 million. Since 2003, there has been a net cumulative income gain of \$3.2 million. It should, however, be noted that about 50% of the maize planted with the GM HT trait was as a stack with the GM IR trait which has been delivering significant net farm income gains from higher yields (see section 3.6.4). Taken together, the net farm income gains from using the stacked traited seed has been about +\$56/ha in 2011. Readers should note that these cost savings do not take into consideration any labour cost saving that may arise from reduced need for hand weeding. For example, Regier G et al (2013) identified amongst small farmers in KwaZulu-Natal, savings of over \$80/ha from reduced requirement for hand weeding with the adoption of GM HT maize.

### **3.2.5 Philippines**

GM HT maize was first grown commercially in 2006, and in 2011 was planted on 631,000 hectares. Information about the impact of the technology in the first two years of adoption was limited, although industry sources estimated that, on average farmers using it had derived a 15%

<sup>37</sup> Based on farm level feedback/surveys to the technology providers

increase in yield. Based on a cost of the technology of \$24-\$27/ha (and assuming no net cost savings), the net national impacts on farm income in 2006 and 2007 were +\$0.98 million and +\$10.4 million respectively. More recent analysis by Gonsales et al (2009) identified an average yield gain of +5%, the same cost of technology of \$24/ha-\$27/ha and a cost saving (reduced weed control costs from reduced cost of herbicides and less hand weeding) of \$35/ha-\$51/ha. In 2011, this equated to a net farm income of +\$52/ha, which at the national level was equal to +\$33.2 million. Cumulatively, since 2006, the total farm income gain has been \$88.2 million.

### 3.2.6 Brazil

2011 was the second year in which GM HT maize was planted in Brazil (on 34% of the total crop: 5.18 million ha). Based on analysis by Galvao (2010 and 2012), the technology is estimated to have delivered a yield gain of 2.5% in 2010 and 3.6% in 2011. The technology (seed premium) costs \$16/ha-\$17/ha after deduction of the seed premium. In net farm income terms, the gain (inclusive of yield gain) was \$79.8/ha. At the national level this is equal to a net farm income gain of \$414 million in 2011, and \$431.5 million for the two years.

### 3.2.7 Colombia

GM HT maize was first planted in Colombia in 2009 and in 2011, just over 32,000 ha (6% of the total crop) used this technology (in the form of stacked traited seed, with GM IR technology). Analysis of its impact is limited, with a recent study by Mendez et al (2011) being the only publicly available material. This analysis focused only on a small area in one region of the country (San Juan valley) and therefore is unlikely to be fully representative of (potential) impact across the country. Nevertheless, as this represents the only available data, we have included it for illustrative purposes. The analysis identified a positive yield impact of +22% for the stacked traited seed (HT tolerance to glufosinate and IR resistance to corn boring pests) and for the purposes of our analysis, all of this yield gain has been included/attributed to the GM IR component of the technology, as presented in section 3.6.7. In terms of impact of costs of production, the GM HT part is estimated to have had a net positive impact on profitability of about \$16/ha in 2011 (seed premium of about \$23/ha, counterbalanced by weed control cost savings of nearly \$39/ha). At the national level, the total income gain in 2011 was \$0.5 million (\$0.9 million for the three years 2009-11).

### 3.2.8 Uruguay

Maize farmers in Uruguay gained access to GM HT maize technology in 2011 (via stacked traited seed) and 52,000 ha of the country's 124,000 ha crop used this technology. Whilst the authors are not aware of any studies examining the impact of GM HT maize in Uruguay, applying impact and cost assumptions based on the neighbouring Argentina, suggests small levels of farm income gains of about \$2/ha, equal to about £0.11 million at the national level.

### 3.2.9 Summary of global economic impact

In global terms, the farm level economic impact of using GM HT technology in maize was \$1.54 billion in 2011 (57% of which was in the US). Cumulatively since 1997, the farm income benefit has been (in nominal terms) \$4.2 billion. Of this, 82% has been due to cost savings and 18% to

yield gains (from improved weed control relative to the level of weed control achieved by farmers using conventional technology).

In terms of the total value of maize production in the main countries using this technology in 2011, the additional farm income generated by the technology is equal to a value added equivalent of 0.7% of global maize production.

### 3.3 Herbicide tolerant cotton

#### 3.3.1 The US

GM HT cotton was first grown commercially in the US in 1997 and in 2011 was planted on 73% of total cotton plantings<sup>38</sup>.

The farm income impact of using GM HT cotton is summarised in Table 18. The primary benefit has been to reduce costs, and hence improve profitability levels, with annual average profitability increasing by between \$21/ha and \$49/ha<sup>39</sup> in the years up to 2004. Since then net income gains fell to between \$3/ha and \$18/ha. In 2010, the net income gain was \$17.6/ha. The relatively smaller positive impact on direct farm income in recent years reflects a combination of reasons, including the higher cost of the technology, significant price increases for glyphosate relative to price increases for other herbicides in 2008-09 and changes in weed control practices (additional costs) for the management of weeds resistant to glyphosate (notably *Palmer Amaranth*), as farmers have increasingly adopted integrated weed management strategies based on the use of mix of herbicides that complement the use of glyphosate. Overall, the net direct farm income impact in 2011 is estimated to be \$49.3 million (this does not take into consideration any non pecuniary benefits associated with adoption of the technology: see section 3.9). Cumulatively since 1997 there has been a net farm income benefit from using the technology of \$924.8 million.

**Table 18: Farm level income impact of using GM HT cotton in the US 1997-2011**

Year	Cost savings (\$/ha)	Net cost saving/increase in gross margins, inclusive of cost of technology (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1997	34.12	21.28	12.56	0.2
1998	34.12	21.28	30.21	0.58
1999	34.12	21.28	53.91	1.29
2000	34.12	21.28	61.46	1.22
2001	65.59	45.27	161.46	4.75
2002	65.59	45.27	153.18	3.49

<sup>38</sup> Although there have been GM HT cultivars tolerant to glyphosate and glufosinate, glyphosate tolerant cultivars have dominated

<sup>39</sup> The only published source that has examined the impact of HT cotton in the US is work by Carpenter & Gianessi (2002), Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006) and Johnson & Strom (2008). In the 2001 study the costs saved were based on historic patterns of herbicides used on conventional cotton in the mid/late 1990s. The latter studies estimated cost savings on the basis of the conventional herbicide treatment that would be required to deliver the same level of weed control as GM HT cotton. Revised analysis has, however, been conducted annually from 2008 to reflect changes in the costs of production (notably cost of the technology, in particular 'Roundup Ready Flex technology'), higher prices for glyphosate relative to other herbicides particularly in 2008 & 2009 and additional costs incurred to control weeds resistant to glyphosate

2003	65.59	45.27	129.75	2.33
2004	83.35	48.80	154.72	2.87
2005	71.12	2.89	9.57	0.18
2006	73.66	3.31	13.29	0.22
2007	76.01	5.40	16.56	0.27
2008	77.60	6.14	12.79	0.41
2009	83.69	7.49	18.96	0.40
2010	94.81	13.57	46.72	0.69
2011	99.24	17.64	49.33	0.70

Source and notes:

1. Impact analysis based on Carpenter & Gianessi (2002), Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006) and Johnson & Strom (2008) and own analysis from 2008
2. Estimated cost of the technology \$12.85/ha (1997-2000) and \$21.32/ha 2001-2003, \$34.55 2004, \$68.22/ha 2005, \$70.35/ha 2006, \$70.61/ha 2007, \$71.56/ha 2008, \$76.2/ha 2009, \$81.24/ha 2010, \$81.6/ha 2011

### 3.3.2 Other countries

Australia, Argentina, South Africa, Mexico, Colombia and Brazil are the other countries where GM HT cotton is grown commercially; from 2000 in Australia, 2001 in South Africa, 2002 in Argentina, 2005 in Mexico, 2006 in Colombia and 2009 in Brazil. In 2011, 99% (577,000 ha), 95% (506,000 ha), all (9,400 ha), 55% (104,800 ha), 72% (68,280 ha) and 31% (426,400 ha) respectively of the total Australian, Argentine, South African, Mexican, Colombian and Brazilian cotton crops were planted to GM HT cultivars.

We are not aware of any published research into the impact of GM HT cotton in South Africa, Argentina, Mexico or Colombia. In Australia, although research has been conducted into the impact of using GM HT cotton (eg, Doyle et al (2003)) this does not provide quantification of the impact<sup>40</sup>. Drawing on industry source estimates<sup>41</sup>, the main impacts have been:

- *Australia*: no yield gain and cost of the technology in the range of \$30/ha to \$45/ha up to 2007. The cost of the technology increased with the availability of 'Roundup Ready Flex' and in 2011 was \$77/ha. The cost savings from the technology (after taking into consideration the cost of the technology) have delivered small net gains of \$5/ha to \$7/ha, although estimates relating to the net average benefits from Roundup Ready Flex since becoming widely adopted from 2008 are higher (eg, \$54/ha in 2011). Overall, in 2011, the total farm income from using the technology was about \$31.3 million and cumulatively, since 2000, the total gains have been \$58.4 million;
- *Argentina*: no yield gain and a cost of technology in the range of \$30/ha to \$40/ha, although with the increasing availability of stacked traits in recent years, the 'cost' part of the HT technology has fallen to about \$20/ha. Net farm income gains (after deduction of the cost of the technology) have been \$8/ha to \$28/ha and in 2011 were \$24/ha. Overall, in

<sup>40</sup> This largely survey based research observed a wide variation of impact with yield and income gains widely reported for many farmers

<sup>41</sup> Sources: Monsanto Australia, Argentina, South Africa & Mexico

- 2011, the total farm income from using GM HT cotton technology was about \$21 million, and cumulatively since 2002, the farm income gain has been \$89 million;
- *South Africa*: no yield gain and a cost of technology in the range of \$15/ha to \$32/ha. Net farm income gains from cost savings (after deduction of the cost of the technology) have been \$30/ha to \$60/ha. In 2011, the average net gain was \$28/ha and the total farm income benefit of the technology was \$0.26 million. Cumulatively since 2001, the total farm income gain from GM HT cotton has been \$3million;
  - *Mexico*: average yield gains of +3.6% from improved weed control have been reported<sup>42</sup> in the first three years of use, no yield gain was recorded in 2008 and yield gains of +5.1% in 2009, +18.1% in 2010 (since when Roundup Ready Flex technology has mainly been used) and +5.1% 2011. The average cost of the technology has been in the range of \$49/ha to \$66/ha. The typical net farm income gains were about \$80/ha in the first two years of use, \$16/ha in 2008 (when there was no yield gain), \$90/ha in 2009, \$447/ha in 2010 and \$149/ha in 2011. Overall, in 2011 the total farm income gain from using GM HT cotton was \$14.7 million and cumulatively since 2005, the total farm income gain has been \$51.4 million;
  - *Colombia*: average yield gain estimated at 4%, with a cost of technology at \$184/ha in 2011 and herbicide cost savings of \$205/ha. In 2011, this equates to a net increase in profitability of \$83/ha, which aggregated to the national level is an increase in farm income of \$4.1 million. Cumulatively since 2006, the total farm income gain has been \$14.9 million;
  - *Brazil*: drawing on analysis by Galveo (2010 and 2012), the average yield gain has been between 2.3% and 3.7%, with a technology fee (seed premium) of \$45/ha to \$52/ha and net cost savings (after deducting the technology fee) of between \$36/ha and \$90/ha. In 2011, the average farm income benefit, inclusive of yield gains, was \$108/ha, which aggregated to the national level is equal to a farm income gain of \$46.2 million. Cumulatively, since 2009, the technology has contributed a total of \$82.6 million additional income to Brazilian cotton farmers.

### 3.3.3 Summary of global economic impact

Across the seven countries using GM HT cotton in 2010, the total farm income impact derived from using GM HT cotton was +\$166.9 million. Cumulatively since 1997, there have been net farm income gains of \$1.22 billion (76% of this benefit has been in the US). Of this, 87% has been due to cost savings and 13% to yield gains (from improved weed control relative to the level of weed control achieved using conventional technology).

## 3.4 Herbicide tolerant canola

### 3.4.1 Canada

Canada was the first country to commercially use GM HT canola in 1996. Since then the area planted to varieties containing GM HT traits has increased significantly, and in 2011 was 96% of the total crop (7.17 million ha).

The farm level impact of using GM HT canola in Canada since 1996 is summarised in Table 19. The key features are as follows:

<sup>42</sup> Annual reports of Monsanto Mexico to the Mexican government

- The primary impact in the early years of adoption was increased yields of almost 11% (eg, in 2002 this yield increase was equivalent to an increase in total Canadian canola production of nearly 7%). In addition, a small additional price premium was achieved from crushers through supplying cleaner crops (lower levels of weed impurities). With the development of hybrid varieties using conventional technology, the yield advantage of GM HT canola relative to conventional alternatives<sup>43</sup> has been eroded. As a result, our analysis has applied the yield advantage of +10.7%, associated with the GM HT technology in its early years of adoption (source: Canola Council study of 2001), to 2003. From 2004 the yield gain has been based on differences between average annual variety trial results for 'Clearfield' (conventional herbicide tolerant varieties) and biotech alternatives. The biotech alternatives have also been differentiated into glyphosate tolerant and glufosinate tolerant. This resulted in; for GM glyphosate tolerant varieties no yield difference for 2004, 2005, 2008 and 2010, +4% 2006 and 2007, +1.67% 2009 and +1.6% 2011. For GM glufosinate tolerant varieties, the yield differences were +12% 2004 and 2008, +19% 2005, +10% 2006 and 2007, +11.8% 2009, +10.9% 2010 and +4.6% 2011. The quality premium associated with cleaner crops (see above) has not been included in the analysis from 2004;
- Cost of production (excluding the cost of the technology) has fallen, mainly through reduced expenditure on herbicides and some savings in fuel and labour. These savings have annually been between about \$25/ha and \$43/ha. The cost of the technology to 2003 was, however, marginally higher than these savings resulting in a net increase in costs of \$3/ha to \$5/ha. On the basis of comparing GM HT canola with 'Clearfield' HT canola (from 2004), there has been a net cost saving of about \$16/ha and \$26/ha;
- The overall impact on profitability (inclusive of yield improvements and higher quality) has been an increase of between \$22/ha and \$48/ha, up to 2003. On the basis of comparing GM HT canola with 'Clearfield' HT canola (from 2004), the net increase in profitability has been between \$23/ha and \$74/ha;
- The annual total national farm income benefit from using the technology has risen from \$6 million in 1996 to \$404 million in 2011. The cumulative farm income benefit over the 1996-2011 period (in nominal terms) was \$2.86 billion;
- In added value terms, the increase in farm income in 2011 has been equivalent to an annual increase in production of 5%.

**Table 19: Farm level income impact of using GM HT canola in Canada 1996-2011**

Year	Cost savings (\$/ha)	Cost savings inclusive of cost of technology (\$/ha)	Net cost saving/increase in gross margins (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1996	28.59	-4.13	45.11	6.23	0.4
1997	28.08	-4.05	37.11	21.69	1.17

<sup>43</sup> The main one of which is 'Clearfield' conventionally derived herbicide tolerant varieties. Also hybrid canolas now account for the majority of plantings (including some GM hybrids) with the hybrid vigour delivered by conventional breeding techniques (even in the GM HT (to glyphosate) varieties)

1998	26.21	-3.78	36.93	70.18	3.43
1999	26.32	-3.79	30.63	90.33	5.09
2000	26.32	-3.79	22.42	59.91	5.08
2001	25.15	-1.62	23.10	53.34	5.69
2002	24.84	-3.59	29.63	61.86	6.17
2003	28.04	-4.05	41.42	132.08	6.69
2004	21.42	+4.44	19.09	70.72	4.48
2005	23.11	+4.50	32.90	148.12	6.56
2006	34.02	+16.93	50.71	233.13	8.09
2007	35.44	+17.46	66.39	341.44	7.54
2008	35.53	+17.39	64.76	361.70	6.36
2009	37.76	+17.99	63.62	369.70	7.32
2010	35.15	+16.36	73.99	448.27	6.11
2011	43.32	+25.35	56.79	404.33	4.99

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on Canola Council study (2001) to 2003 and Gusta M et al (2009). Includes a 10.7% yield improvement and a 1.27% increase in the price premium earned (cleaner crop with lower levels of weed impurities) until 2003. After 2004 the yield gain has been based on differences between average annual variety trial results for 'Clearfield' and biotech alternatives. The biotech alternatives have also been differentiated into glyphosate tolerant and glufosinate tolerant. This resulted in; for GM glyphosate tolerant varieties no yield difference for 2004, 2005, 2008 and 2010, +4% 2006 and 2007, +1.67% 2009, +1.6% 2011. For GM glufosinate tolerant varieties, the yield differences were +12% 2004 and 2008, +19% 2005, +10% 2006 and 2007, +11.8% 2009, +10.9% 2010, +4.6% 2011
2. Negative values denote a net increase in the cost of production (ie, the cost of the technology was greater than the other cost (eg. on herbicides) reductions)
3. All values for prices and costs denominated in Canadian dollars have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.4.2 The US

GM HT canola has been planted on a commercial basis in the US since 1999. In 2011, almost all (over 99%) of the US canola crop was GM HT (390,000 ha).


The farm level impact has been similar to the impact identified in Canada. More specifically:

- Average yields increased by about 6% in the initial years of adoption. As in Canada (see section 3.4.1) the availability of high yielding hybrid conventional varieties has eroded some of this yield gain relative to conventional alternatives. As a result, the positive yield impacts post 2004 have been applied on the same basis as in Canada (comparison with 'Clearfield': see section 3.4.1);
- The cost of the technology has been \$12/ha-\$17/ha for glufosinate tolerant varieties and \$12/ha-\$33/ha for glyphosate tolerant varieties. Cost savings (before inclusion of the technology costs) have been \$18/ha-\$45/ha (\$34/ha in 2011) for glufosinate tolerant canola and \$40-\$79/ha for glyphosate tolerant canola;
- The net impact on gross margins has been between +\$22/ha and +\$90/ha (\$55/ha in 2011) for glufosinate tolerant canola, and between +\$28/ha and +\$61/ha for glyphosate tolerant canola (\$28.3/ha in 2011);
- At the national level the total farm income benefit in 2011 was \$16 million (Figure 10) and the cumulative benefit since 1999 has been \$241.5 million;



- In added value terms, the increase in farm income in 2010 has been equivalent to an annual increase in production of about 5%.

**Figure 10: National farm income impact: GM HT canola in the US 1999-2011 (million \$)**



Source and notes: Impact analysis based on Carpenter & Gianessi (2002), Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006), Johnson & Strom (2008) and updated from 2008 to reflect changes in herbicide prices and weed control practices. Decrease in total farm income impact 2002-2004 is due to decline in total plantings of canola in the US (from 612,000 in 2002 to 316,000 ha in 2004). Positive yield impact applied in the same way as Canada from 2004 – see section 3.4.1

### 3.4.3 Australia

GM HT canola was first planted for commercial use in 2008. In 2011, GM HT canola was planted on 139,150 ha. Almost all of these plantings had tolerance to the herbicide glyphosate, with a very small area planted to varieties that were tolerant to glufosinate.

The main source of data on impact of this technology comes from a farm survey-based analysis of impact of the glyphosate tolerant canola commissioned by Monsanto amongst 92 of the 108 farmers using this technology in 2008/09. Key findings from this survey were as follows:

- The technology was made available in both open pollinated and hybrid varieties, with the open pollinated varieties representing the cheaper end of the seed market, where competition was mainly with open pollinated varieties containing herbicide tolerance (derived conventionally) to herbicides in the triazine (TT) group. The hybrid varieties containing glyphosate tolerance competed with non herbicide tolerant conventional hybrid varieties and herbicide tolerant 'Clearfield' hybrids (tolerant to the imidazolinone group of herbicides), although, where used in 2008, all of the 33 farmers in the survey using GM HT hybrids did so mainly in competition and comparison with 'Clearfield' varieties;

- The GM HT open pollinated varieties sold to farmers at a premium of about \$Aus3/ha (about \$2.5 US/ha) relative to the TT varieties. The GM HT hybrids sold at a seed premium of about \$Aus 9/ha (\$7.55 US/ha) compared to 'Clearfield' hybrids. In addition, farmers using the GM HT technology paid a 'technology' fee in two parts; one part was a set fee of \$Aus500 per farm plus a second part based on output - \$Aus 10.2/tonne of output of canola. On the basis that there were 108 farmers using GM HT (glyphosate tolerant) technology in 2008, the average 'up front' fee paid for the technology was \$Aus5.62/ha. On the basis of average yields obtained for the two main types of GM HT seed used, those using open pollinated varieties paid Aus \$11.83/ha (basis average yield of 1.16 tonnes/ha) and those using GM HT hybrids paid \$Aus12.95/ha (basis: average yield of 1.27 tonnes/ha). Therefore, the total seed premium and technology fee paid by farmers for the GM HT technology in 2008/09 was \$Aus20.45/ha (\$17.16 US/ha) for open pollinated varieties and \$Aus 27.57/ha (\$23.13 US/ha) for hybrid varieties. After taking into consideration the seed premium/technology fees, the GM HT system was marginally more expensive by \$Aus 3/ha (\$2.5 US/ha) and Aus \$4/ha (US \$3.36/ha) respectively for weed control than the TT and 'Clearfield' varieties;
- The GM HT varieties delivered higher average yields than their conventional counterparts: +22.11% compared to the TT varieties and +4.96% compared to the 'Clearfield' varieties. In addition, the GM HT varieties produced higher oil contents of +2% and +1.8% respectively compared to TT and 'Clearfield' varieties;
- The average reduction in weed control costs from using the GM HT system (excluding seed premium/technology fee) was \$Aus 17/ha for open pollinated varieties (competing with TT varieties) and \$Aus 24/ha for hybrids (competing with 'Clearfield' varieties).

In the analysis summarised in Table 20, we have applied these research findings to the total GM HT crop area on a weighted basis in which the results of GM HT open pollinated varieties that compete with TT varieties were applied to 64% of the total area in 2009 and 32% in 2010 and 2011 and the balance of area used the results from the GM HT hybrids competing with 'Clearfield' varieties. This weighting reflects the distribution of farms in the survey. In addition, the seed premia has been adjusted to reflect changes that have occurred post 2008 (mostly reflecting the end part royalty part of the premia that is yield dependant). The findings show an average farm income gain of over US \$69.2/ha and a total farm income gain of \$12.9 million in 2011. Cumulatively since 2008, the total farm income gain has been \$27.5 million.

The performance of GM HT canola relative to the alternatives; conventional TT and 'Clearfield' canola and within these types, hybrid or open pollinated varieties, means that the on-going analysis based on earlier survey work should be treated with some caution. The fact that the share of GM HT canola has risen no higher than 11% of the total canola seed market in 2011 suggests that the economic performance of GM HT canola relative to some of the mainstream alternative production systems and seed types is not offering sufficient enough advantage to encourage take up of the technology. Industry sources have suggested to the authors (in late 2012) that GM HT canola offers greatest economic advantage relative to TT canola and where farmers are faced with weeds that are resistant to a number of non-glyphosate herbicides (eg, annual ryegrass (*Lolium rigidum*) and wild radish (*Raphanus raphanistrum*)). Relative to 'Clearfield' canola and conventional canola (that contains no HT traits, whether GM derived or not), GM HT canola is reported to offer little yield gain and the cost savings associated with reduced herbicide costs have tended to be more than offset by the cost of the technology. These factors may have been one of the main reasons for changes in the pricing of the GM HT

technology introduced in 2012 which resulted in some reduction in the total seed premia level. On the basis of this evidence, the farm income impacts presented in Table 20 may therefore overstate aggregated farm level benefits.

**Table 20: Farm level income impact of using GM HT canola in Australia 2008-2011 (\$US)**

Year	Average cost saving (\$/ha)	Average cost savings (net after cost of technology: \$/ha)	Average net increase in gross margins (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level ('000 \$)
2008	19.18	-20.76	96.87	978
2009	20.13	-21.08	109.23	4,500
2010	21.90	-10.13	68.50	9,133
2011	21.84	-11.03	92.47	12,867

Source derived from and based on Monsanto survey of licence holders 2008

Notes:

1. The average values shown are weighted averages
2. Other weighted average values derived include: yield +21.1% 2008, +20.9% 2009, +15.8% 2010 and 2011 and quality (price) premium of 2.1% applied on the basis of this level of increase in average oil content. In 2010 because of a non GM canola price premia of 7%, the net impact on price was to apply a price discount of -4.9%. In 2011 because of a non GM canola price premia of 7%, the net impact on price was to apply a price discount of -2.9%

### 3.4.4 Summary of global economic impact

In global terms, the farm level impact of using GM HT technology in canola in Canada, the US and Australia was \$433.2 million in 2011. Cumulatively since 1996, the farm income benefit has been (in nominal terms) \$3.13 billion. Within this, 74% has been due to yield gains and the balance (26%) has been from cost savings.

In terms of the total value of canola production in these three countries in 2011, the additional farm income generated by the technology is equal to a value added equivalent of 4.6%. Relative to the value of global canola production in 2011, the farm income benefit added the equivalent of 1.2%.

## 3.5 GM herbicide tolerant (GM HT) sugar beet

### 3.5.1 US

GM HT sugar beet was first grown commercially in the US in 2007. In 2011, 456,500 hectares of GM HT sugar beet were planted, equal to 93% of the total US crop.

Impact of the technology in 2007 and 2008 has been identified as follows:

- a) *Yield*: analysis by Kniss (2008) covering a limited number of farms in Wyoming (2007) identified positive yield impacts of +8.8% in terms of additional root yield (from better weed control) and +12.6% in terms of sugar content relative to conventional crops (ie, the GM HT crop had about a 3.8% higher sugar content, which amounts to a 12.8% total sucrose gain relative to conventional sugar beet once the root yield gain was taken into consideration). In contrast, Khan (2008) found similar yields reported between

conventional and GM HT sugar beet in the Red River Valley region (North Dakota) and Michigan. These contrasting results probably reflect a combination of factors including:

- The sugar beet growing regions in Wyoming can probably be classified as high weed problem areas and, as such, are regions where obtaining effective weed control is difficult using conventional technology (timing of application is key to weed control in sugar beet, with optimal time for application being when weeds are small). Also some weeds (eg, Kochia) are resistant to some of the commonly used ALS inhibitor herbicides like chlorsulfuron. The availability of GM HT sugar beet with its greater flexibility on application timing has therefore potentially delivered important yield gains for such growers;
- The GM HT trait was not available in all leading varieties suitable in all growing regions in 2008, hence the yield benefits referred to above from better weed control have to some extent been counterbalanced by only being available in poorer performing germplasm in states like Michigan and North Dakota (notably not being available in 2008 in leading varieties with rhizomania resistance). It should be noted that the authors of the research cited in this section both perceive that yield benefits from using GM HT sugar beet will be a common feature of the technology in most regions once the technology is available in leading varieties;
- 2008 was reported to have been, in the leading sugar beet growing states, a reasonable year for controlling weeds through conventional technology (ie, it was possible to get good levels of weed control through timely applications), hence the similar performance reported between the two systems.

*b) Costs of production.*

- Kniss's work in Wyoming identified weed control costs (comprising herbicides, application, cultivation and hand labour) for conventional beet of \$437/ha compared to \$84/ha for the GM HT system. After taking into consideration the \$131/ha seed premium/technology fee for the GM HT trait, the net cost differences between the two systems was \$222/ha in favour of the GM HT system. Kniss did, however, acknowledge that the conventional costs associated with this sample were high relative to most producers (reflecting application of maximum dose rates for herbicides and use of hand labour), with a more typical range of conventional weed control costs being between \$171/ha and \$319/ha (average \$245/ha);
- Khan's analysis puts the typical weed control costs in the Red River region of North Dakota to be about \$227/ha for conventional compared to \$91/ha for GM HT sugar beet. After taking into consideration the seed premium/technology fee (assumed by Khan to be \$158/ha<sup>44</sup>), the total weed control costs were \$249/ha for the GM HT system, \$22/ha higher than the conventional system. Despite this net increase in average costs of production, most growers in this region used (and planned to continue using), the GM HT system because of the convenience and weed control flexibility benefits associated with it (which research by Marra and Piggot (2006): see section 3.9) estimated in the corn, soybean and cotton sectors to be valued at between \$12/ha and \$25/ha to US farmers). It is also likely that Khan's analysis may

<sup>44</sup> Differences in the seed premium assumed by the different analysts reflect slightly different assumptions on seed rates used by farmers (the technology premium being charged per bag of seed)

understate the total cost savings from using the technology by not taking into account savings on application costs and labour for hand weeding.

For the purposes of our analysis we have drawn on both these pieces of work, and sought to update the impact assumptions based on experience post 2008. We are not aware of any published yield impact studies. Discussions with independent sugar beet analysts and industry representatives confirm that the early findings of research studies have been realised, with the technology delivering important yield improvements in some regions (those with difficult to control weeds, as identified by Kniss) but not so in other regions. The yield assumptions applied in the analysis below (Table 21) therefore continue to be based on the findings of the original two papers by Kniss and Khan. In relation to the seed premium and weed control costs, these have been updated to reflect changes in seed prices/premia, herbicide usage patterns and herbicide prices. This shows a net farm income gain in 2011 of \$52.6 million to US sugar beet farmers (average gain per hectare of \$115/ha). Cumulatively, the farm income gain since 2007 has been \$193.7 million.

**Table 21: Farm level income impact of using GM HT sugar beet in the US 2007-2011**

Year	Average cost saving (\$/ha)	Average cost savings (net after cost of technology: \$/ha)	Average net increase in gross margins (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level ('000 \$)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
2007	353.35	222.39	584.00	473	0.03
2008	141.50	-10.66	75.48	19,471.4	1.51
2009	142.5	-8.69	108.09	46,740.9	2.68
2010	142.5	-8.69	145.03	64,566.4	2.82
2011	101.81	-46.19	115.27	52,627.7	2.05

Sources derived from and based on Kniss (2008), Khan (2008), Jon Joseph Q et al (2010), Stachler J et al (2011) and GfK Kynetec

Notes:

1. The yield gains identified by Kniss have been applied to the 2007 GM HT plantings in total and to the estimated GM HT plantings in the states of Idaho, Wyoming, Nebraska and Colorado, where penetration of plantings in 2008 was 85% (these states account for 26% of the total GM HT crop in 2008), and which are perceived to be regions of above average weed problems. For all other regions, no yield gain is assumed. For 2008 onwards, this equates to a net average yield gain of +2.79%, +3.21%, +3.21% and +3.19% respectively for 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011
2. The seed premium of \$131/ha, average costs of weed control respectively for conventional and GM HT systems of \$245/ha and \$84/ha, from Kniss, were applied to the crop in Idaho, Wyoming, Nebraska and Colorado. The seed premium of \$158/ha, weed control costs of \$227/ha and \$249/ha respectively for conventional and GM HT sugar beet, identified by Khan, were applied to all other regions using the technology. The resulting average values for seed premium/cost of technology was \$152.16/ha in 2008 and \$151.08/ha in 2009 and 2010. Based on industry and extension service data for 2011, a seed premium of \$148/ha was used. The average weed control cost savings associated with the GM HT system (before taking into consideration the seed premium) were \$141.5/ha in 2008 and \$142.5/ha in 2009 and 2010, and \$101.8/ha in 2011

### 3.5.2 Canada

GM HT sugar beet has also been used in the small Canadian sugar beet sector since 2008. In 2010, 96% of the crop (about 12,940 ha) used this technology. We are not aware of any published analysis of the impact of GM HT sugar beet in Canada, but if the same assumptions used in the US are applied to Canada, the total farm income gain in 2011 was \$1.42 million and cumulatively since 2008, the income gain has been \$5.89 million.

## 3.6 GM insect resistant<sup>45</sup> (GM IR) maize

### 3.6.1 US

GM IR maize was first planted in the US in 1996 and in 2011, seed containing GM IR traits was planted on 65% (22.3 million ha) of the total US maize crop.

The farm level impact of using GM IR maize in the US since 1996 is summarised in Table 22:

- The primary impact has been increased average yields. Much of the analysis in early years of adoption (summarised for example in Marra et al (2002) and James (2002)) identified an average yield impact of about +5%. More comprehensive and recent work by Hutchison et al (2010) examined impacts over the 1996-2009 period and considered the positive yield impact on non GM IR crops of 'area-wide' adoption of the technology. The key finding of this work puts the average yield impact at +7%. This revised analysis has been used as the basis for our analysis below. In 2011, this additional production is equal to an increase in total US maize production of +4.9%;
- The net impact on cost of production has been a small increase of between \$1/ha and \$9/ha (additional cost of the technology being higher than the estimated average insecticide cost savings of \$15-\$16/ha). In the last four years however, with the rising cost of the technology<sup>46</sup>, the net impact on costs has been an increase of \$7/ha to \$16/ha;
- The annual total national farm income benefit from using the technology has risen from \$13.54 million in 1996 to \$3.19 billion in 2011. The cumulative farm income benefit over the 1996-2011 period (in nominal terms) was \$14.4 billion;
- In added value terms, the increase in farm income in 2011 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 4.9%.

**Table 22: Farm level income impact of using GM IR maize in the US 1996-2011**

Year	Cost saving (\$/ha)	Cost savings (net after cost of technology: \$/ha)	Net increase in gross margins (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1996	24.71	-9.21	45.53	13.54	0.05
1997	24.71	-9.21	39.38	96.0	0.40
1998	20.30	-4.8	35.31	225.0	1.13
1999	20.30	-4.8	33.05	265.7	1.47

<sup>45</sup> The first generation being resistant to stalk boring pests but latter generations including resistance against cutworms and earworms

<sup>46</sup> Which tends to be mostly purchased as stacked traited seed

2000	22.24	-6.74	32.71	207.9	1.07
2001	22.24	-6.74	35.68	202.7	1.02
2002	22.24	-6.74	40.13	306.5	1.34
2003	22.24	-6.74	41.37	391.5	1.67
2004	22.24	-6.36	44.90	536.7	2.11
2005	17.30	-1.42	44.49	512.1	2.20
2006	17.30	-1.42	67.13	901.3	2.71
2007	17.30	-1.42	78.69	1,607.6	3.47
2008	24.71	-8.83	95.00	1,990.5	3.94
2009	28.21	-12.33	84.62	2,008.5	4.21
2010	32.06	-16.18	92.65	1,964.2	3.60
2011	22.50	-6.62	141.83	3,188.5	4.09


Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on a combination of studies including the ISAAA (James) review (2002), Marra et al (2002), Carpenter & Gianessi (2002), Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006), Johnson & Strom (2008) and Hutchison et al (2010)
2. Yield impact +7% based on Hutchison et al (2010)
3. Insecticide cost savings based on the above references
4. – (minus) value for net cost savings means the cost of the technology is greater than the other cost savings

### 3.6.2 Canada

GM IR maize has also been grown commercially in Canada since 1996. In 2011 it accounted for 70% of the total Canadian maize crop of 1.2 million ha. The impact of GM IR maize in Canada has been very similar to the impact in the US (similar yield and cost of production impacts). At the national level, this equates to additional farm income generated from the use of GM IR maize of \$116 million in 2011 (Figure 11) and cumulatively since 1996, additional farm income (in nominal terms) of \$694.5 million.

**Figure 11: National farm income impact: GM IR maize in Canada 1996-2011 (million \$)**



Notes:

1. Yield increase of 7% based on US analysis. Cost of technology and insecticide cost savings also based on US analysis
2. GM IR area planted in 1996 = 1,000 ha
3. All values for prices and costs denominated in Canadian dollars have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.6.3 Argentina

In 2011, GM IR maize traits were planted on 90% of the total Argentine maize crop (GM IR varieties were first planted in 1998).

The main impact of using the technology on farm profitability has been via yield increases. Various studies (eg, see ISAAA review in James (2002)) have identified an average yield increase in the region of 8% to 10%, hence an average of 9% has been used in the analysis up to 2004. More recent trade source estimates provided to the authors put the average yield increase in the last 4-5 years to be between 5% and 6%. Accordingly our analysis uses a yield increase value of 5.5% for the years from 2004 (see also note relating to yield impact of stacked traited seed in section 3.2.3: GM HT maize in Argentina).

No savings in costs of production have arisen for most farmers because very few maize growers in Argentina have traditionally used insecticides as a method of control for corn boring pests. As such, average costs of production increased by \$20/ha-\$22/ha (the cost of the technology) in years up to 2006. From 2007, with stacked traited seed becoming available and widely used, the additional cost of the technology relative to conventional seed has increased to about \$29/ha-\$33/ha.

The net impact on farm profit margins (inclusive of the yield gain) has, in recent years, been an increase of \$3/ha to \$23/ha. In 2011, the national level impact on profitability was an increase of \$70.5 million (an added value equal to 2% of the total value of production). Cumulatively, the farm income gain since 1998 has been \$380.7 million.

### 3.6.4 South Africa

GM IR maize has been grown commercially in South Africa since 2000. In 2011, 65% of the country's total maize crop of 2.7 million ha used GM IR cultivars.

The impact on farm profitability is summarised in Table 23. The main impact has been an average yield improvement of between 5% and 32% in the years 2000-2004, with an average of about 15% (used as the basis for analysis 2005-2007). In 2008 and 2009, the estimated yield impact was +10.6%<sup>47</sup> (this has been used as the basis of the analysis for 2010 and 2011). The cost of the technology \$8/ha to \$17/ha has broadly been equal to the average cost savings from no longer applying insecticides to control corn borer pests.

At the national level, the increase in farm income in 2011 was \$102.5 million and cumulatively since 2000 it has been \$887 million. In terms of national maize production, the use of GM IR technology on 69% of the planted area has resulted in a net increase in national maize production

---

<sup>47</sup> Van der Weld (2009)



of 7.2% in 2011. The value of the additional income generated was also equivalent to an annual increase in production of about 6.2%.

**Table 23: Farm level income impact of using GM IR maize in South Africa 2000-2011**

Year	Cost savings (\$/ha)	Net cost savings inclusive of cost of technology (\$/ha)	Net increase in gross margin (\$/ha)	Impact on farm income at a national level (\$ millions)
2000	13.98	1.87	43.77	3.31
2001	11.27	1.51	34.60	4.46
2002	8.37	0.6	113.98	19.35
2003	12.82	0.4	63.72	14.66
2004	14.73	0.46	20.76	8.43
2005	15.25	0.47	48.66	19.03
2006	14.32	-2.36	63.75	63.05
2007	13.90	0.22	182.90	225.70
2008	11.74	-4.55	87.07	145.20
2009	12.83	-2.12	62.05	148.94
2010	13.97	-2.30	70.58	132.61
2011	12.27	-2.02	56.17	102.51

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data (sources: Gouse (2005 & 2006) and Van Der Weld (2009))
2. Negative value for the net cost savings = a net increase in costs (ie, the additional cost of the GM technology exceeded savings from, for example, less expenditure on insecticides)
3. All values for prices and costs denominated in South African Rand have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.6.5 Spain

Spain has been commercially growing GM IR maize since 1998 and in 2011, 26% (97,325 ha) of the country's maize crop was planted to varieties containing a GM IR trait.

As in the other countries planting GM IR maize, the main impact on farm profitability has been increased yields (an average increase in yield of 6.3% across farms using the technology in the early years of adoption). With the availability and widespread adoption of the Mon 810 trait from 2003, the reported average positive yield impact is about +10%<sup>48</sup>. There has also been a net annual average saving on cost of production (from lower insecticide use) of between \$37/ha and \$61/ha<sup>49</sup> (Table 24). This has been the basis of analysis to 2008 and from 2009, it draws on work by Riesgo et al (2012). At the national level, these yield gains and cost savings have resulted in farm income being boosted in 2011 by \$28.5 million and cumulatively since 1998 the increase in farm income (in nominal terms) has been \$139.1 million.

Relative to national maize production, the yield increases derived from GM IR maize were equivalent to a 3.3% increase in national production (2010). The value of the additional income generated from GM IR maize was also equivalent to an annual increase in production of 2.3%.

<sup>48</sup> The cost of using this trait has been higher than the pre 2003 trait (Bt 176) – rising from about €20/ha to €35/ha

<sup>49</sup> Source: Brookes (2003) and Alcade (1999)

**Table 24: Farm level income impact of using GM IR maize in Spain 1998-2011**

Year	Cost savings (\$/ha)	Net cost savings inclusive of cost of technology (\$/ha)	Net increase in gross margin (\$/ha)	Impact on farm income at a national level (\$ millions)
1998	37.40	3.71	95.16	2.14
1999	44.81	12.80	102.20	2.56
2000	38.81	12.94	89.47	2.24
2001	37.63	21.05	95.63	1.10
2002	39.64	22.18	100.65	2.10
2003	47.50	26.58	121.68	3.93
2004	51.45	28.79	111.93	6.52
2005	52.33	8.72	144.74	7.70
2006	52.70	8.78	204.5	10.97
2007	57.30	9.55	274.59	20.63
2008	61.49	10.25	225.36	17.86
2009	8.82	-39.33	172.31	13.11
2010	8.80	-39.27	255.87	19.59
2011	8.46	-37.72	292.53	28.47

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data (based on Brookes (2003), Brookes (2008) and Riesgo et al (2012)). Yield impact +6.3% to 2004 and 10% 2005-2008, +12.6% 2009 onwards. Cost of technology based on €18.5/ha to 2004 and €35/ha from 2005, insecticide cost savings €42/ha to 2008, €6.4/ha 2009 onwards
2. All values for prices and costs denominated in Euros have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.6.6 Other EU countries

A summary of the impact of GM IR technology in other countries of the EU is presented in Table 25. This shows that in 2011, the additional farm income derived from using GM IR technology in these seven countries was about +\$2.2 million, and cumulatively over the 2005-2011 period, the total income gain was \$16.2 million.

**Table 25: Farm level income impact of using GM IR maize in other EU countries 2005-2011**

	Year first planted GM IR maize	Area 2010 (hectares)	Yield impact (%)	Cost of technology 2010 (\$/ha)	Cost savings 2010 (before deduction of cost of technology: \$/ha)	Net increase in gross margin 2010(\$/ha)	Impact on farm income at a national level 2010 (million \$)
France	2005	Nil	N/p	N/p	N/p	N/p	N/p
Germany	2005	Nil	N/p	N/p	N/p	N/p	N/p
Portugal	2005	7,724	+12.5	46.17	0	149.16	1.1
Czech Republic	2005	5,091	+10	46.17	23.75	175.88	0.9
Slovakia	2005	761	+12.3	46.17	0	139.72	0.1
Poland	2006	300	+12.5	46.17	0	132.51	0.04
Romania	2007	588	+7.1% 2007,	42.20	0	66.38	0.04

			+9.6% 2008, +4.8% 2009 onwards				
<b>Total other EU (excluding Spain)</b>		<b>14,464</b>					<b>2.2</b>

Source and notes:

1. Source: based on Brookes (2008) and industry sources for yields in 2008 and 2009 in Romania
2. All values for prices and costs denominated in Euros have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year
3. N/p – planting not permitted in France and Germany in 2009 (and in France 2008)

### 3.6.7 Brazil

Brazil first used GM IR maize technology in 2008. In 2011, 8.68 million ha of GM IR maize was planted (57% of the total crop). Analysis from Galvao (2009, 2010 and 2012) has been used as the basis for estimating the aggregate impacts on farm income and is presented in Table 26. In 2011, the total income gain was over \$1.1 billion, with the cumulative benefit since 2008 equal to \$1.8 billion.

**Table 26: Farm level income impact of using GM IR maize in Brazil 2008-2011**

Year	Cost savings (\$/ha)	Net cost savings inclusive of cost of technology (\$/ha)	Net increase in gross margin (\$/ha)	Impact on farm income at a national level (\$ millions)
2008	41.98	20.93	66.36	96.22
2009	44.21	-14.63	30.37	144.54
2010	48.60	-5.39	55.74	414.74
2011	23.13	-46.25	131.48	1,141.40

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data (source: Galvao (2009, 2010 & 2012))
2. Negative value for the net cost savings = a net increase in costs (ie, the extra cost of the technology exceeded the savings on other costs (eg. less expenditure on insecticides)
3. All values for prices and costs denominated in Brazilian Real have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.6.8 Other countries

GM IR maize has been grown commercially in:

- *The Philippines* since 2003. In 2011, 557,000 hectares out of total plantings of 2.54 million (22%) were GM IR. Estimates of the impact of using GM IR (sources: Gonzales (2005), Yorobe (2004) and Ramon (2005)) show annual average yield increases in the range of 14.3% to 34%. The mid point of this range (+24.15%) was used for the years 2003-2007. For 2008 onwards a yield impact of +18% has been used based on Gonsales et al (2009). Based on the findings of these research papers, a small average annual insecticide cost saving of about \$12/ha-\$14/ha and average cost of the technology of \$30/ha-\$39/ha have been used. The net impact on farm profitability has been between \$37/ha and \$108/ha.

In 2011, the national farm income benefit derived from using the technology was \$60.4 million and cumulative farm income gain since 2003 has been \$176.2 million;

- *Uruguay* since 2004, and in 2011, 98,000 ha (79% of the total crop) were GM IR. Using Argentine data as the basis for assessing impact, the cumulative farm income gain has been \$11.7 million;
- *Honduras*. Here farm level 'trials' have been permitted since 2003, and in 2011, an estimated 29,000 ha used GM IR traits. Evidence from Falck Zepeda et al (2009) indicated that the primary impact of the technology has been to increase average yields (in 2008 +24%). As insecticides have not traditionally been used by most farmers, no costs of production savings have arisen, coupled with no additional cost for use of the technology (which has been provided free of charge for the trials). In our analysis, we have, however, assumed a cost of the technology of \$30/ha, and based on this, the estimated farm income benefit derived from the technology was \$2.6 million in 2011 and cumulatively since 2003 the income gain has been \$4.9 million;
- *Colombia*. GM IR maize has been grown on a 'trial basis' since 2007 in Colombia. In 2011, seed containing this technology was used on 10% of the crop (about 52,000 ha). Based on analysis from Mendez et al (2011) which explored impacts in one small region (San Juan valley), the average yield gain was +22%, the seed premium about \$47/ha and the savings in insecticide use equal to about \$53/ha (ie, a net cost saving of about \$6/ha). Inclusive of the yield gain, the average farm income gain in 2010 was about \$260/ha. If aggregated to the whole of the GM IR area in 2011, this equates to a net farm income gain of about \$13.5 million. Cumulatively since 2007, the net farm income gain has been about \$29.2 million.

### 3.6.9 Summary of economic impact

In global terms, the farm level impact of using GM IR maize was \$4.73 billion in 2011.

Cumulatively since 1996, the benefit has been (in nominal terms) \$18.56 billion. This farm income gain has mostly derived from improved yields (less pest damage) although in some countries farmers have derived a net cost saving associated with reduced expenditure on insecticides.

In terms of the total value of maize production from the countries growing GM IR maize in 2011, the additional farm income generated by the technology is equal to a value added equivalent of 4.5%. Relative to the value of global maize production in 2011, the farm income benefit added the equivalent of 2.2%.

## 3.7 Insect resistant (Bt) cotton (GM IR)

### 3.7.1 The US

GM IR cotton has been grown commercially in the US since 1996, and in 2011 was used on 75% (2.87 million ha) of total cotton plantings.

The farm income impact of using GM IR cotton is summarised in Table 27. The primary benefit has been increased yields (by 9%-11%), although small net savings in costs of production have also been obtained (reduced expenditure on insecticides being marginally greater than the cost of the technology for Bollgard I). Overall, average profitability levels increased by \$53/ha-\$115/ha with Bollgard I cotton (with a single Bt gene) between 1996 and 2002 and by between \$87/ha and

\$175/ha in 2003-2011 with Bollgard II (containing two Bt genes and offering a broader spectrum of control). This resulted in a net gain to farm income in 2011 of \$502 million. Cumulatively, since 1996 the farm income benefit has been \$3.77 billion. In added value terms, the effect of the increased yields and reduced costs of production on farm income in 2011 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 7.5% (237,000 tonnes).

**Table 27: Farm level income impact of using GM IR cotton in the US 1996-2011**

Year	Cost savings (net after cost of technology: \$/ha)	Net increase in gross margins (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1996	4.98	115.32	94.69	1.19
1997	4.98	103.47	87.28	1.30
1998	4.98	88.54	80.62	1.47
1999	4.98	65.47	127.29	2.89
2000	4.98	74.11	162.88	3.10
2001	4.98	53.04	125.22	3.37
2002	4.98	69.47	141.86	3.11
2003	5.78	120.49	239.98	4.27
2004	5.78	107.47	261.23	4.82
2005	24.48	117.81	332.41	5.97
2006	-5.77	86.61	305.17	4.86
2007	2.71	114.50	296.00	5.49
2008	2.71	98.22	189.50	5.89
2009	2.71	128.04	296.79	6.04
2010	2.71	146.37	471.73	6.76
2011	2.71	174.85	502.25	6.93

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on Gianessi & Carpenter (1999), Carpenter & Gianessi (2002), Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006), Johnson & Strom (2008), Marra et al (2002) and Mullins & Hudson (2004)
2. Yield impact +9% 1996-2002 Bollgard I and +11% 2003-2004, +10% 2005 onwards Bollgard II
3. Cost of technology: 1996-2002 Bollgard I \$58.27/ha, 2003-2004 Bollgard II \$68.32/ha, \$49.62/ha 2005, \$46.95/ha 2006, \$25.7/ha 2007-2011
4. Insecticide cost savings \$63.26/ha 1996-2002, \$74.10/ha 2003-2005, \$41.18/ha 2006, \$28.4/ha 2007-2011

### 3.7.2 China

China first planted GM IR cotton in 1997, since when the area planted to GM IR varieties has increased to 72% of the total 5.5 million ha crop in 2011.

As in the US, a major farm income impact has been via higher yields of +8% to +10% on the crops using the technology, although there have also been significant cost savings on insecticides used and the labour previously used to undertake spraying. Overall, annual average costs have fallen by about \$145/ha-\$200/ha and annual average profitability improved by \$123/ha-\$517/ha. In 2011, the net national gain to farm income was \$2.2 billion (Table 28). Cumulatively since 1997 the farm income benefit has been \$13.07 billion. In added value terms, the effect of the increased

yields and reduced costs of production on farm income was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 9.7% (0.72 million tonnes) in 2011.

**Table 28: Farm level income impact of using GM IR cotton in China 1997-2011**

Year	Cost savings (net after cost of technology: \$/ha)	Net increase in gross margins (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1997	194	333	11.33	0.13
1998	194	310	80.97	1.15
1999	200	278	181.67	4.62
2000	-14	123	150.18	2.61
2001	378	472	1,026.26	20.55
2002	194	327	687.27	11.19
2003	194	328	917.00	12.15
2004	194	299	1,105.26	16.89
2005	145	256	845.58	13.57
2006	146	226	792.28	16.86
2007	152	248	942.7	14.46
2008	167	244	933.7	18.64
2009	170	408	1,457.8	10.61
2010	176	503	1,736.5	9.39
2011	184	559	2,198.8	9.69

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on Pray et al (2002) which covered the years 1999-2001. Other years based on average of the 3 years, except 2005 onwards based on Shachuan (2006) – personal communication
2. Negative cost savings in 2000 reflect a year of high pest pressure (of pests not the target of GM IR technology) which resulted in above average use of insecticides on GM IR using farms
3. Yield impact +8% 1997-1999 and +10% 2000 onwards
4. Negative value for the net cost savings in 2000 = a net increase in costs (ie, the extra cost of the technology was greater than the savings on insecticide expenditure – a year of lower than average bollworm pest problems)
5. All values for prices and costs denominated in Chinese Yuan have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.7.3 Australia

Australia planted 95% of its 2011 cotton crop (total crop of 580,000 ha) to varieties containing GM IR traits (Australia first planted commercial GM IR cotton in 1996).

Unlike the other main countries using GM IR cotton, Australian growers have rarely derived yield gains from using the technology (reflecting the effective use of insecticides for pest control prior to the availability of GM IR cultivars), with the primary farm income benefit being derived from lower costs of production (Table 29). More specifically:

- In the first two years of adoption of the technology (Ingard, single gene Bt cotton), small net income losses were derived, mainly because of the relatively high price charged for the seed. Since this price was lowered in 1998, the net income impact has been positive, with cost savings of between \$54/ha and \$90/ha, mostly derived from lower insecticide costs (including application) more than offsetting the cost of the technology;

- For the last few years of use, Bollgard II cotton (containing two Bt genes) has been available offering effective control of a broader range of cotton pests. Despite the higher costs of this technology, users have continued to make significant net cost savings of \$186/ha to \$270/ha;
- At the national level in 2011, the net farm income gain was \$148.5 million and cumulatively since 1996 the gains have been \$525.4 million;
- In added value terms, the effect of the reduced costs of production on farm income in 2011 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 74.4% (761,160 tonnes).

**Table 29: Farm level income impact of using GM IR cotton in Australia 1996-2011**

Year	Cost of technology (\$/ha)	Net increase in gross margins/cost saving after cost of technology (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1996	-191.7	-41.0	-1.63	-0.59
1997	-191.7	-35.0	-2.04	-0.88
1998	-97.4	91.0	9.06	0.43
1999	-83.9	88.1	11.80	4.91
2000	-89.9	64.9	10.71	4.38
2001	-80.9	57.9	7.87	5.74
2002	-90.7	54.3	3.91	3.43
2003	-119.3	256.1	16.3	11.49
2004	-179.5	185.8	45.7	21.33
2005	-229.2	193.4	47.9	23.75
2006	-225.9	190.7	22.49	26.01
2007	-251.33	212.1	11.73	40.90
2008	-264.26	199.86	24.23	37.40
2009	-257.75	232.27	37.05	41.80
2010	-292.17	263.28	125.02	46.50
2011	-298.77	269.23	148.48	74.40

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on Fitt (2001) and CSIRO for bollgard II since 2004
2. All values for prices and costs denominated in Australian dollars have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.7.4 Argentina

GM IR cotton has been planted in Argentina since 1998. In 2011, it accounted for 95% of total cotton plantings.


The main impact in Argentina has been yield gains of 30%. This has more than offset the cost of using the technology<sup>50</sup>. In terms of gross margin, cotton farmers have gained between \$25/ha and \$249/ha annually during the period 1998-2011<sup>51</sup>. At the national level, the annual farm income gains in the last five years have been in the range of \$11 million to \$116 million (Figure 12). Cumulatively since 1998, the farm income gain from use of the technology has been \$362 million. In added value terms, the effect of the yield increases (partially offset by higher costs of

<sup>50</sup> The cost of the technology used in the years up to 2004 was \$86/ha (source: Qaim & DeJanvry). From 2005, the cost has been 116 pesos/ha (\$30/ha- \$40/ha; source: Monsanto Argentina). The insecticide cost savings have been \$13/ha-\$17/ha

<sup>51</sup> The variation in margins has largely been due to the widely fluctuating annual price of cotton

production) on farm income in 2011 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 20.79%.

**Figure 12: National farm income impact: GM IR cotton in Argentina 1998-2011 (million \$)**



Sources and notes:

1. Impact data (source: Qaim & De Janvry (2002) and for 2005 and 2006 Monsanto LAP, although cost of technology in 2005 from Monsanto Argentina). Area data : source ArgenBio
2. Yield impact +30%, cost of technology \$86/ha (\$40/ha 2005), cost savings (reduced insecticide use) \$13/ha-\$17/ha
3. All values for prices and costs denominated in Argentine Pesos have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

### 3.7.5 Mexico

GM IR cotton has been planted commercially in Mexico since 1996. In 2011, GM IR cotton was planted on 99,870 ha (53% of total cotton plantings).

The main farm income impact of using the technology has been yield improvements of between 9% and 14% over the last five years. In addition, there have been important savings in the cost of production (lower insecticide costs)<sup>52</sup>. Overall, the annual net increase in farm profitability has been within the range of \$104/ha and \$354/ha between 1996 and 2010 (Table 30). At the national level, the farm income benefit in 2010 was \$10.9 million and the impact on total cotton production was an increase of 4.6%. Cumulatively since 1996, the farm income benefit has been \$95 million. In added value terms, the combined effect of the yield increases and lower cost of production on farm income in 2010 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 3.5%.

**Table 30: Farm level income impact of using GM IR cotton in Mexico 1996-2011**

<sup>52</sup> Cost of technology has annually been between \$48/ha and \$70/ha up to 2008, \$99.5/ha in 2009 and \$39/ha, based on estimated share of the trait largely sold as a stacked trait, insecticide cost savings between \$88/ha and \$121/ha to 2009 (\$20/ha in 2010) and net impact on costs have been between -\$39/ha and + \$48/ha (derived from and based on Traxler et al (2001) and updated from industry sources)



Year	Cost savings (net after cost of technology: \$/ha)	Net increase in gross margins (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
1996	58.1	354.5	0.3	0.1
1997	56.1	103.4	1.7	0.5
1998	38.4	316.4	11.3	2.7
1999	46.5	316.8	5.3	2.8
2000	47.0	262.4	6.8	5.8
2001	47.6	120.6	3.0	3.7
2002	46.1	120.8	1.8	3.8
2003	41.0	127.7	3.3	3.7
2004	39.3	130.4	6.2	4.5
2005	40.8	132.3	10.4	7.4
2006	20.4	124.4	6.4	4.4
2007	20.5	139.7	8.4	5.1
2008	19.9	150.4	10.5	6.8
2009	-21.0	254.3	7.7	5.0
2010	-39.2	222.34	10.88	3.5

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on Traxler et al (2001) covering the years 1997 and 1998. Yield changes in other years based on official reports submitted to the Mexican Ministry of Agriculture by Monsanto Comercial (Mexico)
2. Yield impacts: 1996 +37%, 1997 +3%, 1998 +20%, 1999 +27%, 2000 +17%, 2001 +9%, 2002 +7%, 2003 +6%, 2004 +7.6%, 2005 +9.25%, 2006 +9%, 2007 & 2008 +9.28%, 2009 +14.2%, 2010 +10.3%
3. All values for prices and costs denominated in Mexican Pesos have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year


### 3.7.6 South Africa

In 2011, GM IR cotton<sup>53</sup> was planted on 8,930 ha in South Africa (95% of the total crop).

The main impact on farm income has been significantly higher yields (an annual average increase of about 24%). In terms of cost of production, the additional cost of the technology (between \$17/ha and \$24/ha for Bollgard I and \$40/ha to \$50/ha for Bollgard II (2006 onwards)) has been greater than the insecticide cost and labour (for water collection and spraying) savings (\$12/ha to \$23/ha), resulting in an increase in overall cost of production of \$2/ha to \$32/ha. Combining the positive yield effect and the increase in cost of production, the net effect on profitability has been an annual increase of between \$27/ha and \$509/ha.

At the national level, farm incomes over the last five years have annually increased by between \$1.2 million and \$4.5 million (Figure 13). Cumulatively since 1998, the farm income benefit has been \$31.6 million. The impact on total cotton production was an increase of 22.8% in 2011. In added value terms, the combined effect of the yield increases and lower costs of production on farm income in 2011 was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 17.4% (based on 2011 production levels).

<sup>53</sup> First planted commercially in 1998

**Figure 13: National farm income impact: GM IR cotton in South Africa 1998-2011 (million \$)**

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on Ismael et al (2002)
2. Yield impact +24%, cost of technology \$14/ha-\$24/ha for Bollgard I and about \$50/ha for Bollgard II, cost savings (reduced insecticide use) \$12/ha-\$23/ha
3. All values for prices and costs denominated in South African Rand have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year
4. The decline in the total farm income benefit 2004 and 2005 relative to earlier years reflects the decline in total cotton plantings. This was caused by relatively low farm level prices for cotton in 2004 and 2005 (reflecting a combination of relatively low world prices and a strong South African currency)

### 3.7.7 India

GM IR cotton has been planted commercially in India since 2002. In 2011, 9.4 million ha were planted to GM IR cotton which is equal to 85% of total plantings.

The main impact of using GM IR cotton has been major increases in yield<sup>54</sup>. With respect to cost of production, the average cost of the technology (seed premium: \$49/ha to \$54/ha) up to 2006 was greater than the average insecticide cost savings of \$31/ha-\$58/ha resulting in a net increase in costs of production. Following the reduction in the seed premium in 2006 to \$20/ha, farmers have made a net cost saving of \$20/ha-\$25/ha. Coupled with the yield gains, important net gains to levels of profitability have been achieved of between \$82/ha and \$356/ha. At the national level, the farm income gain in 2010 was \$2.5 billion and cumulatively since 2002 the farm income gains have been \$9.4 billion (Table 31).

<sup>54</sup> Bennett et al (2004) found average yield increases of 45% in 2002 and 63% in 2003 (average over the two years of 54%) relative to conventionally produced cotton. Survey data from Monsanto (2005) confirmed this high yield impact (+58% reported in 2004) and from IMRB (2006) which found an average yield increase of 64% in 2005 & IMRB (2007) which found a yield impact of +50% in 2006. Later work by Gruere (2008), Qaim (2009) and Herring and Rao (2012) have all confirmed significant yield increases in the range of +30% to +40%

**Table 31: Farm level income impact of using GM IR cotton in India 2002-2010**

Year	Cost savings (net after cost of technology: \$/ha)	Net increase in gross margins (\$/ha)	Increase in farm income at a national level (\$ millions)	Increase in national farm income as % of farm level value of national production
2002	-12.42	82.66	3.69	0.26
2003	-16.2	209.85	20.98	0.47
2004	-13.56	193.36	96.68	1.86
2005	-22.25	255.96	332.74	5.26
2006	3.52	221.02	839.89	14.04
2007	26.41	356.85	2,093.97	22.84
2008	24.28	256.73	1,790.16	24.27
2009	22.19	211.17	1,754.96	23.47
2010	23.10	265.80	2,498.53	24.26
2011	23.65	299.59	3,220.73	22.05

Sources and notes:

1. Impact data based on Bennett et al (2004), IMRB (2005 & 2007), Gruere (2008), Qaim (2009), Herring and Rao (2012)
2. All values for prices and costs denominated in Indian Rupees have been converted to US dollars at the annual average exchange rate in each year

The impact on total cotton production was an increase of 26.4% in 2011. In added value terms, the combined effect of the yield increases and higher costs of production on farm income was equivalent to an annual increase in production of 22% (based on the 2011 production level that is inclusive of the GM IR related yield gains).

### 3.7.8 Brazil

GM IR cotton was planted commercially in Brazil for the first time in 2006, and in 2011 was planted on 345,300 ha (25% of the total crop). The area planted to GM IR cotton in Brazil has fluctuated (eg, 358,000 ha in 2007 and 116,000 ha in 2009) largely due to the performance of the seed containing the GM IR trait compared to leading conventional varieties. In 2006, on the basis of industry estimates of impact of GM IR cotton relative to similar varieties (average yield gain of +6% and a net cost saving (reduced expenditure on insecticides after deduction of the premium paid for using the technology) of about +\$25/ha)), a net farm income gain of about \$125/ha was realised. Since then, however, improved conventional varieties in which the GM IR trait is not present have dominated production because of their superior yields. As a result, varieties containing the GM IR trait have delivered inferior yields (despite offering effective control against bollworm pests) relative to the leading conventional varieties. In addition, boll weevil is a major pest in many cotton growing areas, a pest that the GM IR technology does not target. Analysis by Galvao (2009 & 2010) estimated that the yield performance of the varieties containing GM IR traits was lower (by -2.7% to -3.8%) than the leading conventional alternatives available in 2007-2009. As a result, the average impact on farm income (after taking into consideration insecticide cost savings and the seed premium) has been negative (-\$34.5/ha in 2007, a small net gain of about \$2/ha in 2008 and a net loss of -\$44/ha in 2009). Not surprisingly, at the country level, this resulted in net aggregate losses in 2007 and 2009 from using the technology (eg, -\$5 million in 2009). In 2010, stacked traits (containing GM HT and GM IR traits) became available in some of the leading varieties for the first time and this has contributed to the increase in plantings

since 2010. Estimates of the impact of this technology relative to the leading conventional varieties (Galvao (2010 and 2012)) found a small net yield increase of about 3%. Based on this, together with estimates from Galvao (2010 and 2012) of the seed premium (\$42.54/ha in 2010 and \$46.5/ha in 2011) and insecticide cost savings of \$58.94/ha in 2010 and \$42.7/ha in 2011, the net impact from using the GM IR technology was +46.5/ha in 2011. At the national level this equates to a net income gain of \$16.1 million. Cumulatively, since 2006 GM IR technology has delivered a net farm income gain of \$19.9 million.

### 3.7.9 Other countries

- Colombia.* GM IR cotton has been grown commercially in Colombia since 2002 (42,250 ha planted in 2011 out of a total cotton crop of 68,280 ha). Drawing on recent analysis of impact by Zambrano et al (2009), the main impact has been a significant improvement in yield (+32%). On the cost side, this analysis shows that GM IR cotton farmers tend to have substantially higher expenditures on pest control than their conventional counterparts which, when taking into consideration the approximate \$70/ha cost of the technology, results in a net addition to costs of between \$200/ha and \$280/ha (relative to typical expenditures by conventional cotton growers). Nevertheless, after taking into consideration the positive yield effects, the net impact on profitability has been positive. In 2008, the average improvement in profitability was about \$90/ha and the total net gain from using the technology was \$1.8 million<sup>55</sup>. Since the Zambrano work, the use of GM IR cotton has seen problems with reduced yield benefits in 2009 due mainly to heavy rains in the planting season delaying planting, followed by lack of rain in the growing season and the increasing availability of stacked trait seed. For the purposes of this analysis, the 2010 and 2011 estimates of impact are based on industry source data which were an estimated net yield benefit of +10%, seed premium of \$171/ha and insecticide cost savings of \$87/ha. As a result, the net farm income benefit in 2011 was estimated to be +\$69.8/ha. At the national level, this equated to a net farm income gain of \$2.9 million. Cumulatively, since 2002 the net farm income gain was \$13.7 million;
- Burkina Faso:* GM IR cotton was first grown commercially in 2008. In 2011, GM IR cotton accounted for 58% (232,000 ha) of total plantings. Based on analysis by Vitale et al (2006, 2008 and 2009), the main impact of the technology is improved yields (by +18% to +20%) and savings in insecticide expenditure of about \$52/ha. Based on a cost of technology of \$53/ha, the net impact on cost of production is marginally negative, but inclusive of the yield gains, the net income gain in 2011 was \$202/ha. The total aggregate farm income gain in 2011 was \$46.9 million and cumulatively, since 2008, it has been \$96.7 million;
- Pakistan:* After widespread 'illegal' planting of GM IR cotton in Pakistan for several years, it was officially permitted in 2009 and in 2011, 81% of the crop (2.6 million ha) used this technology. Analysis of the impact draws on Nazli et al (2010) which identified an average yield gain of +12.6%, seed premium of about \$14/ha-\$15/ha and an average insecticide cost saving of about \$20/ha. Based on this, the average farm income benefit in 2011 was \$57.4/ha. At the national level this is equal to a net farm income gain of \$149.2 million. Cumulatively since 2009, the farm income benefit of using this technology is \$334.2 million;

<sup>55</sup> Given that the Zambrano et al work identified important differences between the baseline level of insecticide use by GM IR cotton users and conventional cotton farmers (pre-adoption of the technology), this probably understates the cost savings associated with the technology. A more representative assessment of the impact would compare the costs (post adoption) of GM IR technology users with the likely costs of reverting back to conventional technology on these farms

- Burma:** GM IR cotton has been grown in Burma since 2007 and in 2011 283,000 ha (79% of the total crop) used seed containing the trait. Data on the impact of the technology in Burma is limited, with the brief report from the USDA (2011) being the only one identified. This cited extension advisors in the country indicating that the technology used exclusively in 'long staple' varieties was delivering up to a 70% improvement in yield. Given 'long staple' varieties account for only a part of the total crop, our analysis uses a more conservative average yield of +30% and applies this only to the 'long staple' area (estimates of). In addition, due to the lack of data on seed premia and cost savings (relating to labour and insecticide use), we have used data based on costs and impacts from Pakistan. Based on these assumptions, the average income gain in 2011 was about \$441/ha, which at the national level amounts to a gain of \$125 million. Cumulatively the farm income gain since 2007 is about \$334 million.

### 3.7.10 Summary of global impact

In global terms, the farm level impact of using GM IR cotton was \$6.6 billion in 2011. Cumulatively since 1996, the farm income benefit has been (in nominal terms) \$31.3 billion. Within this, 73% of the farm income gain has derived from yield gains (less pest damage) and the balance (27%) from reduced expenditure on crop protection (spraying of insecticides).

In terms of the total value of cotton production from the countries growing GM IR in 2011, the additional farm income generated by the technology is equal to a value added equivalent of 14.7% (based on the 2010 production level inclusive of the GM IR related yield gains). Relative to the value of global cotton production in 2010, the farm income benefit added the equivalent of 11.6%.

## 3.8 Other GM crops

### 3.8.1 Maize/corn rootworm resistance

GM IR (resistant to corn rootworm (CRW)) maize has been planted commercially in the US since 2003. In 2011, there were 19.1 million ha of GM IR CRW maize (56% of the total US crop).

The main farm income impact<sup>56</sup> has been higher yields of about 5% relative to conventional maize. The impact on average costs of production has been +\$2/ha to +\$12/ha (based on an average cost of the technology of \$25/ha-\$42/ha and an insecticide cost saving of \$32/ha-\$37/ha). As a result, the net impact on farm profitability has been +\$24/ha to +\$121/ha.

At the national level, farm incomes increased by \$4 million in 2003, rising to \$2.3 billion in 2011. Cumulatively since 2003, the total farm income gain from the use of GM IR CRW technology in the US maize crop has been +\$7.1 billion.

GM IR CRW cultivars were also planted commercially for the first time in 2004 in Canada. In 2011, the area planted to CRW resistant varieties was 0.48 million ha. Based on US costs, insecticide cost savings and yield impacts, this has resulted in additional income at the national level of \$54.8 million in 2011 (cumulative total since 2004 of \$126 million).

<sup>56</sup> Impact data based on Carpenter & Gianessi (2002), Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006), Johnson and Strom (2008) and Rice (2004)

At the global level, the extra farm income derived from GM IR CRW maize use has been \$7.2 billion.

### **3.8.2 Virus resistant papaya**

Ringspot resistant papaya has been commercially grown in the US (State of Hawaii) since 1999, and in 2011, 75% of the state's papaya crop was GM virus resistant (395 ha of fruit bearing trees).

The main farm income impact of this technology has been to significantly increase yields relative to conventional varieties. Compared to the average yield in the last year before the first biotech cultivation (1998), the annual average yield increase of biotech papaya relative to conventional crops has been within a range of +15% to +77% (17% in 2011). At a state level, this was equivalent to a 12.7% increase in total papaya production for 2011.

In terms of profitability<sup>57</sup>, the net annual impact has been an improvement of between \$2,400/ha and \$11,400/ha, and in 2011, this amounted to a net farm income gain of \$2,420/ha and an aggregate benefit across the state of \$0.95 million. Cumulatively, the farm income benefit since 1999 has been \$22.9 million.

Virus resistant papaya are also reported to have been grown in China, and in 2011, the area was 4,500 ha. No impact data on this technology has been identified.

### **3.8.3 Virus resistant squash**

GM virus resistant squash has also been grown in some states of the US since 2004. It is estimated to have been planted on 2,000 ha in 2011<sup>58</sup> (10% of the total crop).

Based on analysis from Johnson & Strom (2008), the primary farm income impact of using GM virus resistant squash has been derived from higher yields which in 2011, added a net gain to users of \$28.3 million. Cumulatively, the farm income benefit since 2004 has been \$195.3 million.

### **3.8.4 Other crops**

#### *a) Potatoes*

GM IR potatoes were grown commercially in the US between 1996 and 2000 (planted on 4% of the total US potato crop in 1999 (30,000 ha)). This technology was withdrawn in 2001 when the technology provider (Monsanto) withdrew from the market to concentrate on GM trait development in maize, soybeans, cotton and canola. This commercial decision was also probably influenced by the decision of some leading potato processors and fast food outlets to stop using GM potatoes because of perceived concerns about this issue from some of their consumers, even though the GM potato provided the producer and processor with a lower cost, higher yielding and more consistent product. It also delivered significant reductions in insecticide use (Carpenter & Gianessi (2002)).

---

<sup>57</sup> Impact data based on Carpenter & Gianessi (2002), Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006) and Johnson and Strom (2008)

<sup>58</sup> Mostly found in Georgia and Florida

High starch potatoes were also approved for planting in the EU in 2010 and a small area has been planted in members states such as Sweden, the Czech Republic and Germany. There is no data available on the impact of this technology.

*b) Alfalfa*

GM HT alfalfa was first commercialised in the US in 2007 on about 100,000 ha. However, between 2008 and 2010, it was not allowed to be planted due to legal action requiring the completion of additional environmental impact assessments. This was completed by 2010, and commercial use of the technology allowed to be resumed in 2011. Approximately 200,000 ha of GM alfalfa were planted in 2011. The technology is reported to offer improved weed control, better yields and higher quality forage. No analysis is presented here due to the lack of published studies on the impact.

### **3.9 Indirect (non pecuniary) farm level economic impacts**

As well as the tangible and quantifiable impacts identified and analysed on farm profitability presented above, there are other important impacts of an economic nature. These include impacts on a broader range of topics such as labour use, households and local communities. The literature on these impacts is developing and a full examination of these impacts potentially merits a study in its own right. These issues are not examined in depth in this work as to do so would add considerably to an, already, long report. As such, this section provides only a summary of some of the most important additional, and mostly intangible (difficult to quantify) impacts.

Many of the studies<sup>59</sup> of the impact cited in this report have identified the following reasons as being important influences for adoption of the technology:

*Herbicide tolerant crops*

- Increased management flexibility and convenience that comes from a combination of the ease of use associated with broad-spectrum, post emergent herbicides like glyphosate and the increased/longer time window for spraying. This not only frees up management time for other farming activities but also allows additional scope for undertaking off-farm, income earning activities;
- In a conventional crop, post-emergent weed control relies on herbicide applications after the weeds and crop are established. As a result, the crop may suffer 'knock-back' to its growth from the effects of the herbicide. In the GM HT crop, this problem is avoided because the crop is tolerant to the herbicide;
- Facilitates the adoption of conservation or no tillage systems. This provides for additional cost savings such as reduced labour and fuel costs associated with ploughing, additional moisture retention and reductions in levels of soil erosion;
- Improved weed control has contributed to reduced harvesting costs – cleaner crops have resulted in reduced times for harvesting. It has also improved harvest quality and led to higher levels of quality price bonuses in some regions and years (eg, HT soybeans and HT canola in the early years of adoption respectively in Romania and Canada);

<sup>59</sup> For example, relating to HT soybeans; USDA (1999), Gianessi & Carpenter (2000), Qaim & Traxler (2002), Brookes (2008); relating to insect resistant maize, Rice (2004); relating to insect resistant cotton Ismael et al (2002), Pray et al (2002)

- Elimination of potential damage caused by soil-incorporated residual herbicides in follow-on crops (eg, TT canola in Australia) and less need to apply herbicides in a follow-on crop because of the improved levels of weed control;
- A contribution to the general improvement in human safety (as manifest in greater peace of mind about own and worker safety) from a switch to more environmentally benign products.

#### *Insect resistant crops*

- Production risk management/insurance purposes – the technology takes away much of the worry of significant pest damage occurring and is, therefore, highly valued. Piloted in 2008 and more widely operational from 2009, US farmers using stacked corn traits (containing insect resistant and herbicide tolerant traits) are being offered discounts on crop insurance premiums (for crop losses) equal to \$34.5/ha in 2011. Over the four years, this has applied to 17.2 million ha, resulting in insurance premia savings of \$532 million;
- A 'convenience' benefit derived from having to devote less time to crop walking and/or applying insecticides;
- Savings in energy use – mainly associated with less use of aerial spraying;
- Savings in machinery use (for spraying and possibly reduced harvesting times);
- Higher quality of crop. There is a growing body of research evidence relating to the superior quality of GM IR corn relative to conventional and organic corn from the perspective of having lower levels of mycotoxins. Evidence from Europe (as summarised in Brookes (2008)) has shown a consistent pattern in which GM IR corn exhibits significantly reduced levels of mycotoxins compared to conventional and organic alternatives. In terms of revenue from sales of corn, however, no premia for delivering product with lower levels of mycotoxins have, to date, been reported although where the adoption of the technology has resulted in reduced frequency of crops failing to meet maximum permissible fumonisin levels in grain maize (eg, in Spain), this delivers an important economic gain to farmers selling their grain to the food using sector. GM IR corn farmers in the Philippines have also obtained price premia of 10% (Yorobe J (2004)) relative to conventional corn because of better quality, less damage to cobs and lower levels of impurities;
- Improved health and safety for farmers and farm workers (from reduced handling and use of pesticides, especially in developing countries where many apply pesticides with little or no use of protective clothing and equipment);
- Shorter growing season (eg, for some cotton growers in India) which allows some farmers to plant a second crop in the same season<sup>60</sup>. Also some Indian cotton growers have reported knock on benefits for bee keepers as fewer bees are now lost to insecticide spraying.

Some of the economic impact studies have attempted to quantify some of these benefits (eg, Yorobe J (2004): see above). Where identified, these cost savings have been included in the analysis presented above. Nevertheless, it is important to recognise that these largely intangible benefits are considered by many farmers as a primary reason for adoption of GM technology, and in some cases farmers have been willing to adopt for these reasons alone, even when the measurable impacts on yield and direct costs of production suggest marginal or no direct economic gain.

---

<sup>60</sup> Notably maize in India



Since the early 2000s, a number of farmer-survey based studies in the US have also attempted to better quantify these non pecuniary benefits. These studies have usually employed contingent valuation techniques<sup>61</sup> to obtain farmers' valuations of non pecuniary benefits. A summary of these findings is shown in Table 32.

**Table 32: Values of non pecuniary benefits associated with GM crops in the US**

Survey	Median value (\$/hectare)
2002 IR (to rootworm) corn growers survey	7.41
2002 soybean (HT) farmers survey	12.35
2003 HT cropping survey (corn, cotton & soybeans) – North Carolina	24.71
2006 HT (flex) cotton survey <sup>62</sup>	12.35 (relative to first generation HT cotton)


Source: Marra & Piggott (2006)<sup>11</sup> and (2007)<sup>21</sup>

#### *Aggregating the impact to US crops 1996-2011*

The approach used to estimate the non pecuniary benefits derived by US farmers from biotech crops over the period 1996-2011 has been to draw on the values identified by Marra and Piggott (2006 & 2007: Table 32) and to apply these to the GM crop planted areas during this 16 year period. Figure 14 summarises the values for non pecuniary benefits derived from GM crops in the US (1996-2011) and shows an estimated (nominal value) benefit of \$1,030 million in 2011 and a cumulative total benefit (1996-2011) of \$8.98 billion. Relative to the value of direct farm income benefits presented above, the non pecuniary benefits were equal to 12% of the total direct income benefits in 2011 and 20.5% of the total cumulative (1996-2011) direct farm income. This highlights the important contribution this category of benefit has had on biotech trait adoption levels in the US, especially where the direct farm income benefits have been identified to be relatively small (eg, HT cotton).

<sup>61</sup> Survey based method of obtaining valuations of non market goods that aims to identify willingness to pay for specific goods (eg, environmental goods, peace of mind, etc) or willingness to pay to avoid something being lost

<sup>62</sup> Additionally cited by Marra & Piggott (2007) in 'The net gains to cotton farmers of a natural refuge plan for Bollgard II cotton', Agbioforum 10, 1, 1-10. [www.agbioforum.org](http://www.agbioforum.org)

**Figure 14: Non pecuniary benefits derived by US farmers 1996-2011 by trait (\$ million)***Estimating the impact in other countries*

It is evident from the literature review that GM technology-using farmers in other countries also value the technology for a variety of non pecuniary/intangible reasons. The most appropriate methodology for identifying these non pecuniary benefit valuations in other countries would be to repeat the type of US farmer-surveys in other countries. Unfortunately, the authors are not aware of any such studies having been undertaken to date.

**3.10 GM technology adoption and size of farm**

This issue has been specifically examined in few pieces of research. Examples include:

- Fernandez-Cornejo & McBride (2000) examined the effect of size on adoption of GM crops in the US (using 1998 data). The a priori hypothesis used for the analysis was that the nature of the technology embodied in a variable input like seed (which is completely divisible and not a 'lumpy' input like machinery) should show that adoption of GM crops is not related to size. The analysis found that mean adoption rates appeared to increase with size of operation for herbicide tolerant crops (soybeans and maize) up to 50 hectares in size and then were fairly stable, whilst for GM IR maize, adoption rates appeared to increase with size. This analysis did not, however, take into consideration other factors affecting adoption such as education, awareness of new technology and willingness to adopt, income, access to credit and whether a farm was full or part time – all these are considered to affect adoption yet are also often correlated to size of farm. Overall, the study suggested that farm size has not been an important factor influencing adoption of GM crops;
- Brookes (2003) identified that in Spain the average size of farm adopting GM IR maize was 50 hectares and that many were much smaller than this (under 20 hectares). Size was not therefore considered to be an important factor affecting adoption, with many small farm using the technology;

- Brookes (2005) also identified in Romania that the average size of farm adopting HT soybeans was not related to farm size;
- Pray et al (2002). This research into GM IR cotton adoption in China illustrated that adoption has been mostly by small farmers (the average cotton grower in China plants between 0.3 and 0.5 ha of cotton);
- Adopters of insect resistant cotton and maize in South Africa have been drawn from both large and small farm (see Morse et al 2004, Ismael et al 2002, Gouse (2006));
- In 2007, there were 3.8 million farmers growing GM IR cotton in India, with an average farm-size of about 1.6 hectares (Manjunath (2008)).

Overall, the findings from most studies examining size of adopting farms has shown that size of farm has not been a factor affecting use of crop biotechnology. Both large and small farms have adopted. Size of operation has not been a barrier to adoption and, in 2010, 15.4 million farmers were using the technology globally, 90% of which were resource-poor farmers in developing countries.

### 3.11 Production effects of the technology

Based on the yield assumptions used in the direct farm income benefit calculations presented above (see Appendix 1) and taking into account the second soybean crop facilitation in South America, GM crops have added important volumes to global production of maize, cotton, canola and soybeans (Table 33).

**Table 33: Additional crop production arising from positive yield effects of GM crops**

	1996-2011 additional production (million tonnes)	2011 additional production (million tonnes)
Soybeans	110.2	12.74
Maize	195.0	34.54
Cotton	15.85	2.48
Canola	6.55	0.44
Sugar beet	0.45	0.13

Note: GM HT sugar beet only in the US and Canada, since 2008


The GM IR traits, used in maize and cotton, have accounted for 97.3% of the additional maize production and 99.4% of the additional cotton production. Positive yield impacts from the use of this technology have occurred in all user countries (except for GM IR cotton in Australia<sup>63</sup>) when compared to average yields derived from crops using conventional technology (such as application of insecticides and seed treatments). The average yield impact across the total area planted to these traits over the 16 years since 1996 has been +10.1% for maize and +15.8% for cotton (Figure 15).

As indicated earlier, the primary impact of GM HT technology has been to provide more cost effective (less expensive) and easier weed control, as opposed to improving yields. The improved weed control has, nevertheless, delivered higher yields in some countries. The main

<sup>63</sup> This reflects the levels of *Heliothis* and *Helicoverpa* (boll and bud worm) pest control previously obtained with intensive insecticide use. The main benefit and reason for adoption of this technology in Australia has arisen from significant cost savings (on insecticides) and the associated environmental gains from reduced insecticide use

source of additional production from this technology has been via the facilitation of no tillage production systems, shortening the production cycle, and how it has enabled many farmers in South America to plant a crop of soybeans immediately after a wheat crop in the same growing season. This second crop, additional to traditional soybean production, has added 106.4 million tonnes to soybean production in Argentina and Paraguay between 1996 and 2011 (accounting for 96.6% of the total GM-related additional soybean production).

**Figure 15: Average yield gains GM IR crops (cotton and maize) 1996-2011**



Notes: IRCB = Insect resistance to corn boring pests, IRCRW = Insect resistance to corn rootworm

### 3.12 Trade flows and related issues

#### a) Share of global exports

Looking at the extent to which the leading GM producing countries are traders (exporters) of these crops and key derivatives (and Table 35) show the following:

- Soybeans:** in 2011/12, 38% of global production was exported and 98% of this trade came from countries which grow GM HT soybeans. As there has been some development of a market for certified conventional soybeans and derivatives (mostly in the EU, Japan and South Korea), this has necessitated some segregation of (certified) non GM /conventional exports from supplies that may contain GM origin material, or sourcing from countries where GM HT soybeans are not grown. Based on estimates of the size of the certified non GM/conventional soy markets in the EU and SE Asia (the main markets)<sup>64</sup>, 3% of global trade in soybeans is probably required to be certified as conventional, and if it is assumed that this volume of soybeans traded is segregated from supplies that may

<sup>64</sup> Brookes (2008b) and updated from industry sources and own research

- contain GM soybeans, then the GM share of global trade is 96.7%. A similar pattern occurs in soymeal, where 86% of globally traded meal probably contains GM material;
- *Maize*: 12% of global production was internationally traded in 2011/12<sup>65</sup>. Within the leading exporting nations, the GM maize growers of the US, Argentina, Brazil, South Africa and Canada are important players (% of global trade). As there has been some limited development of a distinct market which requires certified conventional maize (mostly in the EU, and to a lesser extent in Japan and South Korea), this has necessitated some segregation of exports into GM versus certified conventional supplies. The likely share of global trade accounted for by GM maize exports is about 68%;
  - *Cotton*: in 2011/12, 37% of global production was traded internationally. Of the leading exporting nations, the GM cotton growing countries of the US, Australia, India, Pakistan, Brazil and Burkina Faso are prominent exporters accounting for 71.5% of global trade. Given that the market for certified conventional cotton is very small, virtually all of this share of global cotton trade from GM cotton growing countries is probably not subject to any form of segregation and hence may contain GM derived material<sup>66</sup>. In terms of cottonseed meal the GM share of global trade is 63%;
  - *Canola*: 21% of global canola production in 2011/12 was exported, with Canada being the main global trading country. The share of global canola exports accounted for by the three GM HT canola producing countries (Canada, the US and Australia) was 76% in 2011/12. As there has been only a very small development of a market for certified conventional canola globally (the EU, the main market where certified conventional products are required, has been largely self sufficient in canola and does not currently grow GM canola), non segregated GM exports from Canada/US probably account for 76% of global trade. For canola/rapemeal, the GM share of global trade is about 63%.

**Table 34: Share of global crop trade accounted for GM production 2011/12 (million tonnes)**

	Soybeans	Maize	Cotton	Canola
Global production	238	883.5	27.0	61.6
Global trade (exports)	90.4	103.4	10.0	13.0
Share of global trade from GM producers	88.6 (98%)	70.0 (67.7%)	7.15 (71.5%)	9.9 (76%)
Estimated size of market requiring certified conventional (in countries that have import requirements)	3.0	4.4	Negligible	Negligible
Estimated share of global trade that may contain GM (ie, not required to be segregated)	87.4	70.0	71.5	9.9
Share of global trade that may be GM	96.7%	67.7%	71.5%	76%

Sources: derived from and updated - USDA & Oil World statistics, Brookes (2008b)

Notes: Estimated size of market requiring certified conventional in countries with import requirements excludes countries with markets for certified conventional for which all requirements are satisfied by domestic production (eg, maize in the EU). Estimated size of certified conventional market for soybeans

<sup>65</sup> Maize is an important subsistence crop in many parts of the world and hence the majority of production is consumed within the country of production

<sup>66</sup> We consider this to be a reasonable assumption; we are not aware of any significant development of a certified conventional versus biotech cotton market and hence there is little evidence of any active segregation of exports

(based primarily on demand for derivatives used mostly in the food industry): EU 2.0 million tonnes bean equivalents, Japan and South Korea 1 million tonnes.

**Table 35: Share of global crop derivative (meal) trade accounted for GM production 2011/12 (million tonnes)**

	<b>Soymeal</b>	<b>Cottonseed meal</b>	<b>Canola/rape meal</b>
Global production	179.4	15.6	35.8
Global trade (exports)	58.6	0.5	5.4
Share of global trade from GM producers	50.4 (86%)	0.25 (50%)	3.4 (63%)
Estimated size of market requiring certified conventional (in countries that have import requirements)	2.0	Negligible	Negligible
Estimated share of global trade that may contain GM (ie, not required to be segregated)	50.4	0.25	3.4
Share of global trade that may be GM	86%	50%	63%

Sources: derived from and updated - USDA & Oil World statistics, Brookes (2008b)

Notes: Estimated size of certified conventional market for soymeal: EU 1.9 million tonnes, Japan and South Korea 0.1 million tonnes (derived largely from certified conventional beans referred to in above table)

## 4 The environmental impact of GM crops

This section examines the environmental impact of using GM crops over the last sixteen years. The two key aspects of environmental impact explored are:

- a. Impact on insecticide and herbicide use.
- b. Impact on carbon emissions.

These are presented in the sub-sections below.

### 4.1 Use of insecticides and herbicides

Assessment of the impact of GM crops on insecticide and herbicide use requires comparisons of the respective weed and pest control measures used on GM versus the 'conventional alternative' form of production. This presents a number of challenges relating to availability and representativeness.

Comparison data ideally derives from farm level surveys which collect usage data on the different forms of production. A search of the literature on insecticide or herbicide use change with GM crops shows that the number of studies exploring these issues is limited with even fewer, providing data to the pesticide (active ingredient) level. Secondly, national level pesticide usage survey data is also extremely limited; in fact there are no published, detailed, annual pesticide usage surveys conducted by national authorities in any of the countries currently growing GM crop traits. The only country in which pesticide usage data is collected (by private market research companies) on an annual basis, and which allows a comparison between GM and conventional crops to be made, is the US<sup>67</sup>.

Even where national pesticide use survey data is available, it may be of limited value. A reasonable estimate of the amount of herbicide or insecticide usage changes that have occurred with GM crop technology, requires an assessment of what herbicides/insecticides might reasonably be expected to be used in the absence of crop biotechnology on the relevant crops (ie, if the entire crops used non GM production methods). Applying usage rates for the current (remaining) conventional crops is one approach, however, this invariably provides significant under-estimates of what usage might reasonably be in the absence of crop biotechnology, because the conventional cropping dataset used to identify pesticide use relates to a relatively small share of total crop area. This has been the case, for example, in respect of the US maize, canola, cotton and soybean crops for many years. Thus in 2011, the conventional share (not using GM HT technology) of each crop was only 6%, 28%, 27% and 2% respectively for soybeans, maize, cotton<sup>68</sup> and canola, with the conventional share having been below 50% of the total since 1999 in respect of soybeans, since 2001 for cotton and canola, and since 2007 for maize. The reasons why this conventional cropping dataset is unrepresentative of the levels of herbicide/insecticide use that might reasonably be expected in the absence of biotechnology include:

<sup>67</sup> The US Department of Agriculture also conducts pesticide usage surveys but these are not conducted on an annual basis (eg, the last time maize was included was 2010 and previous to this in 2005) and do not disaggregate usage by production type (GM versus conventional)

<sup>68</sup> Source: USDA. Note the conventional share refers to not using GM HT technology, with some of the 'conventional crops' using crop biotechnology-traited seed providing GM insect resistance only. Also, the private market research dataset suggests that the proportion of the US maize and cotton crops not using GM HT technology in 2011 is smaller at 10% in both the maize and cotton crops

- Whilst the degree of pest/weed problems/damage vary by year, region and within region, farmers who continue to farm conventionally may be those with relatively low levels of pest/weed problems, and hence see little, if any, economic benefit from using the GM traits targeted at minimal pest/weed problems. Their insecticide/herbicide usage levels therefore tend to be below the levels that would reasonably be expected on an average farm with more typical pest/weed infestations;
- Some of the farms continuing to use conventional seed generally use extensive, low intensity production methods (including organic) which feature limited (below average) use of herbicides/insecticides. The usage patterns of this sub-set of growers is therefore likely to understate usage for the majority of farmers if they all returned to farming without the use of GM technology;
- The widespread adoption of GM IR technology has resulted in 'area-wide' suppression of target pests such as stalk borers in maize crops. As a result, conventional farmers (eg, of maize in the US) have benefited from this lower level of pest infestation and the associated reduced need to conduct insecticide treatments;
- Some of the farmers using GM traits have experienced improvements in pest/weed control from using this technology relative to the conventional control methods previously used. If these farmers were to now revert to using conventional techniques, it is likely that most would wish to maintain the levels of pest/weed control delivered with use of the GM traits and therefore some would use higher levels of insecticide/herbicide than they did in the pre GM crop days. This argument can, however, be countered by the constraining influence on farm level pesticide usage that comes from the cost of pesticides and their application. Ultimately the decision to use more pesticide or not would be made at the farm level according to individual assessment of the potential benefits (from higher yields) compared to the cost of additional pesticide use.

This problem of poor representativeness of the small conventional dataset has been addressed, firstly by using the average recorded values for insecticide/herbicide usage on conventional crops for years only when the conventional crop accounted for the majority of the total crop and, secondly, in other years (eg, from 1999 for soybeans, from 2001 for cotton and from 2007 for maize in the US) applying estimates of the likely usage if the whole US crop was no longer using crop biotechnology, based on opinion from extension and industry advisors across the US as to what farmers might reasonably be expected to use in terms of weed control practices and usage levels of insecticide/herbicide. In addition, the usage levels identified from this methodology were cross checked (and subject to adjustment) against historic average usage levels of key herbicide and insecticide active ingredients from the private market research dataset so as to minimise the scope for overstating likely usage levels on the conventional alternative. Overall, this approach has been applied in other countries where pesticide usage data is available, though more commonly, because of the paucity of available data, the analysis relies more on extension/advisor opinion and knowledge of actual and potential pesticide use.

This methodology has been used by others. It also has the advantage of providing comparisons of current crop protection practices on both GM crops and the conventional alternatives and so takes into account dynamic changes in crop protection management practices and technologies rather than making comparisons solely on past practices. Details of how this methodology has been applied to the 2011 calculations, sources used for each trait/country combination examined



and examples of typical conventional versus GM pesticide applications are provided in Appendices 1 and 2.

The most common way in which environmental impact associated with pesticide use changes with GM crops has been presented in the literature has been in terms of the volume (quantity) of pesticide applied. However, whilst the amount of pesticide applied to a crop is one way of trying to measure the environmental impact of pesticide use, this is not a good measure of environmental impact because the toxicity of each pesticide is not directly related to the amount (weight) applied. For example, the environmental impact of applying one kg of dioxin to a crop or land is far more toxic than applying 1 kg of salt. There exist alternative (and better) measures that have been used by a number of authors of peer reviewed papers to assess the environmental impact of pesticide use change with GM crops rather than simply looking at changes in the volume of active ingredient applied to crops. In particular, there are a number of peer reviewed papers that utilise the Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ) developed at Cornell University by Kovach et al (1992) and updated annually. This effectively integrates the various environmental impacts of individual pesticides into a single 'field value per hectare'. The EIQ value is multiplied by the amount of pesticide active ingredient (ai) used per hectare to produce a field EIQ value. For example, the EIQ rating for glyphosate is 15.33. By using this rating multiplied by the amount of glyphosate used per hectare (eg, a hypothetical example of 1.1 kg applied per ha), the field EIQ value for glyphosate would be equivalent to 16.86/ha. The EIQ indicator used is therefore a comparison of the field EIQ/ha for conventional versus GM crop production systems, with the total environmental impact or load of each system, a direct function of respective field EIQ/ha values and the area planted to each type of production (GM versus conventional). The use of environmental indicators is commonly used by researchers and the EIQ indicator has been, for example, cited by Brimner et al (2004) in a study comparing the environmental impacts of GM and conventional canola and by Kleiter et al (2005). The EIQ indicator provides an improved assessment of the impact of GM crops on the environment when compared to only examining changes in volume of active ingredient applied, because it draws on some of the key toxicity and environmental exposure data related to individual products, as applicable to impacts on farm workers, consumers and ecology.

In this paper, the EIQ indicator is used in conjunction with examining changes in the volume of pesticide active ingredient applied. Readers should, however, note that the EIQ is an indicator only (largely of toxicity) and does not take into account all environmental issues and impacts. It is therefore not a comprehensive indicator.

Detailed examples of the relevant amounts of active ingredient used and their associated field EIQ values for GM versus conventional crops for the year 2011 are presented in Appendix 4.

#### **4.1.1 GM herbicide tolerant (to glyphosate) soybeans (GM HT)**

##### *a) The USA*

In examining the impact on herbicide usage in the US, two main sources of information have been drawn on: USDA (NASS) national pesticide usage data and GfK Kynetec (private market research sector) national farm survey-based pesticide usage data. Based on these sources of information, the main features relating to herbicide usage on US soybeans over the last sixteen years have been (Table 36 and Table 37):

- The average amount of herbicide active ingredient (ai) used per hectare on the US soybean crop has been fairly stable for the period to 2006, but has increased over the last five years;
- The average field EIQ/ha load has followed a broadly similar pattern of change as the amount of active ingredient used, although the rate of increase in recent years has been less significant than the rate of increase in active ingredient use;
- A comparison of conventionally grown soybeans (per ha) with GM HT soybeans (Table 37) shows that herbicide ai use on conventional soybeans has also followed a similar pattern of change to GM HT soybeans. Initially usage was fairly stable (at around 1.1 to 1.3kg/ha compared to 1.3 to 1.4kg/ha for GM HT soybeans). Since 2006, the average amount of herbicide active ingredient applied to conventional soybeans has followed the same upward path as usage on GM HT soybeans. The increased usage of herbicides on GM HT soybeans partly reflects the increasing incidence of weed resistance to glyphosate that has occurred in recent years (see section 4.1.8 for additional discussion). This has been attributed to how glyphosate was used; because of its broad-spectrum post-emergence activity, it was often used as the sole method of weed control. This approach to weed control put tremendous selection pressure on weeds and as a result contributed to the evolution of weed populations predominated by resistant individual weeds. In addition, the facilitating role of the technology in the adoption of no and reduced tillage production techniques, has also probably contributed to the emergence of weeds resistant to herbicides like glyphosate and to weed shifts towards those weed species that are inherently not well controlled by glyphosate. A few of the glyphosate resistant species, such as marestail (*Conyza canadensis*) and palmer pigweed (*Amaranthus palmeri*) are now reasonably widespread in the US.

Growers of GM HT crops in the US are increasingly being advised to be more proactive and include other herbicides (with different and complementary modes of action) in combination with glyphosate (and in some cases reverting back to ploughing) in their integrated weed management systems, even where instances of weed resistance to glyphosate have not been found.

This proactive, diversified approach to weed management is therefore the principal strategy for avoiding the emergence of herbicide resistant weeds in GM HT crops. A proactive weed management programme also generally requires less herbicide, has a better environmental profile and is more economical than a reactive weed management programme.

At the macro level, the adoption of both reactive and proactive weed management programmes in GM HT crops has already begun to influence the mix, total amount and overall environmental profile of herbicides applied to GM HT soybeans (and to cotton, corn and canola). This is shown in the evidence relating to changes in herbicide use, as illustrated in Table 36 and Table 37. Thus, in 2011, just over 50% of the GM HT soybean crop received an additional herbicide treatment of one of the following active

ingredients<sup>69</sup> 2,4-D, chlorimuron, flumioxazin and fomesafen. This compares with 15% of the GM HT soybean crop receiving a treatment of one of these four herbicide active ingredients in 2006. As a result, the average amount of herbicide active ingredient applied to the GM HT soybean crop in the US (per hectare) increased by about 35% over this period. This compared with the average amount of herbicide active ingredient applied to the conventional (non GM) soybean alternative which increased by 45% over the same period. The increase in the use of herbicides on conventional soybeans in the US can also be partly attributed to the on-going development of weed resistance to non-glyphosate herbicides commonly used and highlights that the development of weed resistance to herbicides is a problem faced by all farmers, regardless of production method (also see section 4.1.8 for more detailed discussion of weed resistance issues);

- A comparison of average field EIQs/ha also shows fairly stable values for both conventional and GM HT soybean crops for most of the period to the mid 2000s, followed by increases in recent years. The average load rating for GM HT soybean crops has been lower than the average load rating for conventional soybeans for most of the period, 2008-2011 excepted, despite the continued shift to no/low tillage production systems that rely much more on herbicide-based weed control than conventional tillage systems and the adoption of reactive and proactive weed resistance management programmes. Since 2006, the average field EIQ/ha ratings on GM HT soybean and conventional soybean crops have increased by about 39% (on both production systems).

**Table 36: Herbicide usage on soybeans in the US 1996-2011**

Year	Average ai use (kg/ha): NASS data	Average ai use: GfK Kynetec data: index 1998=100	Average field EIQ/ha: NASS data	Average field EIQ/ha: based on GfK Kynetec data
1996	1.02	N/a	22.0	N/a
1997	1.22	N/a	26.2	N/a
1998	1.09	100	21.5	25.8
1999	1.05	94.9	19.6	23.2
2000	1.09	96.0	20.2	23.1
2001	0.73	100.1	13.4	23.5
2002	1.23	97.8	21.4	21.6
2003	N/a	104.7	N/a	22.6
2004	1.29	106.1	15.2	22.6
2005	1.23	106.3	20.2	22.6
2006	1.53	101.3	16.9	21.4
2007	N/a	113.0	N/a	23.6
2008	N/a	125.1	N/a	26.1
2009	N/a	125.7	N/a	26.6
2010	N/a	135.0	N/a	28.8
2011	N/a	144.8	N/a	31.3

Sources: NASS data no collection of data in 2003, 2007-2011. GfK Kynetec 1998-2011, N/A = not available. Average ai/ha figures derived from GfK dataset are not permitted by GfK to be published

<sup>69</sup> The four most used herbicide active ingredients used on soybeans after glyphosate (source: derived from GfK Kynetec)

**Table 37: Herbicide usage on GM HT and conventional soybeans in the US 1996-2011**

Year	Average ai use (kg/ha) index 1998=100: conventional	Average ai use (kg/ha) index 1998=100: GM HT	Average field EIQ/ha: conventional	Average field EIQ/ha: GM HT
1996	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
1997	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
1998	100	100	28.0	21.8
1999	90.3	98.3	25.6	21.4
2000	86.6	100.6	24.4	22.0
2001	91.6	103.0	25.9	22.6
2002	85.2	100.6	24.1	21.1
2003	83.6	107.7	23.5	22.4
2004	84.2	108.8	23.6	22.5
2005	86.2	108.6	23.6	22.5
2006	79.5	102.9	21.3	21.3
2007	90.5	114.4	24.6	23.5
2008	95.1	126.7	25.3	26.1
2009	94.7	127.8	24.4	26.6
2010	97.3	137.9	26.4	28.9
2011	115.7	147.0	29.6	31.4

Source: derived from GfK Kynetec, N/A = not available, NASS data does not differentiate between GM and conventional crops and therefore cannot be used as a source for this comparison. Average ai/ha figures derived from GfK dataset are not permitted by GfK to be published

- The comparison data between the GM HT crop and the conventional alternative presented in section 4.1 is, however, of limited value. A reasonable estimate of the amount of herbicide usage changes that have occurred with GM HT crop technology, requires an assessment of what herbicides might reasonably be expected to be used in the absence of crop biotechnology (ie, if the entire US soybean crop was conventional). Applying usage rates for the current (remaining) conventional crops is one approach, as presented in the analysis above. However, this invariably provides significant under estimates of what usage might reasonably be in the absence of crop biotechnology, because the conventional cropping dataset used to identify pesticide use relates to a relatively small share of total crop area. This has been the case for the US soybean crops for many years, thus in 2011, the conventional share (not using GM HT technology) of soybeans was only 6%, with the conventional share having been below 50% of the total since 1999. The reasons why this conventional cropping dataset is unrepresentative of the levels of herbicide use that might reasonably be expected in the absence of biotechnology include:
  - i. Whilst the degree of weed problems/damage vary by year, region and within region, farmers who continue to farm conventionally may be those with relatively low levels of weed problems, and hence see little, if any, economic benefit from using the GM HT traits targeted at minimal weed problems. Their herbicide usage levels therefore tend to be below the levels that would reasonably be expected on an average farm with more typical weed infestations;
  - ii. Some of the farms continuing to use conventional seed generally use extensive, low intensity production methods (including organic) which feature limited (below

- average) use of herbicides. The usage patterns of this sub-set of growers is therefore likely to understate usage for the majority of farmers if they all returned to farming without the use of GM HT technology;
- iii. Some of the farmers using GM HT traits have experienced improvements in weed control from using this technology relative to the conventional control methods previously used. If these farmers were to now revert to using conventional techniques, it is likely that most would wish to maintain the levels of weed control delivered with use of the GM HT traits and therefore some would use higher levels of herbicide than they did in the pre GM HT crop days.

In addition, the use of no/low tillage production systems also tends to be less prominent amongst conventional soybean growers compared to GM HT growers. As such, the average herbicide ai/ha and EIQ/ha values recorded for all remaining conventional soybean growers tends to fall and be lower than the average would have been had all growers still been using conventional technology. The approach used to address this deficiency has been to make comparisons between typical weed control programmes for GM HT soybeans (designed to both reactively and proactively address weed resistance issues) and recorded (average) herbicide treatment regimes for GM HT soybeans, with typical herbicide treatment regimes for an average conventional soybean grower that would deliver a similar level of weed control to the level delivered in the GM HT system. This is a methodology used by others, for example, Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006) and Johnson & Strom (2008). Based on this approach, information collected by these analysts<sup>70</sup> and updated as part of this research for 2009 to 2011, the respective values for conventional soybeans in the last five years are shown in Table 38. These usage levels were then compared to typical and recommended weed control regimes for GM HT soybeans and recorded usage levels on the GM HT crop (which accounted for over 90% of the total crop since 2007), using the dataset from GfK Kynetec.

**Table 38: Average ai use and field EIQs for conventional soybeans 2006-2011 to deliver equal efficacy to GM HT soybeans**

Year	Ai use (kg/ha)	Field eiq/ha
2006	1.48	36.2
2007	1.60	33.1
2008	1.62	36.2
2009	1.66	42.7
2010	1.77	46.1
2011	2.14	44.0

Sources: Sankala & Blumenthal (2006), Johnson & Strom (2008) and updated for this research for 2009-2011, including drawing on GfK Kynetec usage data

Through this (most representative) comparison of conventional versus GM HT soybean herbicide usage, the estimated national level changes in herbicide use and the environmental impact associated with the adoption of GM HT soybeans<sup>71</sup> (Table 39) shows:

<sup>70</sup> That was based on consultations with extension advisors in over 50 US states

<sup>71</sup> The approach compares the level of herbicide use (herbicide ai use and field EIQ/ha values) on the respective areas planted to conventional and GM HT soybeans in each year by comparing actual usage on the GM HT crop with the level of herbicide use that

- In 2011, there was a small net decrease in herbicide ai use of 5.5% (3.35 million kg). The EIQ load was significantly lower by 17% compared with the conventional (no/low tillage) alternative (ie, if all of the US soybean crop had been planted to conventional soybeans);
- Cumulatively since 1996, there have been savings in both active ingredient use and the associated environmental impact (as measured by the EIQ indicator) of 4.2% (-30 million kg) in active ingredient usage and -26% for the field EIQ load.

**Table 39: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT soybeans in the US 1996-2011**

Year	ai decrease (kg)	eiq saving (units)	% decrease in ai	% eiq saving
1996	-92,867	7,244,793	-0.32%	0.76%
1997	-611,373	47,694,918	-1.90%	4.56%
1998	-117,766	177,331,355	-0.32%	16.49%
1999	3,605,828	253,779,872	8.11%	23.05%
2000	3,460,138	270,441,757	7.70%	24.31%
2001	3,548,361	318,296,972	7.94%	28.76%
2002	4,613,517	383,788,976	10.48%	35.21%
2003	2,573,857	371,919,023	5.82%	33.93%
2004	2,447,592	392,372,051	5.43%	35.12%
2005	2,288,990	387,196,464	5.34%	36.33%
2006	4,221,167	403,620,297	9.30%	36.52%
2007	2,812,022	225,044,694	6.83%	26.40%
2008	-277,900	279,172,655	-0.57%	25.56%
2009	408,283	451,128,959	0.79%	34.20%
2010	-2,177,969	502,228,028	-4.05%	34.55%
2011	3,357,894	198,449,355	5.53%	17.17%

*b) Canada*

The analysis of impact in Canada is based on comparisons of typical herbicide regimes used for GM HT and conventional soybeans and identification of the main herbicides that are no longer used since GM HT soybeans have been adopted<sup>72</sup>. Details of these are presented in Appendix 3. Overall, this identifies:

- Up to 2006, an average ai/ha and field EIQ value/ha for GM HT soybeans of 0.9 kg/ha and 13.8/ha respectively, compared to conventional soybeans with 1.43 kg/ha of ai and a field EIQ/ha of 34.2;
- Post 2006, the same values for conventional with 1.32 kg/ai and a field EIQ/ha of 20.88 for GM HT soybeans.

Based on these values, at the national level<sup>73</sup>, in 2011, there was a net decrease in the volume of active ingredient used of 5.5% (-112,125 kg) and a 28% decrease in associated environmental

---

would reasonably be expected to be applied if this crop reverted to conventional production systems (non GM) and achieved the same level of weed control as delivered in the GM HT system

<sup>72</sup> Sources: George Morris Center (2004) and the (periodically) updated Ontario Weed Control Guide

<sup>73</sup> Savings calculated by comparing the ai use and EIQ load if all of the crop was planted to a conventional (non GM) crop relative to the ai and EIQ levels on the actual areas of GM and non GM crops in each year

impact (as measured by the EIQ indicator: Table 40). Cumulatively since 1997, there has been a 8.5% saving in active ingredient use (2.2 million kg) and a 21.5% saving in field EIQ/ha indicator value.

**Table 40: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT soybeans in Canada 1997-2011**

Year	ai saving (kg)	eiq saving (units)	% decrease in ai (- = increase)	% eiq saving
1997	530	20,408	0.03	
1998	25,973	1,000,094	1.85	0.06
1999	106,424	4,097,926	7.41	2.98
2000	112,434	4,329,353	7.41	11.93
2001	169,955	6,544,233	11.12	17.90
2002	230,611	8,879,827	15.75	25.36
2003	276,740	10,656,037	18.53	29.83
2004	351,170	13,522,035	20.38	32.82
2005	373,968	14,399,885	22.24	35.80
2006	84,130	10,191,227	4.85	24.54
2007	75,860	9,167,500	4.49	22.71
2008	96,800	11,726,000	5.63	28.52
2009	103,374	12,521,832	5.23	26.49
2010	113,729	13,776,201	5.38	27.27
2011	122,126	14,793,393	5.54	28.05

*c) Brazil*

Drawing on herbicide usage data from AMIS Global and Kleffmann, plus information from industry and extension advisers, the annual average use of herbicide active ingredient per ha in the early years of GM HT adoption was estimated to be a difference of 0.22kg/ha (ie, GM HT soybeans used 0.22 kg/ha less of herbicide active ingredient) and resulted in a net saving of 15.62 field EIQ/ha units. More recent data on herbicide usage, however, suggests a change in herbicide regimes used in both systems, partly due to changes in herbicide availability, prices, increasing adoption of reduced/no tillage production practices (in both conventional and GM HT soybeans) and weed resistance issues. As a result, estimated values for the respective systems in 2011 (see Appendix 3) were:

- An average active ingredient use of 2.91 kg/ha for GM HT soybeans compared to 2.39 kg/ha for conventional soybeans;
- The average field EIQ/ha value for the two production systems were 40.77/ha for GM HT soybeans compared to 37.39/ha for conventional soybeans<sup>74</sup>.

Based on the above herbicide usage data, (Table 41):

- In 2011, the total herbicide active ingredient use and total field EIQ/ha values were respectively 28% and 11% higher than the conventional counterparts;

<sup>74</sup> Inclusive of herbicides (mostly glyphosate) used in no/low tillage production systems for burndown. Readers should note that this data is based on recorded usage of key actives for the two production systems and does not indicate if equal efficacy to the GM HT system is achieved in the conventional system

- Cumulatively since 1997, there has been a 4% increase in herbicide active ingredient use (28.5 million kg). However, there has been a 2.5% reduction in the environmental impact (263 million field EIQ/ha units).

**Table 41: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT soybeans in Brazil 1997-2011**

Year	ai saving (kg negative sign denotes increase in ai use)	eiq saving (units)	% decrease in ai (- = increase)	% eiq saving
1997	22,333	1,561,667	0.1	0.3
1998	111,667	7,808,333	0.3	1.4
1999	263,533	18,427,667	0.7	3.3
2000	290,333	20,301,667	0.7	3.4
2001	292,790	20,473,450	0.7	3.4
2002	389,145	27,211,105	0.8	3.8
2003	670,000	46,850,000	1.2	5.9
2004	1,116,667	78,083,333	1.7	8.4
2005	2,010,000	140,550,000	2.9	14.4
2006	2,546,000	178,030,000	4.0	19.8
2007	-5,808,563	-45,847,926	-8.8	-4.9
2008	-5,704,705	-45,028,156	-17.6	-8.2
2009	-6,642,000	-54,763,974	-18.7	-9.1
2010	-7,529,650	-62,082,740	-20.0	-10.0
2011	-10,675,990	-69,393,935	-28.2	-10.8

*d) Argentina*

In assessing the changes in herbicide use associated with the adoption of GM HT soybeans in Argentina, it is important to take into consideration the following contextual factors:

- Prior to the first adoption of GM HT soybeans in 1996, 5.9 million ha of soybeans were grown, mostly using conventional tillage systems. The average use of herbicides was limited (1.1 kg ai/ha with an average field EIQ/ha value of 21<sup>75</sup>);
- In 2011, the area planted to soybeans had increased 18.4 million ha. Almost all of this (99%) was planted to varieties containing the GM HT trait, and 90% plus of this area used no/reduced tillage systems that rely more on herbicide-based weed control programmes than conventional tillage systems. 25% of the total crop was also 'second crop soybeans' in 2011/12, which followed on immediately behind a wheat crop in the same season.

The use of herbicides in Argentine soybean production since 1996 has increased, both in terms of the volume of herbicide ai used and the average field EIQ/ha loading. In 2010, the estimated average herbicide ai use was 3.02 kg/ha and the average field EIQ was 47/ha<sup>76</sup>. Given 99% of the total crop is GM HT, these values effectively represent the typical values of use and impact for GM HT soybeans in Argentina.

<sup>75</sup> Derived from GFK Kynetec herbicide usage data

<sup>76</sup> Source: AMIS Global (national herbicide usage data based on farm surveys)



These changes should, however, be assessed within the context of the fundamental changes in tillage systems that have occurred over the 1996-2010 period (some of which may possibly have taken place in the absence of the GM HT technology<sup>77</sup>). Also, the expansion in soybean plantings has included some areas that had previously been considered too weedy for profitable soybean cultivation. This means that comparing current herbicide use patterns with those of 16 years ago is not a reasonably representative comparison of the levels of herbicide use under a GM HT reduced/no tillage production system and a conventional reduced/no tillage soybean production system.

To make a representative comparison of usage of the GM HT crop, with what might reasonably be expected if all of the GM HT crop reverted to conventional soybean production, requires identification of typical herbicide treatment regimes for conventional soybeans that would deliver similar levels of weed control (in a no tillage production system) as achieved in the GM HT system. To do this, we identified a number of alternative conventional treatments in the mid 2000s and again more recently in 2011/12 (see Appendix 3). Based on these, the current GM HT, largely no tillage production system, has a slightly higher volume of herbicide ai use (3.02 kg/ha compared to 2.78 kg/ha) than its conventional no tillage alternative. However, in terms of associated environmental impact, as measured by the EIQ methodology, the GM HT system delivers a 1.8% improvement (GM HT field EIQ of 47/ha compared to 48/ha for conventional no/low tillage soybeans).

At the national level these reductions in herbicide use<sup>78</sup> are equivalent to:

- In 2011, a 7.4% increase in the volume of herbicide ai used (4.4 million kg) but a net 1.8% reduction in the associated environmental impact, as measured by the EIQ indicator (18.4 million EIQ/ha units);
- Cumulatively since 1996, there has been a net reduction in herbicide ai use (due to estimates of earlier comparisons of GM HT versus conventional soybean herbicide usage for the late 1990s and early 2000s) of 1.7% (-4.8 million kg) and the field EIQ load is 11% lower (1,293 million field EIQ/ha units) than the level that might reasonably be expected if the total Argentine soybean area had been planted to conventional cultivars using a no/low tillage production system.

*e) Paraguay*

The analysis presented below for Paraguay is based on AMIS Global usage data for the soybean crop and estimates of conventional alternative equivalents. Based on this, the respective differences for herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT and conventional soybeans in 2011 were:

- Conventional soybeans: average volume of herbicide used 3.03 kg/ha and a field EIQ/ha value of 51.84/ha;
- GM HT soybeans: average volume of herbicide used 3.3 kg/ha and a field EIQ/ha value of 52.7/ha.

<sup>77</sup> It is likely that the trend to increased use of reduced and no till systems would have continued in the absence of GM HT technology. However, the availability of this technology has probably played a major role in facilitating and maintaining reduced and no till systems at levels that would otherwise have not arisen

<sup>78</sup> Based on comparing the current GM HT no till usage with what would reasonably be expected if the same area and tillage system was planted to a conventional (non GM) crop and a similar level of weed control was achieved

Using these values, the level of herbicide ai use and the total EIQ load in 2011 were respectively 26.4% higher in terms of active ingredient use (+0.7 million kg), and higher by 4.2% in terms of associated environmental impact as measured by the EIQ indicator (2.2 million EIQ/ha units). Cumulatively, since 1999, herbicide ai use has been 7.5% higher (1.9 million kg<sup>79</sup>) whilst the associated environmental impact, as measured by the EIQ indicator, was 8.2% lower (ie, despite an increase in active ingredient use, there was a net improvement in environmental impact associated with herbicide use).

*f) Uruguay*

Analysis for Uruguay also draws on AMIS Global data and estimates of the herbicide regime on conventional alternatives that would deliver a level of weed control with equal efficacy to GM HT soybeans. Based on this, the respective values for 2011 were:

- Conventional soybeans: average volume of herbicide used 2.45 kg/ha and a field EIQ/ha value of 43.64/ha;
- GM HT soybeans: average volume of herbicide used 2.49 kg/ha and a field EIQ/ha value of 39.6/ha.

Using these values, the level of herbicide ai use and the total EIQ load in 2011 were respectively 1.6% higher in terms of active ingredient use (+34,700 kg), but lower by 9.2% in terms of associated environmental impact as measured by the EIQ indicator (-5.5 million EIQ/ha units). Cumulatively, since 1999, herbicide ai use has been 2.5% higher (321,000 kg<sup>80</sup>) whilst the associated environmental impact, as measured by the EIQ indicator, was 9.8% lower.

*g) Bolivia*

As no data on herbicide use in Bolivia has been identified, usage values and assumptions for differences in the adjacent country of Paraguay have been used. On this basis, the impact values are as follows:

- In 2011, a 25% increase in the volume of herbicide ai used (260,000 kg) but a net 3.9% reduction in the associated environmental impact, as measured by the EIQ indicator;
- Cumulatively since 2005, there has been a net increase in herbicide ai use of 10% (+593,000 kg) but a net reduction in the field EIQ load of 5%.

*h) Romania*

Romania joined the EU at the beginning of 2007 and therefore was no longer officially permitted to grow GM HT soybeans. The analysis below therefore refers to the period 1999-2006. Based on herbicide usage data for the years 2000-2003 from Brookes (2005), the adoption of GM HT soybeans in Romania has resulted in a small net increase in the volume of herbicide active ingredient applied, but a net reduction in the EIQ load. More specifically:

- The average volume of herbicide ai applied has increased by 0.09 kg/ha to 1.35 kg/ha;
- The average field EIQ/ha has decreased from 23/ha for conventional soybeans to 21/ha for GM HT soybeans.

<sup>79</sup> Up to 2006, estimated ai use was slightly higher for conventional relative to GM HT soybeans by 0.03 kg/ha

<sup>80</sup> Up to 2006, estimated ai use was slightly higher for conventional relative to GM HT soybeans by 0.03 kg/ha

This data has been used as the base for analysis of the environmental impact associated with herbicide use up to 2003. For the period 2003 to 2006, this has been updated by herbicide usage data from AMIS Global. Accordingly, in 2006, the average amount of herbicide active ingredient applied to the GM HT soybean crop was 0.87 kg/ha (field EIQ/ha of 13.03) compared to 0.99 kg/ha for conventional soybeans (field EIQ/ha of 19.09). Overall, during the 1999-2006 period, the total volume of herbicide ai use was 2% higher (equal to about 15,600 kg) than the level of use if the crop had been all non GM since 1999 but the field EIQ load had fallen by 11%.

With the banning of planting of GM HT soybeans in 2007, there has been a net negative environmental impact associated with herbicide use on the subsequent Romanian soybean crop, as farmers will have had to resort to conventional chemistry to control weeds. Based on AMIS Global herbicide usage data for 2011, when the entire crop was conventional, the average amount of herbicide active ingredient applied per ha had increased by 80% and the average field EIQ/ha rating by 95% relative to 2006 usage levels on GM HT soybeans. This points to a significant deterioration in the environmental impact associated with herbicide usage on soybeans since the GM HT technology was banned from usage.

*i) South Africa*

GM HT soybeans have been grown in South Africa since 2000 (401,000 ha in 2011). Analysis of impact on herbicide use and the associated environmental impact of these crops (based on AMIS Global data and typical herbicide treatment regimes for GM HT soybeans and conventional soybeans: see Appendix 3) shows the following:

- Since 1999, the total volume of herbicide ai use has been 11.7% higher (equal to about 290,000 kg of ai) than the level of use if the crop had been conventional;
- The field EIQ load has fallen by 10.3% (equal to 8.7 million field EIQ/ha units) since 1999 (in 2010 the EIQ load was 8.2% lower).

*j) Summary of impact*

Across all of the countries that have adopted GM HT soybeans since 1996, the net impact on herbicide use and the associated environmental impact<sup>81</sup> has been (Figure 16):


- In 2011, a 7.5% increase in the total volume of herbicide ai applied (12.5 million kg) but a 5.5% reduction in the environmental impact (measured in terms of the field EIQ/ha load);
- Since 1996, 0.6% less herbicide ai has been used (12.5 million kg) and the environmental impact applied to the soybean crop has fallen by 15.5%.

It should be noted that this analysis takes into consideration changes in herbicide use, in recent years, on GM HT soybeans, that have occurred to specifically address the issue of weed resistance to glyphosate in some regions. Compared to five years ago, the amount of herbicide active ingredient applied and number of herbicides used with GM HT soybeans in many regions has increased, and the associated environmental profile, as measured by the EIQ indicator, deteriorated. However, relative to the conventional alternative, the environmental profile of GM

<sup>81</sup> Relative to the expected herbicide usage if all of the GM HT area had been planted to conventional varieties, using the same tillage system (largely no/low till) and delivering an equal level of weed control to that obtained under the GM HT system

HT soybean crop use has continued to offer important advantages<sup>82</sup> and in most cases, provides an improved environmental profile compared to the conventional alternative (as measured by the EIQ indicator).

**Figure 16: Reduction in herbicide use and the environmental load from using GM HT soybeans in all adopting countries 1996-2011**



#### 4.1.2 GM Herbicide tolerant (GM HT) maize

##### *a) The USA*

Drawing on the two main statistical sources of pesticide usage data (USDA and GfK Kynetec), Table 42 and Table 43 summarise the key features:

- Both average herbicide ai use and the average field EIQ/ha rating on the US maize crop have fallen by between 10% and 15% since 1996;
- The average herbicide ai/ha used on a GM HT maize crop has been about 0.6 to 0.7 kg/ha lower than the average usage on the residual conventional crop in the period to about 2007. In the last few years the differential between the increasingly GM HT crop and small conventional crop has narrowed, so that by 2010, average levels of active ingredient use were broadly similar;
- The average field EIQ/ha used on a GM HT crop has been about 20/ha units lower than the conventional crop, although in the last five years the difference has narrowed and is now broadly similar;
- The recent increase in ai use and the associated field EIQ/ha for GM HT maize mainly reflects the increasing adoption of integrated (reactive and proactive) weed management

<sup>82</sup> Also, many of the herbicides used in conventional production systems had significant resistance issues themselves in the mid 1990s. This was, for example, one of the reasons why glyphosate tolerant soybeans were rapidly adopted, as glyphosate provided good control of these weeds

practices designed to address the issue of weed resistance to glyphosate (see section 4.1.8 for more detailed discussion) . Since 2006, the average amount of herbicide active ingredient (and its associated field EIQ/ha value) has increased by about a third back to levels of use broadly comparable with the use levels on the small residual conventional maize crop. There has been an increasing proportion of the GM HT crop receiving additional treatments with herbicides such as acetochlor, atrazine, 2 4,D, mesotione and S metolachlor.

**Table 42: Herbicide usage on maize in the US 1996-2011**

Year	Average ai use (kg/ha): NASS data	Average ai use (kg/ha) index 1998=100: GfK data	Average field EIQ/ha: NASS data	Average field EIQ/ha: GfK data
1996	2.64	N/a	54.4	N/a
1997	2.30	N/a	48.2	N/a
1998	2.47	100	51.3	62.0
1999	2.19	88.1	45.6	54.7
2000	2.15	87.8	46.2	54.5
2001	2.30	86.6	48.8	53.8
2002	2.06	82.4	43.4	51.1
2003	2.29	83.2	47.5	51.2
2004	N/a	80.0	N/a	48.9
2005	2.1	80.6	51.1	48.7
2006	N/a	79.5	N/a	47.7
2007	N/a	85.0	N/a	49.8
2008	N/a	88.7	N/a	50.9
2009	N/a	86.9	N/a	49.7
2010	2.36	90.5	49.2	51.4
2011	N/a	91.6	N/a	51.8

Sources and notes: derived from NASS pesticide usage data 1996-2003 and 2010 (no data collected in 2004, 2006-2009 and 2011), GfK Kynetec data from 1998-2011. N/a = not available. Average ai/ha figures derived from GfK dataset are not permitted by GfK to be published.

**Table 43: Average US maize herbicide usage and environmental load 1997-2011: conventional and GM HT**

Year	Average ai/ha (kg) index 1998=100: conventional	Average ai/ha index 1998=100 (kg): GMHT	Average field EIQ: conventional	Average field EIQ: GMHT
1997	92.3	98.9	57.0	34.5
1998	100	100	63.2	34.5
1999	87.9	99.5	55.9	34.6
2000	89.3	98.3	56.5	34.7
2001	87.9	105.9	56.2	39.1
2002	85.3	99.9	54.6	34.6
2003	87.3	100	55.6	33.0
2004	85.3	101.5	54.7	34.9
2005	87.9	109.1	56.2	38.5
2006	87.9	112.2	56.5	39.4
2007	92.8	128.2	59.4	45.3

2008	87.9	140.3	56.2	50.0
2009	88.8	136.9	56.1	48.7
2010	90.2	142.7	58.0	50.7
2011	85.2	145.3	54.7	57.5

Sources and notes: derived from GfK Kynetec. 1997 based on the average of the years 1998-1999. Average ai/ha figures derived from GfK dataset are not permitted by GfK to be published

The comparison data between the GM HT crop and the conventional alternative presented above, is, as indicated in section 4.1, however, of limited value. A reasonable estimate of the amount of herbicide usage changes that have occurred with GM HT crop technology, requires an assessment of what herbicides might reasonably be expected to be used in the absence of crop biotechnology (ie, if the entire US maize crop was conventional). Applying usage rates for the current (remaining) conventional crops is one approach, as presented in the analysis above. However, this invariably provides under-estimates of what usage might reasonably be in the absence of crop biotechnology, because the conventional cropping dataset used to identify pesticide use relates to a relatively small share of total crop area. This has been the case for the US maize crop for many years, thus in 2011, the conventional share (not using GM HT technology) of maize was 28%<sup>83</sup>, with the conventional share having been below 50% of the total since 2007. The approach used to address this deficiency has been to make comparisons between typical herbicide treatment regimes for GM HT maize (including more recently the use of proactive and reactive weed management systems to address weed resistance issues), actual recorded usage of herbicides on the GM HT crop and typical herbicide treatment regime for an average conventional maize grower that would deliver a similar level of weed control to the level delivered in the GM HT system.

Using this approach, the respective values for conventional maize in 2011, were 3.43 kg herbicide ai/ha and a field EIQ rating of 84.1/ha. This compares with GM glyphosate tolerant maize (2.72 kg herbicide ai/ha and a field EIQ rating of 57.5/ha) and GM glufosinate tolerant maize (2.04 kg herbicide ai/ha and a field EIQ/ha rating of 44.76/ha).

At the national level (Table 44), in 2011, there has been an annual saving in the volume of herbicide active ingredient use of 15.1% (17.8 million kg). The annual field EIQ load on the US maize crop has also fallen by 27.6% in 2011 (equal to 797 million field EIQ/ha units). The cumulative decrease in active ingredient use since 1997 has been 10.9% (180 million kg), and the cumulative reduction in the field EIQ load has been 13.3%.

**Table 44: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT maize in the US 1997-2011**

Year	ai decrease (kg)	eiq saving (units)	% decrease in ai	% eiq saving
1997	150,669	3,289,024	0.15	0.16
1998	2,035,698	45,547,351	2.03	2.13
1999	1,691,777	39,635,149	1.75	1.92
2000	2,637,395	61,022,158	2.65	2.88

<sup>83</sup> Source: USDA. Note the conventional share refers to not using GM HT technology, with some of the 'conventional crops' using crop biotechnology-treated seed providing GM insect resistance only. Also, the GfK Kynetec dataset suggests that the proportion of the US maize crop not using GM HT technology in 2011 was smaller at 10% of the total

2001	2,733,427	65,572,295	2.88	3.25
2002	4,227,123	102,237,216	4.28	4.86
2003	5,226,766	127,103,738	5.31	6.06
2004	7,918,178	194,961,239	6.52	7.56
2005	7,658,532	223,957,285	6.39	8.39
2006	16,289,458	384,122,360	14.75	15.71
2007	28,117,185	663,032,455	21.31	22.69
2008	28,539,264	680,940,318	25.74	27.73
2009	27,087,280	657,124,206	22.25	25.90
2010	28,029,682	704,662,043	22.04	26.49
2011	17,845,620	797,335,990	15.14	27.61

*b) Canada*

The impact on herbicide use in the Canadian maize crop has been similar to the impact reported above in the US. Using industry sourced information<sup>84</sup> about typical herbicide regimes for conventional and GM HT maize (see Appendix 3), the key impact findings are:

- The herbicide ai/ha load on a GM HT crop has been between 0.88 kg/ha (GM glyphosate tolerant) and 1.069 kg/ha (GM glufosinate tolerant) lower than the conventional maize equivalent crop (average herbicide ai use at 2.71 kg/ha);
- The field EIQ/ha values for GM glyphosate and GM glufosinate tolerant maize are respectively 36/ha and 39/ha compared to 61/ha for conventional maize;
- At the national level in 2011 (based on the plantings of the different production systems), the reductions in herbicide ai use and the total field EIQ load were respectively 29.9% (976,000 kg) and 35.7% (26.3 million: Table 45);
- Cumulatively since 1997, total national herbicide ai use has fallen by 12.6% (5.6 million kg) and the total EIQ load has fallen by 14.6% (147 million field EIQ units).

**Table 45: Change in herbicide use and environmental load from using GM HT maize in Canada 1999-2011**

Year	Total ai saving (kg)	Total field EIQ reductions (in units per hectare)
1999	59,324	1,439,924
2000	121,985	2,991,494
2001	177,902	4,461,172
2002	255,305	6,377,468
2003	209,556	5,334,283
2004	203,320	5,234,173
2005	467,088	11,963,706
2006	501,479	13,110,306
2007	697,961	18,379,776
2008	565,770	14,979,769
2009	776,103	20,837,313
2010	584,446	15,557,562
2011	975,687	20,304,883

<sup>84</sup> Including the Weed Control Guide (2004 and updated) from the Departments' of Agriculture in Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan

*c) South Africa*

Drawing on herbicide usage data from AMIS Global and industry level sources that compare typical herbicide treatment regimes for conventional and GM HT maize in South Africa (see appendix 3), the impact of using GM HT technology in the South African maize crop (0.99 million ha in 2011) has been:

- On a per hectare basis in 2011 there has been a 0.01kg decrease in the amount of herbicide active ingredient used and an improvement in the average field EIQ of 8.68/ha;
- In 2011, at the national level, the amount of herbicide used was 9,930 kgs (-0.1%) lower than the amount that would probably have been used if the crop had all been planted to conventional seed. The total field EIQ load was 4.8% lower;
- Cumulatively since 2003, total national herbicide ai use has fallen by 1.4% (1.1 million kg) and the total EIQ load has fallen by 4.4%.

*d) Argentina*

Using a combination of AMIS Global herbicide usage data industry estimates of typical herbicide regimes for the two different systems (see Appendix 3), the impact of GM HT maize use in Argentina has been as follows (first used commercially in 2004):

- The average volume of herbicide ai applied to GM HT maize was about 4.2 kg/ha compared to 4.89 kg/ha for conventional maize, in 2011;
- The average field EIQ/ha load for GM HT maize is significantly lower than the conventional counterpart (75.8/ha for GM HT maize, 93.2/ha for conventional maize);
- The reduction in the volume of herbicide used was 1.6 million kg (-16%) in 2011. Since 2004, the cumulative reduction in usage has been 5.3% (- 3.3 million kg);
- In terms of the field EIQ load, the reduction in 2011 was 20% (-41.1 million field/ha units) and over the period 2004-2011, the load factor fell by 7.7%.

*e) Brazil*

Brazil first used GM HT maize commercially in 2010, and in 2011, the area planted to seed containing this trait was 5.18 million ha. Drawing on a combination of sources (AMIS Global, industry and Galvao (2012)), the estimated environmental impact associated with changes in herbicide use on this crop is as follows:

- The average amount of herbicide active use and associated field EIQ/ha rating for GM HT maize in 2011 was 2.25 kg/ha and 40.75/ha respectively. This compared with conventional maize with herbicide active ingredient use of 2.75 kg/ha and a field EIQ rating of 58.19/ha;
- In 2011, the use of GM HT technology resulted in a saving in the use of 2.6 million kg of herbicide active ingredient (-6.3%) and a reduction in the EIQ rating of 10.3%;
- Cumulatively (2010-2011), the herbicide active ingredient usage saving has been 3.6%, with an EIQ load reduction of 5.8%.

*f) Other countries*

GM HT maize was also grown commercially in the Philippines, for the first time in 2006 and 631,000 ha used this technology in 2011. Weed control practices in maize in the Philippines are based on a combination of use of herbicides and hand weeding, with only about a third of the crop annually receiving herbicide treatments (ie, the majority of the crop, much of which is a



subsistence crop, uses hand weeding as the primary form of weed control). The authors are not aware of any analysis which has examined the impact on herbicide use and the associated environmental 'footprint' of using GM HT maize in the Philippines.

GM HT maize was also grown in Colombia on a 'farm level trial basis' (32,100 ha in 2011). Analysis of the environmental impact associated with changes in herbicide use on these crops has not been possible due to a lack of data.


*g) Summary of impact*

In the countries where GM HT maize has been most widely adopted, there has been a net decrease in both the volume of herbicides applied to maize and a net reduction in the environmental impact applied to the crop (Figure 17). More specifically:

- In 2011, total herbicide ai use was 12.7% lower (23 million kg) than the level of use if the total crop had been planted to conventional varieties. The EIQ load was also lower by 22.8%;
- Cumulatively since 1997, the volume of herbicide ai applied is 10.1% lower than its conventional equivalent (a saving of 193 million kg). The EIQ load has been reduced by 12.5%.

As with the GM HT soybean analysis, this analysis takes into consideration changes in herbicide use, in recent years, on GM HT maize that have specifically addressed the issue of weed resistance to glyphosate in some regions. The trends in herbicide are broadly similar to soybeans, though less significant; the average amount of herbicide active ingredient use initially fell with the adoption of GM HT maize, but has, in the last few years, increased. At the same time, usage levels on conventional maize crops have also tended to increase, partly due to weed resistance (to herbicides other than glyphosate). Overall, however, the net environmental impact associated with the herbicides used on GM HT crops continues to represent an improvement relative to environmental impact associated with herbicide use on conventional forms of production.

**Figure 17: Reduction in herbicide use and the environmental load from using GM HT maize in adopting countries 1997-2011**



### 4.1.3 GM HT Herbicide tolerant (GM HT) cotton

#### *a) The USA*

Drawing on the herbicide usage data from the USDA and GfK Kynetec, both the volume of ai used and the average field EIQ/ha on the US cotton crop remained fairly stable to the mid 2000s, although since then there has been a rise in usage (Table 46).

**Table 46: Herbicide usage on cotton in the US 1996-2011**

Year	Average ai use (kg/ha): NASS data	Average ai use (index 1998=100): GfK data	Average field EIQ/ha: NASS data	Average field EIQ/ha: based on GfK data
1996	1.98	N/a	53.19	N/a
1997	2.43	N/a	42.50	N/a
1998	2.14	100	35.60	45.3
1999	2.18	89.2	36.20	40.1
2000	2.18	95.4	35.20	42.5
2001	1.89	97.1	27.50	42.9
2002	N/a	96.9	N/a	42.3
2003	2.27	95.1	33.90	41.4
2004	N/a	103.1	N/a	44.5
2005	N/p	107.7	N/p	46.4
2006	N/a	105.0	N/a	45.8
2007	2.7	107.3	47.40	45.5
2008	N/a	113.3	N/a	48.8
2009	N/a	122.5	N/a	53.1
2010	2.5	142.0	53.11	61.5
2011	N/a	145.9	N/a	64.9

Sources and notes: derived from NASS pesticide usage data 1996-2003 and 2010 (no data collected in 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009 and 2011), GfK Kynetec data from 1998-2011. N/p = Not presented - 2005 results based on NASS data are significantly different and inconsistent with previous trends and GfK data. These results have therefore not been presented. Average ai/ha figures derived from GfK dataset are not permitted by GfK to be published

Looking at a comparison of average usage data for GM HT versus conventional cotton, the GfK Kynetec dataset<sup>85</sup> shows that the average level of herbicide ai use (per ha) has been consistently higher than the average level of usage on conventional cotton. In terms of the average field EIQ/ha, the GfK dataset suggests that there has been a marginally lower average field EIQ rating for GM HT cotton in the first few years of adoption, but since then, the average field EIQ/ha rating has been lower for conventional cotton (Table 47).

**Table 47: Herbicide usage and its associated environmental load: GM HT and conventional cotton in the US 1997-2011**

Year	Average ai use (index 1998=100): conventional cotton	Average ai use (index 1998=100): GM HT cotton	Average field EIQ/ha: conventional cotton	Average field EIQ/ha: GM HT cotton
1997	109.4	104.8	40.3	45.3

<sup>85</sup> The NASS dataset does allow for comparisons between the two types of production systems

1998	100	100	43.5	49.0
1999	84.6	86.4	37.1	41.7
2000	93.2	89.5	41.3	42.6
2001	85.2	94.3	38.1	44.9
2002	82.3	94.2	37.7	44.0
2003	72.9	100.2	33.1	44.5
2004	70.9	102.3	32.9	47.6
2005	70.4	105.2	33.5	48.9
2006	76.7	101.8	35.2	48.1
2007	75.6	102.9	33.7	47.5
2008	86.9	107.5	37.5	50.6
2009	75.6	118.0	35.4	55.7
2010	97.7	134.7	42.7	63.8
2011	78.3	137.5	37.4	67.1

Sources and notes: derived from GfK 1998-2011. 1997 based on the average of the years 1997-1999. Average ai/ha figures derived from GfK dataset are not permitted by GfK to be published

The comparison data between the GM HT crop and the conventional alternative presented above, is, as indicated in section 4.1, not a reasonable representation of average herbicide usage on the average conventional alternative for the last 10-12 years. This is particularly relevant to cotton because much of the residual conventional cotton crop is concentrated in regions which traditionally use extensive production systems (eg, Texas). The approach used to address this deficiency has been to make comparisons between typical herbicide treatment regimes for GM HT cotton (including more recently the use of integrated weed management systems to address weed resistance issues), actual recorded usage of herbicides on the GM HT crop and typical herbicide treatment regimes for an average conventional cotton grower that would deliver a similar level of weed control to the level delivered in the GM HT system. The approach for identifying the 'conventional alternative' draws on the work of Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006) and Johnson & Strom (2008), and has been updated from 2008 onwards. It compared typical herbicide treatment regimes for GM HT and average conventional cotton crops that would deliver similar levels of weed control to that level delivered in the GM HT systems (in other words what herbicide treatments would reasonably be expected if GM HT technology was no longer available). Based on this methodology, the respective values for conventional cotton in the last six years are shown in Table 48. These usage levels were then compared to typical weed treatment regimes for GM HT cotton and recorded usage levels on the GM HT crop (which accounted for 73% of the total crop in 2011<sup>86</sup>), using the dataset from GfK Kynetec.

**Table 48: Average ai use and field EIQs for conventional cotton 2006-2011 to deliver equal efficacy to GM HT cotton**

Year	ai use (kg/ha)	Field eiq/ha
2006	2.61	49.3
2007	2.98	52.1
2008	3.26	60.1
2009	3.59	64.6
2010	4.07	73.6
2011	4.48	85.0

<sup>86</sup> Source USDA. Based on the GfK dataset the proportion of the US cotton crop not using GM HT technology is estimated at only 10%

Sources: based on Sankala & Blumenthal (2006), Johnson & Strom (2008) and updated to reflect changes in weed resistance management practices

Using this basis for herbicide regimes for conventional cotton and comparing with typical weed control regimes for GM HT cotton and recorded usage for GM HT cotton (from the GfK Kynetec dataset), at the national level (Table 49), the impact of using the GM HT technology in 2011 resulted in a 13.4% decrease in the amount of herbicide use (2.3 million kg) and a 15.4% decrease in the associated environmental impact, as measured by the EIQ indicator. Cumulatively since 1997, there have been savings in herbicide use of 4.9% for ai use (11 million kg) and a 7.6% reduction in the associated environmental impact, as measured by the EIQ indicator.

**Table 49: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT cotton in the US 1997-2011**

Year	ai decrease (kg: + sign denotes increase in usage)	eiq saving (units)	% decrease in ai	% eiq saving
1997	194,126	2,428,514	1.3	0.8
1998	268,015	5,612,708	1.8	+0.5
1999	1,111,761	31,351,903	6.8	8.0
2000	1,065,210	40,941,518	6.3	7.8
2001	710,162	20,555,753	4.1	7.4
2002	706,310	24,032,871	4.5	7.2
2003	512,302	28,841,339	3.9	7.4
2004	+4,001	8,599,710	0.0	3.8
2005	+268,966	4,840,670	+1.8	1.8
2006	+314,796	5,367,442	+2.0	1.9
2007	831,195	14,492,231	6.4	6.4
2008	895,615	18,599,640	9.0	10.1
2009	1,192,270	23,265,816	9.3	10.1
2010	1,840,035	35,897,072	10.2	11.0
2011	2,300,807	50,143,023	13.4	15.4

*b) Australia*

Drawing on information from the University of New England study from 2003<sup>87</sup>, analysis of the typical herbicide treatment regimes for GM HT and conventional cotton and more recent industry assessments of conventional versus the newer 'Roundup Ready Flex' cotton that is widely used in Australia (see Appendix 3) shows the following:

- The herbicide ai/ha load on a GM HT crop has been about 0.11 kg/ha higher (at 2.87 kg/ha) than the conventional cotton equivalent crop (2.77 kg/ha). Under the Roundup Ready Flex versus conventional equivalent<sup>88</sup>, the conventional ai/ha load is 0.47 kg/ai more;

<sup>87</sup> Doyle et al (2003)

<sup>88</sup> Designed to deliver equal efficacy

- The average field EIQ/ha value for GM HT cotton has been 51/ha, compared to 66/ha for conventional cotton. Under the Roundup Ready Flex versus conventional equivalent, the conventional cotton has a higher field EIQ/ha load of 4.5/ha;
- Based on the above data, at the national level (Table 50), in 2011, herbicide ai use has been 10.6% lower than the level expected if the whole crop had been planted to conventional cotton cultivars. The total field EIQ load was 6.5% lower;
- Cumulatively since 2000, total national herbicide ai use fell by 3.8% (656,000 kg) and the total EIQ load decreased by 4.1%.

**Table 50: National level changes in herbicide ai use and field EIQ values for GM HT cotton in Australia 2000-2011**

Year	ai decrease (kg: + sign denotes increase in usage)	eiq saving (units)	% change in ai: (+ sign denotes increase in usage)	% eiq saving
2000	+1,290	106,030	+0.1	0.4
2001	+8,051	661,743	+0.8	3.6
2002	+9,756	801,898	+1.5	6.5
2003	+9,028	742,052	+1.7	7.2
2004	+17,624	1,448,593	+2.0	9.0
2005	+24,235	1,991,945	+2.9	12.1
2006	48,910	471,405	7.4	4.5
2007	23,718	228,602	8.4	5.2
2008	57,591	555,084	9.0	5.5
2009	83,111	801,049	10.3	6.3
2010	242,096	2,333,389	10.6	6.5
2011	271,002	2,611,998	10.6	6.5

*c) South Africa*

Using industry level sources that compare typical herbicide treatment regimes for conventional and GM HT cotton in South Africa (see appendix 3), the impact of using GM HT technology in the South African cotton crop has been:

- In 2011, there has been an average 0.1 kg decrease in the amount of herbicide active ingredient used and a 13% decrease in the environmental impact, as measured by the EIQ indicator (-4.3 field EIQ/ha units);
- At the national level, the amount of herbicide used in 2011 was 94 kg (0.5%) lower than the amount that would probably have been used if the crop had all been planted to conventional seed. The total field EIQ load was, however, 13.4% lower;
- Cumulatively since 2001, total national herbicide ai use increased by 1.2% (5,500 kg), whilst the total EIQ load fell by 7.1%. This shows that although the amount of herbicide used on the cotton crop has increased since the availability and use of GM HT cotton, the associated environmental impact of herbicide use on the cotton crop has fallen.

*d) Argentina*

GM HT cotton has been grown commercially in Argentina since 2002, and in 2011, there were 506,000 ha planted to GM HT cotton.

Based on industry level information relating to typical herbicide treatment regimes for GM HT and conventional cotton (see appendix 3), the impact of using this technology on herbicide use and the associated environmental impact has been:

- A 48% and 56% respective reduction in the amount of active ingredient (kg) and field EIQ rating per hectare;
- In 2011, the national level reduction in the amount of herbicide applied to the cotton crop was 0.85 million kg (-46%) lower than would otherwise have occurred if the whole crop had been planted to conventional varieties. The associated EIQ load was 57% lower;
- Cumulatively, since 2002, the amount of herbicide active ingredient applied had fallen 30% (-3.8 million kg). The field EIQ rating associated with herbicide use on the Argentine cotton crop fell 34% over the same period.

*e) Other countries*

Cotton farmers in Mexico, Colombia and Brazil have also been using GM HT technology since 2005, 2006 and 2009 respectively. No analysis is presented for the impact of using this technology in these countries because of the limited availability of herbicide usage data.


*f) Summary of impact*

In 2011, the overall effect of using GM HT cotton technology (Figure 18) in the adopting countries has been a reduction in herbicide ai use<sup>89</sup> of 15.9% and a decrease in the total environmental impact of 18.2%. Cumulatively since 1997, herbicide ai use fell by 6.1% (-15.5 million kg) and the associated environmental impact fell by 8.9%.

As with the analysis of herbicide use changes on GM HT soybeans and maize, this analysis takes into consideration changes in herbicide use, in recent years, on GM HT cotton that have occurred to specifically address the issue of weed resistance to glyphosate in some regions (notably the US). Such actions have resulted in a significant number of (US) cotton farmers using additional herbicides to glyphosate with GM HT cotton (that were not used in the early years of GM HT (to glyphosate) crop adoption) and can be seen in the increase in the average amounts of herbicide active ingredient applied per ha. Nevertheless, the net environmental impact associated with the herbicides used on GM HT crops in 2011 continues to represent an improvement relative to the environmental profile of herbicides that would likely be used if the crop reverted to using conventional (non GM) technology.

<sup>89</sup> Relative to the herbicide use expected if all of the GM HT area had been planted to conventional cultivars, using the same tillage system and providing the same level of weed control as delivered by the GM HT system

**Figure 18: Reduction in herbicide use and the environmental load from using GM HT cotton in the US, Australia, Argentina and South Africa 1997-2011**



#### 4.1.4 GM Herbicide tolerant (GM HT) canola

##### a) The USA

Based on analysis of typical herbicide treatments for conventional, GM glyphosate tolerant and GM glufosinate tolerant canola identified in Sankala and Blumenthal (2003 & 2006), Johnson and Strom (2008), updates for 2011 undertaken as part of this research and data from the GfK Kynetec dataset (see Appendix 3), the changes in herbicide use and resulting environmental impact arising from adoption of GM HT canola in the US since 1999<sup>90</sup> are summarised in Table 51. This shows consistent savings in terms of both the amount of herbicide active ingredient applied and the EIQ value for both glyphosate and glufosinate tolerant canola relative to conventional canola.

**Table 51: Active ingredient and field EIQ differences conventional versus GM HT canola US 1999-2011**

Year	ai saving GM HT (to glyphosate: kg/ha)	ai saving GM HT (to glufosinate: kg/ha)	eiq saving GM HT (to glyphosate: field eiq/ha)	eiqsaving GM HT (to glufosinate: field eiq/ha)
1999	0.68	0.75	14.8	18.4
2000	0.68	0.75	14.8	18.4
2001	0.68	0.75	14.8	18.4
2002	0.57	0.75	17.7	18.4
2003	0.57	0.75	17.7	18.4
2004	0.79	0.83	21.2	19.8
2005	0.79	0.83	21.2	19.8

<sup>90</sup> The USDA pesticide usage survey does not include coverage of canola

2006	0.7	0.78	19.8	18.8
2007	0.47	0.74	15.8	17.9
2008	0.47	0.74	15.8	17.9
2009	0.11	0.72	10.2	17.6
2010	0.09	0.57	9.9	14.6
2011	0.02	0.65	8.25	16.14

Sources: derived from Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006), Johnson & Strom (2008) and updates of this work, GfK Kynetec

The reduction in the volume of herbicides used was equal to 118,600 kg of active ingredient (-27.4%) in 2011. In terms of the EIQ load, this had fallen by 4.7 million field EIQ units (-47%) compared to the load that would otherwise have been applied if the entire crop had been planted to conventional varieties. Cumulatively, since 1999, the amount of active ingredient use has fallen by 37%, and the EIQ load reduced by 47%.

*b) Canada*

Similar reductions in herbicide use and the environmental 'foot print' associated with the adoption of GM HT canola have been found in Canada (see Appendix 3):

- The average volume of herbicide ai applied to GM HT canola has been 0.65 kg/ha (GM glyphosate tolerant) and 0.39 kg/ha (GM glufosinate tolerant), compared to 1.13 kg/ha for conventional canola. This analysis has been applied to the years to 2004. From 2005, the conventional 'alternative' used as the basis for comparison is 'Clearfield' canola, which makes up the vast majority of conventional plantings<sup>91</sup>. In terms of active ingredient use, GM HT canola tolerant to glyphosate uses more (+0.137 kg/ha) but GM HT to glufosinate uses less (-0.21 kg/ha) active ingredient than 'Clearfield' canola;
- The average field EIQ/ha load for GM HT canola has been significantly lower than the conventional counterpart (10/ha for GM glyphosate tolerant canola, 7.9/ha for GM glufosinate tolerant canola, 26.2/ha for conventional canola). In relation to comparisons with 'Clearfield' canola (used from 2005 as the comparison) in terms of EIQ field ratings, the typical GM HT to glyphosate canola results in a saving of 0.84/ha and GM HT to glufosinate canola results in a saving of 4.45/ha;
- On the basis of comparisons with 'Clearfield' canola, the reduction in the volume of herbicide used was 0.25 million kg (a reduction of 5.9%) in 2011. Since 1996, the cumulative reduction in usage has been 17% (12.1 million kg);
- In terms of the field EIQ load, the reduction in 2011 was 21.2% (18.2 million) and over the period 1996-2011, the load factor fell by 27%.

*c) Australia*

Australia first allowed commercial planting of GM HT canola in 2008. Based on analysis of Fischer & Tozer (2009: see Appendix 3) which examined the use of GM HT (to glyphosate) canola relative to triazine tolerant (non GM) and 'Clearfield' canola, the average savings from adoption of the GM HT system were 0.4 kg/ha of active ingredient use and a reduction in the average field EIQ/ha of 2.74/ha (when applied to the 2011 crop weighted by type of conventional canola the GM HT replaced (ie, triazine tolerant or 'Clearfields')). At the national level in 2011, this resulted in a net saving of just over 56,160 kgs of active ingredient (2.7% saving across the total canola

<sup>91</sup> Herbicide tolerant by a non GM process, tolerant to the imidazolinone group of herbicides




crop) and a 1.4% reduction in the associated environmental impact of herbicide use (as measured by the EIQ indicator) on the Australian canola crop.

*d) Summary of impact*

In the countries where GM HT canola has been adopted, there has been a net decrease in both the volume of herbicides applied to canola and the environmental impact applied to the crop (Figure 19). More specifically:

- In 2011, total herbicide ai use was 6.3% lower (0.43 million kg) than the level of use if the total crop had been planted to conventional non GM varieties. The EIQ load was also lower by 18.9%;
- Cumulatively since 1996, the volume of herbicide ai applied was 17.3% lower than its conventional equivalent (a saving of 14.8 million kg). The EIQ load had been reduced by 27.1%.

**Figure 19: Reduction in herbicide use and the environmental load from using GM HT canola in the US, Canada and Australia 1996-2011**



#### 4.1.5 GM HT sugar beet

##### *The USA*

GM HT sugar beet was first planted on a small area in the US in 2007, and in 2011 accounted for 93% (456,570 ha) of the total US sugar beet crop. In terms of weed control, the use of this technology has resulted in a switch in use from a number of selective herbicides to glyphosate. Drawing on evidence from a combination of industry observers and the GfK Kynetec dataset on pesticide use, the analysis below summarises the environmental impact (see appendix 3 for details of the typical conventional versus GM HT sugar beet treatment).

The switch to GM HT sugar beet has resulted in a net increase in the amount of herbicide active ingredient used (about +0.33 kg/ha 2007-2009, +0.58 kg/ha in 2010 and +0.82 in 2011), but a decrease in the field EIQ/ha value of 5.4/ha 2007-2009 and 1.6/ha in 2010. In 2011, the EIQ rating

was -2/ha (ie a marginal deterioration). As a result, the 2011 impact of use of the technology was an increase in the volume of herbicide ai applied of 374,000 kg (+48%) and an increase in the associated environmental load, as measured by the EIQ indicator of 5.6%. Cumulatively, since 2007 there has been additional use of 0.87 million kg of ai but a 4% improvement in the associated environmental impact of herbicides used on the US sugar beet crop (as measured by the EIQ indicator).

GM HT sugar beet is also planted on a small area (about 13,000 ha in 2011) in Canada. Due to the lack of publicly available data on sugar beet herbicide use in Canada, no environmental impact analysis is presented. The impact is likely to be similar to the impact in the US.

#### 4.1.6 GM IR maize

##### a) *The US*

Since 1996, when GM IR maize was first used commercially in the US, the average volume of insecticide use has fallen (Table 52). Whilst levels of insecticide ai use have fallen on both conventional and GM IR maize, usage by GM IR growers has consistently been lower than their conventional counterparts (with the exception of 2008). A similar pattern has occurred in respect of the average field EIQ value. This data therefore suggests both that insecticide use *per se* has fallen on the US maize crops over the last sixteen years and that usage on GM IR crops has fallen by a greater amount. However, examining the impact of GM IR traits on insecticide use is more complex because:

- There are a number of pests for the maize crop. These vary in incidence and damage by region and year and typically affect only a proportion of the total crop. In the case of GM IR maize, this comprises two main traits that target stalk boring pests and the corn rootworm (second generation events have also included protection against cutworms and earworms). In the US, typically, a maximum of about 10% of the crop was treated with insecticides for stalk boring pests each year and about 30% of the US maize area treated with insecticides for corn rootworm. This means that assessing the impact of the GM IR technology requires disaggregation of insecticide usage specifically targeted at these pests and limiting the maximum impact area to the areas that would otherwise require insecticide treatment, rather than necessarily applying insecticide savings to the entire area planted to seed containing GM IR traits targeting these pests. This is particularly relevant if conclusions are to be drawn from examination of insecticide usage changes overall, and of the proportion of the US maize crop typically receiving treatments of insecticides. Of note here has been the significant increase in the proportion of the US maize crop that has technically been in receipt of insecticides in terms of 'area treated' (equally applicable to GM IR and conventional crops) over the last 7-8 years. This reflects the growing preference by farmers for sowing maize seed that has been treated with the insecticides clothianidin and thiamethoxim and is unrelated to the adoption of GM IR technology;
- Typically, the first users of the GM IR technology will be those farmers who regularly experience economic levels of damage from the GM IR target pests. This means that once the level of adoption (in terms of areas planted to the GM IR traits) is in excess of the areas normally treated with insecticide sprays for these pests, it is likely that additional areas planted to the traits are largely for insurance purposes and no additional insecticide

savings would arise (if assumed across all of the GM IR area). Secondly, comparing the level of insecticide use on the residual conventional crop with insecticide use on the GM IR area would probably understate the insecticide savings, because the residual conventional farmers tend to be those who do not suffer the pest problems that are the target of the GM IR technology and hence do not spray their crops with appropriate insecticide treatments;

- The widespread adoption of GM IR maize technology has resulted in 'area-wide' suppression of target pests such as stalk borers in maize crops. As a result, conventional farmers have benefited from this lower level of pest infestation and the associated reduced need to conduct insecticide treatments (Huchison et al (2010)).

In order to address these issues, our approach has been to first identify the insecticides typically used to treat the stalk boring and rootworm pests and their usage rates from the GfK Kynetec database and relevant literature (eg, Carpenter & Gianessi (1999)). These sources identified average usage of insecticides for the control of stalk boring pests and rootworm at 0.6 kg/ha and 0.216 kg/ha respectively. The corresponding field EIQ/ha values are 20/ha for stalk boring pests and 7.63/ha for rootworm.

These active ingredient and field EIQ savings were then applied to the maximum of the area historically receiving insecticide spray treatments for stalk boring pests and corn rootworm (10% and 30% respectively of the US maize crop) or the GM IR area targeting these pests, whichever was the smallest of the two areas.

Based on this approach, at the national level, the use of GM IR maize has resulted in an annual saving in the volume of insecticide ai use of 80% (of the total usage of insecticides typically targeted at both corn boring pests and corn rootworm) in 2011 (4.1 million kg) and the annual field EIQ load fell by 82.3% in 2010 (equal to 141 million field EIQ/ha units). Since 1996, the cumulative decrease in insecticide ai use has been 42% (40.7 million kg), and the cumulative reduction in the field EIQ load has been 38% (Table 53).

**Table 52: Average US maize insecticide usage and its environmental load 1996-2011: conventional versus GM IR**

Year	Average ai/ha (kg): conventional	Average ai/ha (kg): GM IR	Average field EIQ: conventional	Average field EIQ: GM IR
1996	0.78	0.61	22.4	18.1
1997	0.76	0.59	22.0	17.7
1998	0.84	0.63	24.1	18.4
1999	0.73	0.61	21.1	18.3
2000	0.72	0.54	20.9	16.4
2001	0.59	0.49	18.0	14.4
2002	0.56	0.30	17.2	10.5
2003	0.66	0.41	19.1	12.5
2004	0.64	0.30	18.8	10.3
2005	0.50	0.33	14.7	11.2
2006	0.59	0.34	17.1	10.5
2007	0.44	0.24	13.1	7.9

2008	0.53	0.27	15.8	8.3
2009	0.36	0.21	12.0	7.0
2010	0.25	0.21	7.2	6.7
2011	0.40	0.14	12.0	4.6

Sources: derived from GfK Kynetec (limited insecticides typically targeting control of stalk boring and rootworm pests and excluding seed treatments for which there is no significant difference in the pattern of usage between conventional and GM IR maize) and Carpenter & Gianessi (1999).

**Table 53: National level changes in insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR maize in the US 1996-2011 (targeted at stalk boring and rootworm pests)**

Year	ai decrease (kg)	eiq saving (units)	% decrease in ai	% eiq saving
1996	180,000	6,000,000	2.8	1.9
1997	1,467,773	48,925,760	19.1	14.0
1998	1,946,520	64,884,000	22.6	17.7
1999	1,879,080	62,636,000	25.9	20.3
2000	1,931,640	64,388,000	25.7	21.6
2001	1,838,160	61,272,000	30.1	25.1
2002	1,915,680	63,856,000	29.2	24.1
2003	1,943,603	64,855,127	31.4	26.8
2004	2,105,594	70,494,074	36.3	32.0
2005	2,344,543	78,852,057	51.4	47.8
2006	2,776,990	94,275,192	65.9	64.4
2007	4,176,915	142,948,919	72.9	68.2
2008	3,972,994	136,462,730	76.8	72.7
2009	4,038,767	138,738,515	78.3	74.7
2010	4,113,864	141,321,293	83.8	82.3
2011	4,117,494	141,265,278	80.0	82.3

Note: 2003 was the first year of commercial use of GM IR targeting corn rootworm

*b) Canada*

As in the US, the main impact has been associated with reduced use of insecticides. Based on analysis of a typical insecticide treatment regime targeted at corn boring pests prior to the introduction of GM IR technology that is now no longer required<sup>92</sup>, this has resulted in a farm level saving of 0.43 kg/ha of ai use and a reduction of the field EIQ/ha of 20.7/ha. Applying this saving to the area devoted to GM IR maize in 1997 and then to a maximum of 5% of the total Canadian maize area in any subsequent year, the cumulative reduction in insecticide ai use targeted at stalk boring pests has been 556,000 kg (-94%). In terms of environmental load, the total EIQ/ha load has fallen by 18.7 million units (-82%)<sup>93</sup>.

*c) Spain*

Analysis for Spain draws on insecticide usage data from the early years of GM IR trait adoption when the areas planted with this trait were fairly low (1999-2001 – from Brookes (2002)) and

<sup>92</sup> And limiting the national impact to 5% of the total maize crop in Canada – the estimated maximum area that probably received insecticide treatments targeted at corn boring pests before the introduction of GM IR maize

<sup>93</sup> This relates to the total insecticide usage that would otherwise have probably been used on the Canadian maize crop to combat corn boring pests

restricts the estimation of insecticide savings to a maximum of 10% of the total maize crop area, which may have otherwise received insecticide treatments for corn boring pests. The difference in the data presented for Spain relative to the other countries is that the changes identified in insecticide usage relate to total insecticide use rather than insecticides typically used to target stalk boring pests. As a result of the adoption of GM IR maize, there has been a net decrease in both the volume of insecticide used and the field EIQ/ha load<sup>94</sup>. More specifically:

- The volume of total maize insecticide ai use was 40% lower than the level would probably have been if the entire crop had been conventional in 2011 (-35,000 kg). Since 1998 the cumulative saving (relative to the level of use if all of the crop had been conventional) was 425,000 kg of insecticide ai (a 34% decrease);
- The field EIQ/ha load has fallen by 19% since 1999 (-11.4 million units). In 2011, the field EIQ load was 22.7% lower than its conventional equivalent.

#### *d) Argentina*

Although GM IR maize has been grown commercially in Argentina since 1998, the environmental impact of the technology has been very small. This is because insecticides have not traditionally been used on maize in Argentina (the average expenditure on all insecticides has only been \$1-\$2/ha), and very few farmers have used insecticides targeted at stalk boring pests. This absence of conventional treatments reflects several reasons including poor efficacy of the insecticides, the need to get spray timing right (at time of corn borer hatching because otherwise insecticides tend to be ineffective once the pest has bored into the stalk), seasonal and annual variations in pest pressure and lack of awareness as to the full level of yield damage inflicted by the pest. As indicated in section 3, the main benefits from using the technology have been significantly higher levels of average yield, reduced production risk and improved quality of grain.

#### *e) South Africa*

Due to the limited availability of insecticide usage data in South Africa, the estimates of the impact on insecticide use from use of GM IR maize in South Africa presented below are based on the following assumptions:

- Irrigated crops are assumed to use two applications of cypermethrin to control stalk boring pests. This equates to about 0.168 kg/ha of active ingredient and a field EIQ of 6.11/ha (applicable to area of 200,000 ha);
- A dryland crop area of about 1,768,000 ha is assumed to receive an average of one application of cypermethrin. This amounts to 0.084 kg/ha of active ingredient and has a field EIQ of 3.06/ha;
- The first 200,000 ha to adopt GM IR technology is assumed to be irrigated crops.

Based on these assumptions:

- In 2011, the adoption of GM IR maize resulted in a net reduction in the volume of insecticides used of 149,560 kg (relative to the volume that would probably have been used if 1.768 million ha had been treated with insecticides targeted at stalk boring pests). The EIQ load (in respect of insecticide use targeted at these pests) was 90% lower than it would otherwise have been in the absence of use of the GM IR technology);

<sup>94</sup> The average volume of all insecticide ai used is 0.96 kg/ha with an average field EIQ of 26/ha

- Cumulatively since 2000, the reductions in the volume of ai use and the associated environmental load from sprayed insecticides were both 56% (1.11 million kg ai).

*f) Brazil*

The GM IR maize area in Brazil, in 2011, was 8.68 million ha (first planted commercially in 2008). Various stalk boring and other pests are commonplace in the Brazilian maize crop, with the Fall Armyworm (*Spodoptera*) being a major pest, and approximately 50% of the total annual crop has regularly been treated with insecticides targeting this pest (typically five spray treatments/crop).

The availability of GM IR maize that targets this pest has allowed users to decrease the number of insecticide spray runs from about five to two and significantly reduce the use of insecticides such as methomyl, lufenuron, triflumuron, sponosad and thiodicarb. As a result, the typical average saving in active ingredient use has been 0.356 kg/ha and the field EIQ/ha saving has been 21.5/ha<sup>95</sup>. Applying these savings to the national level (constrained to a maximum of 48% of the total maize crop that has been the historic average annual area receiving insecticide treatments), this resulted in 2.58 million kg of insecticide active ingredient saving in 2011. This represents a 100% reduction in the environmental impact associated with insecticide use targeted at these pests. Cumulatively, over the three years of use, the ai and field EIQ savings have been 76% lower than they would otherwise have been if this technology had not been used (a saving of 7.15 million kg of ai).

*g) Colombia*

The GM IR area in Colombia in 2011 was about 32,100 ha (first grown in 2009). Based on analysis by Mendez et al (2011), this estimates that conventional maize growers (in the San Juan valley) typically use 0.56 kg/ai of insecticide to control maize pests, with an average field EIQ of 15.89/ha. Applying these savings to the GM IR area in 2009-2011, the technology has contributed to a saving in insecticide active ingredient use of 30,400 kgs. In terms of both active ingredient use and EIQ rating, this represents about a 30% reduction.

*h) Other countries*

GM IR maize has also been grown on significant areas in the Philippines (since 2003: 557,000 ha planted in 2010), in Uruguay (since 2004: 98,000 ha in 2011) and in Honduras (on a trial basis: since 2003: 30,000 ha in 2011). Due to limited availability on insecticide use on maize crops<sup>96</sup>, it has not been possible to analyse the impact of reduced insecticide use and the associated environmental impact in these countries.

*i) Summary of impact*


Across all of the countries that have adopted GM IR maize since 1996, the net impact on insecticide use and the associated environmental load (relative to what could have been expected if all maize plantings had been to conventional varieties) have been (Figure 20):

<sup>95</sup> Based on AMIS Global data for the 2006-2009 period

<sup>96</sup> Coupled with the 'non' application of insecticide measures to control some pests by farmers in many countries and/or use of alternatives such as biological and cultural control measures

- In 2011, an 86.2% decrease in the total volume of insecticide ai applied (6.9 million kg) and an 89.7% reduction in the environmental impact (measured in terms of the field EIQ/ha load<sup>97</sup>);
- Since 1996, 45.2% less insecticide ai has been used (50 million kg) and the environmental impact from insecticides applied to the maize crop has fallen by 41.7%.

**Figure 20: Reduction in insecticide use and the environmental load from using GM IR maize in adopting countries 1996-2011**



#### 4.1.7 GM insect resistant (GM IR) cotton

##### a) The USA

Whilst the annual average volume of insecticides used on the US cotton crop has fluctuated (as to be expected according to variations in regional and yearly pest pressures), there has been an underlying decrease in usage (Table 54). Applications on GM IR crops and the associated environmental impact have also been consistently lower for most years until 2007. Drawing conclusions from the usage data for the conventional versus GM IR cotton alone should, however, be treated with caution for a number of reasons (see also section 4.1.6):

- There are a number of pests for the cotton crop. These vary in incidence and damage by region and year and may affect only a proportion of the total crop. In the case of GM IR cotton, this comprises traits that target various *Heliothis* and *Helicoverpa* pests (eg, budworm and bollworm). These are major pests of cotton crops in all cotton growing regions of the world (including the US) and can devastate crops, causing substantial reductions in yield, unless crop protection practices are employed. In the US, all of the

<sup>97</sup> Readers should note that these estimates relate to usage of insecticides targeted mainly at stalk boring and rootworm pests. Some of the active ingredients traditionally used to control these pests may still be used with GM IR maize for the control of some other pests that some of the GM IR technology does not target

crop may typically be treated with insecticides for *Heliothis/Helicoverpa* pests each year although in some regions, notably Texas, the incidence and frequency of pest pressure tends to be much more limited than in other regions. In addition, there are pests such as boll weevil which are not targeted by current GM IR traits and crops receive insecticide treatments for these pests. This means that assessing the impact of the GM IR cotton technology requires disaggregation of insecticide usage specifically targeted at the *Heliothis/Helicoverpa* pests, and possibly limiting the maximum impact area to the areas that would otherwise require insecticide treatment rather than necessarily applying insecticide savings to the entire area planted to seed containing GM IR traits targeting these pests;

- The widespread adoption of GM insect resistant technology has resulted in 'area-wide' suppression of target pests such as some *Heliothis/Helicoverpa* pests in cotton crops. As a result, some conventional farmers have benefited from this lower level of pest infestation and the associated reduced need to conduct insecticide treatments (Wu et al (2008));
- Typically, the first users of the GM IR technology will be those farmers who regularly experience economic levels of damage from the GM IR target pests. This means that once the levels of adoption (in terms of areas planted to the GM IR traits) become significant (above 50% of the US crop from 2005, and 75% in 2011), it is likely that the residual conventional crop tends to be found in regions where the pest pressure and damage from *Heliothis/Helicoverpa* pests is lower than would otherwise be the case in the regions where GM IR traits have been adopted. Hence, using data based on the average insecticide use on this residual conventional crop as an indicator of insecticide use savings relating to the adoption of GM IR traits probably understates the insecticide savings.

In order to address these issues, our approach has been to first identify the insecticides typically used to treat the *Heliothis/Helicoverpa* pests and their usage rates from the GfK Kynetec database and relevant literature (eg, Carpenter & Gianessi (1999), Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006)). This identified average usage of a number of insecticides commonly used for the control of these pests in terms of amount of active ingredient applied, field eiQ/ha values and the proportion of the total crop receiving each active ingredient in a baseline period of 1996-2000. As most of these insecticide active ingredients are still in use in 2011 (for control of some other pests than those targeted by the GM IR trait), we have calculated the potential maximum usage of each insecticide for each year under the assumption of no GM IR technology was used (using the baseline 1996-2000 adoption rates) and then compared these levels of use with actual recorded usage in each year. The difference between the two values represents the savings in insecticide usage attributed to the GM IR technology. Thus the annual savings estimated have been between 0.21 kg/ha and 0.405 kg/ha of active ingredient use and the field EIQ savings have been between 7.76/ha and 14.9/ha. In 2011, the savings were 0.4 kg/ai/ha and the field eiQ saving was 14.7/ha. These active ingredient and field EIQ savings were then applied to the GM IR area targeting these pests.

At the national level, the use of GM IR cotton has resulted in an annual saving in the volume of insecticide ai use of 26.6% in 2011 (1.15 million kg) and the annual field EIQ load on the US cotton crop also fell by 28% in 2011 (equal to 42.2 million field EIQ/ha units). Since 1996, the cumulative decrease in insecticide ai use has been 11.2% (11.0 million kg), and the cumulative reduction in the field EIQ load has been 11.4% (Table 55).



**Table 54: Average US cotton insecticide usage and environmental impact 1996-2011: conventional versus GM IR**

Year	Average ai/ha (kg) index 1998=100: conventional	Average ai/ha (kg) index 1998=100: GM IR	Average field EIQ: conventional	Average field EIQ: GM IR
1996	82.7	80.1	40.1	32.4
1997	118.7	118.2	53.0	44.0
1998	100	100	53.6	43.7
1999	82.0	44.0	45.3	41.1
2000	87.4	53.5	47.6	45.1
2001	88.3	41.7	47.8	32.9
2002	57.7	42.5	29.2	33.5
2003	100.4	36.6	50.3	28.5
2004	56.4	44.6	28.0	34.0
2005	32.8	38.3	14.6	20.4
2006	95.0	39.9	42.3	28.8
2007	60.4	47.9	29.9	35.1
2008	44.4	40.3	20.8	29.1
2009	39.3	35.4	18.3	26.0
2010	67.5	38.3	30.7	27.7
2011	80.2	32.7	45.1	22.8

Sources: derived from GfK Kynetec

**Table 55: National level changes in insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR cotton in the US 1996-2011**

Year	ai decrease (kg)	eiq saving (units)	% decrease in ai	% eiq saving
1996	213,371	7,708,736	3.1	3.2
1997	219,217	7,919,934	2.3	2.7
1998	236,617	8,548,572	2.8	2.7
1999	410,076	15,070,341	5.9	5.4
2000	564,221	19,685,752	6.9	6.3
2001	136,502	27,049,342	9.3	9.2
2002	511,015	18,226,708	9.2	9.2
2003	560,624	20,236,059	9.1	9.2
2004	649,509	23,980,157	11.6	12.9
2005	1,143,628	42,105,057	26.9	24.2
2006	1,193,080	43,623,825	15.1	16.0
2007	929,047	34,274,333	17.7	18.7
2008	613,891	22,331,832	19.9	21.9
2009	689,965	25,161,611	21.2	23.3
2010	1,187,626	43,639,636	23.2	25.7
2011	1,152,902	42,225,917	26.6	28.0

*b) China*

Since the adoption of GM IR cotton in China there have been substantial reductions in the use of insecticides. In terms of the average volume of insecticide ai applied to cotton, the application to a typical hectare of GM IR cotton in the earlier years of adoption was about 1.35 kg/ha, compared

to 6.02 kg/ha for conventionally grown cotton (a 77% decrease)<sup>98</sup>. In terms of an average field EIQ load/ha the GM IR cotton insecticide load was 61/ha compared to 292/ha for conventional cotton. More recent assessments of these comparisons (see Appendix 3) put the average conventional treatment at 2.75 kg/ha, with a field EIQ/ha of 124.38/ha, compared to 1.86 kg/ha and a field EIQ/Ha of 82.74/ha for GM IR cotton.

Based on these differences, the amount of insecticide ai used and its environmental load impact were respectively 23.7% and 23.9% lower in 2011 (Table 56) than the levels that would have occurred if only conventional cotton had been planted. Cumulatively since 1997, the volume of insecticide use has decreased by 30.3% (108.7 million kg ai) and the field EIQ load has fallen by 31.1% (5.3 billion field EIQ/ha units).

**Table 56: National level changes in insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR cotton in China 1997-2011**

Year	ai decrease (kg)	eiq saving (units)	% decrease in ai	% eiq saving
1997	158,780	7,843,630	0.6	0.6
1998	1,218,870	60,211,395	4.5	4.6
1999	3,054,180	150,874,530	13.6	13.9
2000	5,678,720	280,525,120	24.8	25.3
2001	10,152,580	501,530,930	35.0	35.7
2002	9,807,000	484,459,500	38.8	39.5
2003	13,076,000	645,946,000	42.5	42.5
2004	17,279,000	853,571,500	50.3	50.3
2005	15,411,000	761,293,500	50.2	50.2
2006	16,335,660	806,971,110	51.2	51.2
2007	3,382,000	158,236,180	20.5	19.8
2008	3,406,920	159,402,131	21.5	20.8
2009	3,177,300	148,658,727	22.8	22.0
2010	3,070,500	143,661,795	22.5	21.7
2011	3,499,925	163,753,620	23.1	23.9

Note: Change of basis in comparison data conventional versus GM IR cotton in 2007: see appendix 3

*c) Australia*

Using a combination of data from AMIS Global, industry sources and CSIRO<sup>99</sup>, the following changes in insecticide use on Australian cotton have occurred:

- There has been a significant reduction in both the volume of insecticides used and the environmental impact associated with this spraying (Table 57);
- The average field EIQ/ha value of the Ingard technology was less than half the average field EIQ/ha for conventional cotton. In turn, this saving has been further increased with the availability and adoption of the Bollgard II cotton from 2003/04;
- The total amount of insecticide ai used and its environmental impact (Table 58) has been respectively 54% (0.65 million kg) and 59% lower in 2011 than the levels that would have occurred if only conventional cotton had been planted;

<sup>98</sup> Sources: based on a combination of industry views and Pray et al (2001)

<sup>99</sup> The former making a direct comparison of insecticide use of Bollgard II versus conventional cotton and the latter a survey-based assessment of actual insecticide usage in the years 2002-03 and 2003-04

- Cumulatively, since 1996 the volume of insecticide use is 32.4% lower (16.8 million kg) than the amount that would have been used if GM IR technology had not been adopted and the field EIQ load has fallen by 32.6%.

**Table 57: Comparison of insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for conventional, Ingard and Bollgard II cotton in Australia**

	Conventional	Ingard	Bollgard II
Active ingredient use (kg/ha)	11.0 (2.1)	4.3	2.2 (0.91)
Field EIQ value/ha	220 (65)	97	39 (25.0)

Sources and notes: derived from industry sources and CSIRO 2005. Ingard cotton grown from 1996, Bollgard from 2003/04, bracketed figures = values updated/revised for 2011)

**Table 58: National level changes in insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR cotton in Australia 1996-2011**

Year	ai decrease (kg)	eiq saving (units)	%decrease in ai	% eiq saving
1996	266,945	4,900,628	6.1	5.6
1997	390,175	7,162,905	9.1	8.4
1998	667,052	12,245,880	12.2	11.2
1999	896,795	16,463,550	15.2	14.0
2000	1,105,500	20,295,000	19.6	18.0
2001	909,538	16,697,496	23.8	21.9
2002	481,911	8,847,021	19.1	17.6
2003	427,621	7,850,352	20.1	18.4
2004	1,932,876	39,755,745	58.3	60.0
2005	2,177,393	44,785,011	64.4	66.2
2006	1,037,850	21,346,688	62.9	64.7
2007	486,886	10,014,368	69.2	71.1
2008	1,066,894	21,944,078	66.5	68.4
2009	1,403,591	28,869,319	69.9	71.9
2010	2,925,150	60,165,015	73.0	75.0
2011	656,285	22,076,545	53.9	58.6

*d) Argentina*

Adoption of GM IR cotton in Argentina has also resulted in important reductions in insecticide use<sup>100</sup>:

- The average volume of insecticide ai used by GM IR cotton growers is 44% lower than the average of 0.736 kg/ha for conventional cotton growers in 2011;
- The average field EIQ/ha is also significantly lower for GM IR cotton growers (38.2/ha for conventional growers compared to 15.1/ha for GM IR growers);
- The total amount of ai used and its environmental impact (Table 59) have been respectively 42.3% (165,000 kg) and 57.6% lower (11.7 million field EIQ/ha units in 2011) than the levels that would have occurred if only conventional cotton had been planted;

<sup>100</sup> Based on data from Qaim and De Janvry (2005)

- Cumulatively since 1998, the volume of insecticide use is 16.2% lower (0.83 million kg) and the EIQ/ha load 22.8% lower (54.7 million field EIQ/ha units) than the amount that would have been used if GM IR technology had not been adopted.

**Table 59: National level changes in insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR cotton in Argentina 1998-2011**

Year	ai decrease (kg)	eiq saving (units)	% decrease in ai	% eiq saving
1998	2,550	160,000	0.3	0.3
1999	6,120	384,000	0.8	1.1
2000	12,750	800,000	3.3	4.5
2001	5,100	320,000	1.1	1.6
2002	10,200	640,000	5.4	7.4
2003	23,664	1,484,800	17.6	23.9
2004	22,400	1,408,000	6.0	8.2
2005	9,180	576,000	3.2	4.4
2006	35,904	2,252,800	9.6	13.1
2007	66,218	4,154,880	21.8	29.7
2008	121,176	7,603,200	44.1	60.1
2009	145,370	9,121,280	35.9	48.9
2010	201,030	14,190,336	43.4	59.0
2011	165,158	11,658,250	42.3	57.6

Notes: derived from sources including CASAFE and Kynetec. Decrease in impact for 2005 associated with a decrease in GM IR plantings in that year

*e) India*

The analysis presented below is based on insecticide usage data from AMIS Global and typical spray regimes for GM IR and non GM IR cotton (source: Monsanto Industry, India 2006, 2009 and 2011). The respective differences for ai use (see appendix 3) and field EIQ values for GM IR and conventional cotton used in 2011 are:

- Conventional cotton: average volume of insecticide used was 1.69 kg/ha and a field EIQ/ha value of 66.1/ha;
- GM IR cotton: average volume of insecticide used was 0.64 kg/ha and a field EIQ/ha value of 17.55/ha.

Based on these values the level of insecticide ai use and the total EIQ load in 2011 were respectively 49.5% (11.2 million kg) and 61% (521 million field EIQ/ha units) lower than would have been expected if the total crop had been conventional cotton. Cumulatively, since 2002, the insecticide ai use was 19.1% lower (49.8 million kg) and the total EIQ load 24% lower (2.3 billion EIQ/ha units).

*f) Brazil*

GM IR cotton was first planted commercially in 2006 (in 2011, on 345,000 ha, 25% of the total crop). Due to the limited availability of data, the analysis presented below is based on the experience in Argentina (see above). Thus, the respective differences for insecticide ai use and field EIQ values for GM IR and conventional cotton used as the basis for the analysis are:

- Conventional cotton: average volume of insecticide used is 0.736 kg/ha and a field EIQ/ha value of 38.2/ha;
- GM IR cotton: average volume of insecticide used 0.41 kg/ha and a field EIQ/ha value of 15.1/ha.

Based on these values the level of insecticide use and the total EIQ load in 2011 were respectively 11% (112,000 kg) and 15% (7.9 million EIQ/ha units) lower than would have been expected if the total crop had been conventional cotton. Cumulatively since 2006, the total active ingredient saving has been 0.5 million kg (9%) and the EIQ/ha load factor has fallen by 12%.

*g) Mexico*

GM IR cotton has been grown in Mexico since 1996, and in 2011, 99,870 ha (53% of the total crop) were planted to varieties containing GM IR traits.

Drawing on industry level data that compares typical insecticide treatments for GM IR and conventional cotton (see appendix 3), the main environmental impact associated with the use of GM IR technology in the cotton crop has been a significant reduction in the environmental impact associated with insecticide use on cotton. More specifically:

- On a per ha basis, GM IR cotton uses 31% less (-1.6 kg) insecticide than conventional cotton. The associated environmental impact, as measured by the EIQ indicator, of the GM IR cotton is a 32% improvement on conventional cotton (a field EIQ/ha value of 56.6/ha compared to 137/ha for conventional cotton);
- In 2011, at a national level, there had been a 16.3% saving in the amount of insecticide active ingredient use (161,980 kg) applied relative to usage if the whole crop had been planted to conventional varieties. The field EIQ load was 16.2% lower;
- Cumulatively since 1996, the amount of insecticide active ingredient applied was 9.5% (1 million kg) lower relative to usage if the Mexican cotton crop had been planted to only conventional varieties over this period. The field EIQ load was 9.4% lower than it would otherwise have been if the whole crop had been using conventional varieties.

*h) Other countries*

Cotton farmers in South Africa, Colombia and Burkina Faso have also been using GM IR technology in recent years (respectively since 1998, 2002 and 2008). In 2011, the respective plantings were 8,930 ha, 42,250 ha and 232,000 ha. Analysis of the impact on insecticide use and the associated environmental 'foot print' are not presented for these crops because of the lack of publicly available insecticide usage data.


*i) Summary of impact*

Since 1996, the net impact on insecticide use and the associated environmental 'foot print' (relative to what could have been expected if all cotton plantings had been to conventional varieties) in the main GM IR adopting countries has been (Figure 21):

- In 2011, a 37.4% decrease in the total volume of insecticide applied (17 million kg) and a 41.4% reduction in the environmental impact (measured in terms of the field EIQ/ha load);

- Since 1996, 24.8% less insecticide ai has been used (188.7 million kg) and the environmental impact from insecticides applied to the cotton crop has fallen by 27.3%.

**Figure 21: Reduction in insecticide use and the environmental load from using GM IR cotton in adopting countries 1996-2011**



#### 4.1.8 Other environmental impacts - development of herbicide resistant weeds and weed shifts

##### Context

The development of weeds resistant to herbicides, or of gene flow from crops to wild relatives, are not new developments in agriculture and are, therefore, not issues unique to the adoption of biotechnology in agriculture. All weeds have the ability to adapt to selection pressure, and there are examples of weeds that have developed resistance to a number of herbicides and to mechanical methods of weed control (eg, prostrate weeds such as dandelion which can survive mowing).

Weed resistance occurs mostly when the same herbicide(s), with the same mode of action, have been applied on a continuous basis over a number of years. There are hundreds of resistant weed species confirmed in the International Survey of Herbicide Resistant Weeds ([www.weedscience.org](http://www.weedscience.org)). Worldwide, there are 24 weed species that are currently<sup>101</sup> resistant to glyphosate, compared to 129 weed species resistant to ALS herbicides and 70 weed species resistant to triazine herbicides, such as atrazine.

Several of the confirmed glyphosate resistant weed species have also been found in areas where no GM HT crops have been grown. For example, there are currently 14 weeds recognised in the US as exhibiting resistance to glyphosate, of which two are not associated with glyphosate

<sup>101</sup> Accessed February 2013

tolerant crops. It should, however, be noted that where GM HT crops have been widely grown, some farmers have relied too much on the use of single herbicides like glyphosate to manage weeds in GM HT crops and this has contributed to the development of weed resistance. In addition, the adoption of GM HT technology has played a major role in facilitating the adoption of no and reduced tillage production techniques in North and South America (see section 4.2). This has also probably contributed to the emergence of weeds resistant to herbicides like glyphosate and to weed shifts towards those weed species that are inherently not well controlled by glyphosate. A few of the glyphosate resistant species, such as marestail (*Conyza Canadensis*) and palmer pigweed (*Amaranthus Palmeri*) are now reasonably widespread in the US. The affected area in the US is now within the range of 15% to 35% of the total area annually planted to crops in which GM HT technology is used (maize, cotton, soybeans, canola and sugar beet). In Argentina, development of resistance to glyphosate in weeds such as Johnson Grass (*Sorghum halepense*) is also reported.

#### *Control and implications*

Where farmers are faced with the existence of weeds resistant to glyphosate, there is a need to adopt reactive weed management strategies incorporating the use of a mix of herbicides (ie, the same way as control of other herbicide resistant weeds). In recent years, there has also been a growing consensus among weed scientists of a need for changes in the weed management programmes in GM HT crops, because of the evolution of these weed populations that are resistant to glyphosate. Growers of GM HT crops are increasingly being advised to be more proactive and include other herbicides (with different and complementary modes of action) in combination with glyphosate in their weed management systems (and in some cases to revert to ploughing), even where instances of weed resistance to glyphosate have not been found. This proactive approach to weed management is therefore the principal strategy for avoiding the emergence of herbicide resistant weeds in GM HT crops. A proactive weed management programme also generally requires less herbicide, has a better environmental profile and is more economical than a reactive weed management programme (see Appendix 3 for examples in the soybean sector).

At the macro level, the adoption of both reactive and proactive weed management programmes in GM HT crops has already begun to influence the mix, total amount and overall environmental profile of herbicides applied to GM HT soybeans, cotton, maize and canola. This is shown in the analysis presented in earlier sub-sections within section 4.1, where for example, the usage and mix of herbicides on GM HT crops in the US has increased in recent years. This is also shown in the evidence relating to changes in herbicide use, as reported in the annual farm level surveys that the authors have drawn on for this research. For example, in the US GM HT soybean crop in 2011, just over 50% of the crop received an additional herbicide treatment of one of the following active ingredients<sup>102</sup> 2,4-D, chlorimuron, flumioxazin and fomesafen. This compares with 15% of the GM HT soybean crop receiving a treatment of one of these four herbicide active ingredients in 2006. As a result, the average amount of herbicide active ingredient applied to GM HT soybean crops in the US (per hectare) increased by about a third over the previous five year period (the associated EIQ value has increased by a similar amount). This compared with the average amount of herbicide active ingredient applied to the conventional (non GM) soybean alternative which increased by 45% over the same period (the associated EIQ value for conventional soybean

<sup>102</sup> The four most used herbicide active ingredients used on soybean crops after glyphosate (source: derived from GfK Kynetec)

crops increased by 39%). The increase in the use of herbicides on conventional soybean crops in the US can also be partly attributed to the on-going development of weed resistance to non-glyphosate herbicides commonly used and highlights that the development of weed resistance to herbicides is a problem faced by all farmers, regardless of production method. In addition, it is interesting to note that in the US cotton crop, whilst the average amount of herbicide active ingredient used has increased over the last five years, during the last two seasons, average use of glyphosate has fallen, being replaced with additional use of other herbicides. This suggests that US cotton farmers are increasingly adopting current/recent recommended practices for managing weed resistance (to glyphosate).

Relative to the conventional alternative, however, the overall environmental profile and economic impact of the GM HT crops continues to offer advantages<sup>103</sup> (see Appendix 3). It should also be noted that, as indicated in section 4.1.1, whilst the amount of herbicide applied to GM HT crops in some countries like the US has increased in recent years, so has the amount of herbicide applied to conventional alternatives. The increase in the use of herbicides on conventional alternatives for crops like soybean in the US also reflects the ongoing development of weed resistance to herbicides commonly used and highlights that the development of weed resistance to herbicides is a problem faced by all farmers, regardless of production method.

In addition, control of volunteer herbicide resistant crops has also been addressed in the same way, and few differences have been reported between volunteer management strategies in conventional crops compared to GM HT crops (see for example, Canola Council (2005) relating to volunteer canola management).

## 4.2 Carbon sequestration

This section assesses the contribution of GM crop adoption to reducing the level of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The scope for GM crops contributing to lower levels of GHG comes from two principal sources:

- Fewer herbicide or insecticide applications (eg, targeted insecticide programmes developed in combination with GM IR cotton where the number of insecticide treatments has been significantly reduced and hence there are fewer tractor spray passes);
- The use of 'no-till' (NT) and 'reduced-till'<sup>104</sup> (RT) farming systems. These have increased significantly with the adoption of GM HT crops because the GM HT technology has improved growers ability to control competing weeds, reducing the need to rely on soil cultivation and seed-bed preparation as means to getting good levels of weed control. As a result, tractor fuel use for tillage is reduced, soil quality is enhanced and levels of soil erosion cut. In turn, more carbon remains in the soil and this leads to lower GHG emissions<sup>105</sup>.

<sup>103</sup> Also, many of the herbicides used in conventional production systems had significant resistance issues themselves; this was, for example, one of the reasons why glyphosate tolerant soybeans were rapidly adopted, since glyphosate provided good control of these weeds

<sup>104</sup> No-till farming means that the ground is not ploughed at all, while reduced tillage means that the ground is disturbed less than it would be with traditional tillage systems. For example, under a no-till farming system, soybean seeds are planted through the organic material that is left over from a previous crop such as corn, cotton or wheat, without any soil disturbance, whereas reduced tillage would include ridge till, mulch till and reduced tillage (where 15-30% of plant residue is left on the soil surface after planting).

<sup>105</sup> The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has agreed that conservation/no till cultivation leads to higher levels of soil carbon.



The mitigation of GHG can be measured in terms of the amount of carbon dioxide removed from the atmosphere (due to reduced consumption of tractor fuel and the storing of carbon in the soil) which would otherwise have been released as carbon dioxide.

#### 4.2.1 Tractor fuel use

##### *a) Reduced and no tillage*

The traditional intensive method of soil cultivation is based on the use of the mouldboard plough followed by a range of seed bed preparations. This has, however, been increasingly replaced in recent years by less intensive methods such as reduced tillage (using reduced chisel or disc ploughing) or conservation tillage (mulch-till, ridge-till, strip-till and no-till). The strip-till and NT systems rely much more on herbicide-based weed control, often comprising a pre-plant burn-down application and secondary applications post-emergent.

To estimate fuel savings from the adoption of conservation tillage systems, notably NT systems which are facilitated by the availability of GM HT crops, we have reviewed reports and data from a number of sources, of which the main ones of relevance were: the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Energy Estimator for Tillage Model (2012), the Voluntary Reporting of Greenhouse Gases-Management Evaluation Tool (COMET-VR), Jasa (2002), Reeder (2010), Illinois University (2006) and USDA (2006):

- The USDA's Energy Estimator for Tillage Model estimates diesel fuel use and costs in the production of key crops by specific locations across the USA and compares potential energy savings between conventional tillage (CT) and alternative tillage systems. The quantity of tractor fuel used for seed-bed preparation, herbicide spraying and planting in each of these systems is illustrated for soybeans planted in Illinois (Table 60). Conventional tillage requires 49.01 litres/ha, compared to mulch till at 40.88 litres/ha, ridge till 32.36 litres/ha and no-till 21.79 litres/ha;

**Table 60: USA soybean: tractor fuel consumption by tillage method (litres per ha) 2012**

Year 1 – Illinois	Conventional tillage	Mulch till	Ridge-till	No-till
Chisel	0.00	9.35	0.00	0.00
Plough, mouldboard	17.49	0.00	0.00	0.00
Disk, tandem light finishing	3.74	3.74	0.00	0.00
Cultivator, field 6-12 in sweeps	6.92	6.92	0.00	0.00
Planter, double disk operation	4.12	4.12	4.12	0.00
Planter, double disk operation w/fluted coulter	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.05
Cultivator, row - 1st pass ridge till	0.00	0.00	5.80	0.00
Cultivator, row - 2nd pass ridge till	0.00	0.00	6.92	0.00
Sprayer, post emergence	1.22	1.22	0.00	1.22
Sprayer, insecticide post emergence	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22
Harvest, killing crop 50% standing stubble	14.31	14.31	14.31	14.31

<b>Total fuel use:</b>	<b>49.01</b>	<b>40.88</b>	<b>32.36</b>	<b>21.79</b>
<b><i>Saving on Conventional tillage:</i></b>		<b>8.13</b>	<b>16.65</b>	<b>27.22</b>

Source: USDA Energy Estimator 2012

- The fuel saving obtained by a switch from conventional tillage to mulch-till, ridge-till and no-till for corn and soybeans across the three most important crop management zones (CMZ's) in the US is illustrated in Table 61. The adoption of no-till in corn results in a 24.41 litre/ha saving compared with conventional tillage and in the case of soybeans, the no-till saving is 27.12 litre/ha<sup>106</sup>, a saving of 44.8% and 55.3% respectively;

**Table 61: Total farm diesel fuel consumption estimate (litres per ha) 2012**

<b>Crop (crop management zones)</b>	<b>Conventional tillage</b>	<b>Mulch-till</b>	<b>Ridge-till</b>	<b>No-till</b>
<b>Corn</b> (Minnesota, Iowa & Illinois)				
Total fuel use	54.50	46.98	36.39	30.09
Potential fuel savings over conventional tillage		7.52	18.11	24.41
Saving		13.8%	33.2%	44.8%
<b>Soybeans</b> (Iowa, Illinois & Nebraska)				
Total fuel use	49.01	38.62	33.74	21.89
Potential fuel savings over conventional tillage		10.39	15.27	27.12
Saving		21.2%	31.2%	55.3%

Source: USDA Energy Estimator 2012

- The Voluntary Reporting of Greenhouse Gases-Carbon Management Evaluation Tool (COMET-VR ) gives a higher reduction of 41.81 litres/ha when conventional tillage is replaced by no-till on non-irrigated corn and a reduction of 59.68 litres/ha in the case of soybeans in Nebraska;
- The University of Illinois (2006) compared the relative fuel use across four different tillage systems for both corn and soybeans. The 'deep' tillage and 'typical' intensive systems required 36.01 litres/ha compared to the strip-till and no-till systems used 22.92 litres/ha – a reduction of 13.09 litres/ha;
- Reeder (2010) estimated that ridge-till or no-till typically uses 19 to 38 litres/ha less diesel fuel than conventional tillage;
- Analysis by Jasa (2002) at the University of Nebraska calculated fuel use based on farm survey data for various crops and tillage systems. Intensive tillage (resulting in 0%-15% crop residue) using the mouldboard plough uses 49.39 litres/ha, reduced tillage (15%-30% residue) based on a chisel plough and/or combination of disk passes uses 28.34-31.24 litres/ha, conservation tillage (>30% residue) based on ridge tillage 25.16 litre/ha and no-till and strip-tillage 13.38 litres/ha - a reduction of 36.01 litres/ha compared to intensive tillage;
- Other analyses have suggested similar savings in fuel from no-till. For example, the USDA 2007 Farm Bill Theme Paper 'Energy and Agriculture' states: *'During the past couple of decades, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has helped farmers adopt no-till practices on about 25 million hectares of cropland. Assuming an average saving of 33.13*

<sup>106</sup> These figures differ from ones presented in last year's report because the USDA Energy Estimator has been updated (11/05/2012).

*litres/ha in diesel fuel, this amounts to savings of 821 million litres of diesel fuel per year with cost savings to farmers of about \$500 million per year.'*

In our analysis<sup>107</sup> presented below, it is assumed that the adoption of NT farming systems in soybean production reduces cultivation and seedbed preparation fuel usage by 27.12 litres/ha compared with traditional conventional tillage and in the case of RT cultivation by 10.39 litres/ha. In the case of maize, NT results in a saving of 24.41 litres/ha and 7.52 litres/ha in the case of RT compared with conventional intensive tillage. These are conservative estimates and are in line with the USDA Fuel Estimator for soybeans and maize. The amount of tractor fuel used for seedbed preparation, herbicide spraying and planting in each of these systems is shown in Table 62.

**Table 62: Tractor fuel consumption by tillage method (litre/ha) 2012**

Tillage system	US soybean litre/ha	US maize litres/ha
Intensive tillage: traditional cultivation: mouldboard plough, disc and seed planting etc	49.01	54.50
Mulch till - Reduced tillage (RT): chisel plough, disc and seed planting	38.62	46.98
No-till (NT): fertiliser knife, seed planting plus 2 sprays	21.89	30.09

Source: Adapted from USDA Fuel Estimator 2012

In terms of GHG, each litre of tractor diesel consumed contributes an estimated 2.67<sup>108</sup> kg of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. The adoption of NT and RT systems in respect of fuel use therefore results in reductions of carbon dioxide emissions of 72.41 kg/ha and 27.74 kg/ha respectively for soybeans and 65.17 kg/ha and 20.08 kg/ha for maize.

*b) Reduced application of herbicides and insecticides*

For both herbicide and insecticide spray applications, the quantity of energy required to apply the pesticides depends upon the application method. For example, in the USA, a typical method of application is with a 50 foot boom sprayer which consumes approximately 0.84 litres/ha<sup>109</sup> (Lazarus (2012)). One less spray application therefore reduces carbon dioxide emissions by 2.24 kg/ha<sup>110</sup>.

The conversion of one hectare of conventional tillage to no-till equates to a saving of approximately 483 km travelled by a standard family car<sup>111</sup> and one less spray pass is equal to a saving of nearly 15 km travelled.

<sup>107</sup> In previous editions of this report the authors have used different savings that reflect changing estimates of fuel use by the USDA Energy Estimator. For example in the previous report covering the period 1996-2010 savings of 27.22 litres/ha for NT and 9.56 litres/ha for RT compared to CT were used.

<sup>108</sup> In previous editions of this report the authors have applied a co-efficient of 2.75 to convert 1 litre of diesel to kgs of carbon dioxide. This report (and the report covering the period 1996-2010) uses the updated figure of 2.6676 rounded to 2.67.

<sup>109</sup> In previous editions of this report (up to and including the 5<sup>th</sup> report covering 1996-2009) the authors have used 1.31 litres/ha.

<sup>110</sup> Given that many farmers apply insecticides via sprayers pulled by tractors, which tend to use higher levels of fuel than self-propelled boom sprayers, the estimates used in this section (for reductions in carbon emissions), which are based on self-propelled boom application, probably understate the carbon benefits.

<sup>111</sup> Assumed standard family car carbon dioxide emission rating = 150 grams/km. Therefore 72.41 kg of carbon dioxide divided by 150g/km = 483 km.

### 4.2.2 Soil carbon sequestration

Soil organic carbon has been depleted through:

- the long-term use of extractive farming practices; and
- the conversion of natural ecosystems (such as forest lands, prairie lands and steppes) into crop and grazing lands.

Such a conversion depletes the soil organic carbon pool by increasing the rate of conversion of soil organic matter to carbon dioxide, thereby reducing the input of biomass carbon and accentuating losses by erosion. Most agricultural soils have lost 30 to 40 tonnes/ha of carbon, and their current reserves of soil organic carbon are much lower than their potential capacity.

Soil carbon sequestration involves adding the maximum amount of carbon possible to the soil. The technical potential for this process is higher in degraded/desertified soils, and soils that have been managed with extractive farming practices, than it is in good-quality soils that have been managed according to recommended management practices (RMPs). Thus, converting degraded/desertified soils into restorative land and adopting RMPs can increase the soil carbon pool. The rate of soil carbon sequestration through the adoption of RMPs on degraded soils ranges from 100 kg/ha per year in warm and dry regions to 1,500 kg/ha per year in cool and temperate regions.

A recent estimate of the technical potential of soil organic carbon sequestration through adoption of RMPs for world cropland soils (1.5 billion ha) is 0.6 billion to 1.2 billion tonnes of carbon per year and about 3 billion tonnes of carbon per year in soils of all ecosystems (eg, cropland, grazing land, forest lands, degraded lands and wetlands: Lal R (2010)).

Examples of soil and crop management technologies that increase soil carbon sequestration include:

- no-till farming with residue mulch and cover cropping;
- integrated nutrient management (INM), which balances nutrient application with use of organic manures and inorganic fertilizers;
- various crop rotations (including agroforestry);
- use of soil amendments (such as zeolites, biochar, or compost); and
- improved pastures with recommended stocking rates and controlled fire as a rejuvenate method (Lal (2009)).

The most effective natural method of achieving soil carbon sequestration is by the absorption of atmospheric carbon dioxide in plants by photosynthesis, where plants convert carbon dioxide into plant tissue (lignin and carbohydrates). When a plant dies, a portion of the stored carbon is left behind in the soil by decomposing plant residue (eg, roots, stalks) and a larger portion is emitted back into the atmosphere. This organic carbon is maintained in soils through a dynamic process with plants acting as the primary vehicle. Decomposition rates tend to be proportional to the amount of organic matter in the soil. By enhancing the organic matter a higher Carbon-Stock Equilibrium (CSE) can be achieved. For example a shift from conventional tillage to RT/NT increases the amount of crop residue returned to the soil and decreases the decomposition rate of

soil organic matter. Continuous use of NT will result in an increase in soil carbon over time until a higher CSE is reached.

Changes in cultivation management can therefore potentially increase the accumulation of soil organic carbon (SOC), thereby sequestering more carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. More specifically:

- The degradation of crop soils by the oxidation of soil carbon to carbon dioxide started in the 1850's with the introduction of large scale soil cultivation using the mouldboard plough. The effect of ploughing on soil carbon has been measured by Reicosky (1995) for a selection of cultivation techniques (after tilling wheat). Using a mouldboard plough results in soil carbon losses far exceeding the carbon value of the previous wheat crop residue and depleting soil carbon by 1,990 kg/ha compared with a no-tillage system;
- Lal (1999) estimated that the global release of soil carbon since 1850 from land use changes has been 136 +/- 55 Pg<sup>112</sup> (billion tonnes) of carbon. This is approximately half of the total carbon emissions from fossil fuels (270 +/- 30 Pg (billion tonnes)), with soil cultivation accounting for 78 +/- 12 Pg and soil erosion 26 +/- 9 Pg of carbon emissions. Lal also estimates that the potential of carbon sequestration in soil, biota and terrestrial ecosystems may be as much as 3 Pg C per year (1.41 parts per million of atmospheric carbon dioxide). A strategy of soil carbon sequestration over a 25 to 50 year period could therefore have a substantial impact on lowering the rate at which carbon dioxide is rising in the atmosphere providing the necessary time to adopt alternative energy strategies;
- Bernacchi *et al* (2005) estimate that if the total area of corn/soybeans in the USA converted to no-till, 21.7 Tg C (21.7 million tonnes) would be sequestered annually (approximately 350 kg/C/ha/yr), an offset of about 2% of annual USA carbon emissions.

A number of researchers have examined issues relating to carbon sequestration and different tillage systems. The following are of note:

- West and Post (2002). This work analysed 67 long-term agricultural experiments, consisting of 276 paired treatments. These results indicate, on average, that a change from conventional tillage (CT) to no-till (NT) can sequester 57 +/- 14 g carbon per square metre per year (grams carbon m<sup>-2</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>), excluding a change to NT in wheat-fallow systems. The cropping system that obtained the highest level of carbon sequestration when tillage changed from CT to NT was corn:soybeans in rotation (90 +/- 59 grams carbon m<sup>-2</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>.) This level of carbon sequestration equates to 900 +/- 590 kg/carbon/ha/yr, which would have decreased carbon dioxide level in the atmosphere by 3,303 +/- 2,165 kg of carbon dioxide per ha/year<sup>113</sup>;
- Johnson *et al* (2005) summarised how alternative tillage and cropping systems interact to sequester soil organic carbon (SOC) and impact on GHG emissions from the main agricultural area in central USA. This analysis estimated that the rate of SOC storage in NT compared to CT has been significant, but variable, averaging 400 +/- 61 kg/carbon/ha/yr (Table 63);
- Calegari *et al* (2008) conducted a 19 year experiment comparing CT and NT management systems with various winter cover crop treatments in Brazil. The research identified that

<sup>112</sup> 1 Pg of soil carbon pool equates to 0.47 parts per million of atmospheric carbon dioxide.

<sup>113</sup> Conversion factor for carbon sequestered into carbon dioxide = 3.67.

the NT system led to 64.6% more carbon being retained in the upper soil layer than in the CT system. It also found that using NT with winter cover crops resulted in soil properties that most closely resembled an undisturbed forest (ie, best suited for greenhouse gas storage). In addition, both maize and soybean yields were found to be respectively 6% and 5% higher, under NT, than CT production systems;

- IPCC estimates put the rate of soil organic carbon (SOC) sequestration by the conversion from conventional to all conservation tillage (NT and RT) in North America within a range of 50 to 1,300 kg carbon ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (it varies by soil type, cropping system and eco-region), with a mean of 300 kg carbon ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>.

Our analysis using the COMET-VR 2.0 tool<sup>114</sup> for the three key production states and assuming the adoption of NT from CT for non-irrigated corn in the major corn producing states results in a projected 269 kg to 514 kg carbon per year being sequestered (Table 63);

**Table 63: Summary of the potential of NT cultivation systems (kg of carbon/ha/yr)**

	Low	High	Average
West and Post (2002)	310	1,490	900
Johnson <i>et al</i> (2005)	339	461	400
Liebig (2005)	80	460	270
IPCC	50	1,300	300
COMET-VR V2 <sup>115</sup> (NT from CT in corn)			
<i>Illinois</i>	269	456	359
<i>Minnesota</i>	303	504	399
<i>Nebraska</i>	316	514	412

- The adoption of NT systems has also had an impact on other GHG emissions such as methane and nitrous oxide which are respectively 21 and 310 times more potent than carbon dioxide. Robertson (2002) and Sextstone *et al* (1985) suggested that the adoption of NT (sequestering SOC) could do so at the expense of increased nitrous oxide production if growers were to increase the use of nitrogen fertiliser in NT production systems;
- Robertson *et al* (2000) measured gas fluxes for carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide and methane and other sources of global warming potential (GWP) in cropped and unmanaged ecosystems over the period 1991 to 1999. They found that the net GWP was highest for conventional tillage systems at 114 grams of carbon dioxide equivalents/ha/year compared with 41 grams/ha/year for an organic system with legumes cover and 14 grams/ha/year for a no-till system (with liming) and minus 20 grams/ha/year for a NT system (without liming). The major factors influencing the beneficial effect of no-till over conventional and organic systems is the high level of carbon sequestration and reduced use of fuel resulting in emissions of 12 grams of carbon dioxide equivalents m<sup>-2</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>

<sup>114</sup> COMET-VR 2.0 is a web-based tool that provides estimates of carbon sequestration and net greenhouse gas emissions from soils and biomass for US farms. It links databases containing information on soils, climate and management practices to run an ecosystem simulation model as well as empirical models for soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> from fuel usage for field operations. In 2011, an updated version was released - <http://www.comet2.colostate.edu/>.

<sup>115</sup> In previous editions of this report (up to and including the report covering 1996-2009) the authors have applied data obtained from COMET-VR version 1. Reports since then have used data from version 2.

compared with 16 grams in conventional tillage and 19 grams for organic tillage. The release of nitrous oxide in terms of carbon dioxide was equivalent in the organic and NT systems due to the availability of nitrogen under the organic system compared with the targeted use of nitrogen fertiliser under the NT systems;

- The importance of nitrogen fixing legume grain crops has also been investigated by Almaraz *et al* (2009). They studied the GHG emission associated with N<sub>2</sub> fixing soybean grown under CT and NT tillage systems. Their findings suggest that using NT in N-fixing legume crops may reduce both carbon dioxide and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in comparison to CT, because in the CT system, harvest residue is incorporated into the soil during ploughing (increasing N<sub>2</sub>O emissions);
- Omonode *et al* (2011) assessed N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in corn following three decades of different tillage and rotation systems. Seasonal cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were significantly lower by 40%-57% under NT compared to long term chisel and mouldboard plough tillage systems, due to soil organic C decomposition associated with higher levels of soil residue mixing and higher soil temperatures;
- Using IPCC emission factors, Johnson *et al* (2005) estimated the offsetting effect of alternative fertiliser management and cropping systems. For a NT cropping system that received 100 kg N per ha per year (net from all sources), the estimated annual nitrous oxide emission of 2.25 kg N per ha per year would have to increase by 32%-97% to completely offset carbon sequestration gains of 100-300 kg per ha per year;
- Baker *et al* (2007) expressed caution with the premise that NT results in positive carbon sequestration compared with CT. Their analysis identified 37 out of 45 studies (from 17 experiments) with sampling depth <30 cm at which NT treatments (82%) reported more SOC than in the CT control with a mean annual SOC gain of 0.38 +/- 0.72 t ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>. In contrast, in 35 of 51 studies (from 5 experiments) with sampling depths >30 cm, the NT treatments registered less SOC relative to CT with a mean annual loss of -0.23 +/- 0.97 t ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>. In both cases, however, the standard error associated with the estimates was so large that the mean (impact of tillage) was not considered to be significant;
- Research by Angers and Eriksen-Hamel (2008) and Blanco-Canqui and Lal (2008) found that the majority of SOC increase under NT is in the top 10 to 15 cm of soil with insignificant changes (or even decreases) in SOC relative to CT at depths over 15 cm. Hence, newly sequestered carbon in a NT system is accumulated where it is most vulnerable to environmental and management pressures. This makes any permanent increase in SOC associated with NT systems vulnerable to changes in environmental pressures and soil management practices;
- Angers and Eriksen-Hamel's (2008) work also compared NT and full-inversion tillage (FIT) trials and found that while there was a statistically significant increase in total SOC stocks under NT (100.3 versus 95.4 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> for NT and FIT respectively in the upper 10 cm), to the 21-25 cm soil depth (which corresponds to the mean ploughing depth (23 cm)), the average SOC content was significantly greater under FIT than NT. It was also greater under FIT just below the average depth of ploughing (26-35 cm). However, overall there was significantly more SOC (4.9 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>) under NT than FIT across all depths and this difference in favour of NT increased weakly with the duration of the experiment.

The discussion above illustrates the difficulty in estimating the contribution NT systems can make to soil carbon sequestration. The modelling of soil carbon sequestration is also made more difficult by the dynamic nature of soils, climate, cropping types and patterns. If a specific crop

area is in continuous NT crop rotation, the full SOC benefits described above can be realised. However, if the NT crop area is returned to a conventional tillage system, a proportion of the SOC gain will be lost. The temporary nature of this form of carbon storage will only become permanent when farmers adopt a continuous NT system which itself tends to be highly dependent upon effective herbicide-based weed control systems.

In sum, drawing on the various discussed literature, the analysis presented in the following sub-sections assumes<sup>116</sup> the following:

*USA*: soil carbon sequestered by tillage system for corn and soybeans in continuous rotation:

- NT systems store 375 kg of carbon/ha/year;
- RT systems store 175 kg of carbon/ha/year; and
- CT systems release 25 kg of carbon/ha/year).

*Argentina and Brazil*: soil carbon retention is 175 kg carbon/ha/year for NT soybean cropping and CT systems release 25 kg carbon/ha/year.

Where the use of biotech crops has resulted in a reduction in the number of spray passes or the use of less intensive cultivation practices (ie, less ploughing) this has provided (and continues to provide) a permanent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions.

### 4.2.3 Herbicide tolerance and conservation tillage

The adoption of GM HT crops has impacted on the type of herbicides applied, the method of application (foliar, broadcast, soil incorporated) and the number of herbicide applications. For example, the adoption of GM HT canola in North America has resulted in applications of residual soil-active herbicides being replaced by post-emergence applications of broad-spectrum herbicides with foliar activity (Brimner *et al* (2004)). Similarly, in the case of GM HT cotton the use of glyphosate to control both grass and broadleaf weeds, post-emergent, has replaced the use of soil residual herbicides applied pre- and post-emergence (McClelland *et al* (2000)). The type and number of herbicide applications have therefore changed, often resulting in a reduction in the number of herbicide applications (see section 3).

In addition to the reduction in the number of herbicide applications there has been a shift from conventional tillage to reduced-till and no-till. This has had a marked effect on tractor fuel consumption due to energy intensive cultivation methods being replaced with no/reduced tillage and herbicide-based weed control systems. The GM HT crop where this is most evident is GM HT soybeans. Here, adoption of the technology has made an important contribution to facilitating the adoption of reduced or no tillage farming<sup>117</sup>. Before the introduction of GM HT soybean cultivars, NT systems were practised by some farmers with varying degrees of success

<sup>116</sup> In previous editions of this report (reports up to and including the one covering the period 1996-2009) the authors have assumed NT systems store 300 kg of carbon/ha/yr, RT systems store 100 kg of carbon/ha/yr and CT systems release 100 kg of carbon/ha/yr. The changes adopted in subsequent reports, including this one, reflect recent research referred to above. The reader should also note that the relative difference has remained unchanged at +400 kg and +200 kg of carbon/ha/yr respectively. Similarly, for Argentina, the authors applied a carbon sequestration rate of 100 kg of carbon/ha/yr for RT/NT systems and a carbon release of 100 kg of carbon/ha/yr for CT systems, the difference between the systems has remained at 200 kg of carbon/ha/yr in both the old and current analysis.

<sup>117</sup> See for example, CTIC 2002.



using a number of herbicides. The opportunity for growers to control weeds with a non-residual foliar herbicide as a “burn down” pre-seeding treatment, followed by a post-emergent treatment when the soybean crop became established, has made the NT system more reliable, technically viable and commercially attractive. These technical and cost advantages have contributed to the rapid adoption of GM HT cultivars and a substantial increase in the NT soybean area in the USA (also more than a seven fold increase in Argentina). In both countries, GM HT soybeans are estimated to account for over 95% of the NT soybean crop area.

#### 4.2.4 Herbicide tolerant soybeans

##### 4.2.4.1 The USA

Over the 1996-2011 period the area of soybeans cultivated in the USA increased rapidly from 26 million ha to 30 million ha. Over the same period, the area planted using conventional tillage is estimated to have fallen by 21.1% (from 7.5 million ha to 5.9 million ha), whilst the area planted using reduced-till, mulch till and ridge till has increased by 14.6% (from 10.8 million ha to 12.3 million ha) and the area planted using no-till has increased by 53% (from 7.7 million ha to 11.8 million ha).

The most rapid rate of adoption of the GM HT technology has been by growers using NT systems (GM HT cultivars accounting for an estimated 99% of total NT soybeans by 2011). This compares with conventional tillage systems for soybeans where GM HT cultivars may account for up to 89% of total conventional tillage soybean plantings (Table 64).

**Table 64: USA soybean: tillage practices and the adoption of GM HT cultivars 1996-2011 (million ha)**

	Total area	No-till	Reduced till	Conventional till	Total GM HT area	Total conventional area	No till GM HT area	Reduced till biotech area	Conventional tillage GM HT area
1996	25.98	7.72	10.75	7.51	0.49	25.49	0.23	0.16	0.10
1997	28.33	8.72	12.03	7.58	3.20	25.13	1.92	1.20	0.08
1998	29.14	9.28	12.69	7.17	11.77	17.37	4.92	4.82	2.03
1999	29.84	9.65	12.78	7.41	16.39	13.45	6.08	7.03	3.28
2000	30.15	9.90	12.69	7.56	18.21	11.94	6.93	7.61	3.67
2001	29.99	10.16	12.53	7.30	22.18	7.81	8.63	9.02	4.53
2002	29.55	10.31	12.26	6.98	24.29	5.26	9.38	10.41	4.50
2003	29.71	10.92	12.30	6.49	25.74	3.97	10.37	11.07	4.26
2004	30.28	11.69	12.51	6.08	27.20	3.08	11.40	11.28	4.52
2005	28.88	11.40	11.65	5.83	26.87	2.01	11.29	11.06	4.52
2006	30.57	12.34	12.03	6.20	27.21	3.36	12.09	10.44	4.68
2007	25.75	10.69	10.03	5.03	23.43	2.32	10.42	9.10	3.91
2008	30.20	12.47	11.78	5.95	27.78	2.42	12.35	10.72	4.71
2009	30.91	12.76	12.06	6.09	28.13	2.78	12.63	10.97	4.53
2010	31.56	12.72	12.62	6.22	29.35	2.21	12.59	11.55	5.21
2011	30.05	11.81	12.32	5.92	28.25	1.80	11.69	11.28	5.28

Source: Adapted from Conservation Tillage and Plant Biotechnology (CTIC) 1998, 2000, 2002, 2006, 2007 and 2008, GfK Kynetec

Reduced tillage includes mulch till and ridge till

The importance of GM HT soybeans in the adoption of a NT system has also been confirmed by an American Soybean Association (ASA) study (2001) of conservation tillage. This study found that the availability of GM HT soybeans has facilitated and encouraged farmers to implement reduced tillage practices; a majority of growers surveyed indicated that GM HT soybean technology had been the factor of *greatest* influence in their adoption of reduced tillage practices.

*a) Fuel consumption*

Based on the soybean crop area planted by tillage system, type of seed planted (GM HT and conventional) and applying the fuel usage consumption rates presented in section 4.2.1, the total consumption of tractor fuel has increased by only 7.6% (72.4 million litres) from 952.1 to 1,024.5 million litres (1996 to 2011: Table 65) while the area planted increased by 15.7%, some 4.1 million ha. Over the same period, the average fuel usage fell 7% (from 36.6 litres/ha to 34.1 litres/ha: Table 65). A comparison of GM HT versus conventional production systems shows that in 2011, the average tillage fuel consumption on the GM HT planted area was 33.6 litres/ha compared to 41.6 litres/ha for the conventional crop (primarily because of differences in the share of NT plantings).

**Table 65: USA soybean: consumption of tractor fuel used for tillage (1996-2011)**

	Total fuel consumption (million litres)	Average (litre/ha)	Conventional average (litre/ha)	GM HT average (litres/ha)
1996	952.1	36.6	36.8	30.8
1997	1,027.0	36.2	37.2	28.8
1998	1,044.9	35.8	37.5	33.5
1999	1,067.9	35.8	37.4	34.4
2000	1,077.2	35.7	37.7	34.4
2001	1,064.2	35.5	39.0	34.2
2002	1,040.9	35.2	40.5	34.1
2003	1,032.1	34.7	42.2	33.6
2004	1,036.9	34.2	42.6	33.3
2005	985.1	34.1	45.2	33.3
2006	1,038.3	34.0	42.4	32.9
2007	867.9	33.7	41.5	32.9
2008	1,019.7	33.8	43.4	32.9
2009	1,043.4	33.8	44.0	32.7
2010	1,070.7	33.9	42.1	33.3
2011	1,024.5	34.1	41.6	33.6

The cumulative permanent reduction in tillage fuel use in USA soybeans is summarised in Table 66. This amounted to a reduction in tillage fuel usage of 864.6 million litres which equates to a reduction in carbon dioxide emission of 2,308 million kg.

**Table 66: USA soybeans: permanent reduction in tractor fuel consumption and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (1996-2011)**

	Annual reduction based on 1996 average (litres/ha)	Crop area (million ha)	Total fuel saving (million litres)	Carbon dioxide (million kg)
1996	0.00	25.98	0.00	0.00
1997	0.40	28.33	11.36	30.33
1998	0.80	29.15	23.38	62.41
1999	0.86	29.84	25.65	68.50
2000	0.92	30.15	27.66	73.86
2001	1.16	29.99	34.94	93.28
2002	1.41	29.54	41.72	111.39
2003	1.91	29.71	56.64	151.23
2004	2.40	30.28	72.69	194.09
2005	2.54	28.88	73.33	195.80
2006	2.68	30.56	81.84	218.51
2007	2.95	25.75	75.85	202.51
2008	2.89	30.21	87.32	233.15
2009	2.89	30.91	89.35	238.56
2010	2.72	31.56	86.00	229.62
2011	2.56	30.05	76.86	205.22
<b>Total</b>			<b>864.60</b>	<b>2,308.48</b>

Assumption: baseline fuel usage is the 1996 level of 36.6 litres/ha

*b) Soil carbon sequestration*

Based on the crop area planted by tillage system and type of seed planted (GM HT and conventional) and using estimates of the soil carbon sequestered by tillage system for corn and soybeans in continuous rotation (the NT system is assumed to store 375 kg of carbon/ha/year, the RT system assumed to store 175 kg carbon/ha/year and the CT system assumed to release 25 kg carbon/ha/year)<sup>118</sup>, our estimates of total soil carbon sequestered are (Table 67):

- An increase of 1,848 million kg carbon/year (from 4,589 million kg in 1996 to 6,437 million kg carbon/year in 2011 due to the increase in crop area planted and the increase in the NT soybean area);
- the average level of carbon sequestered per ha increased by 21.2% (37.5 kg carbon/ha/year) from 176.7 to 214.2 kg carbon/ha/year.

**Table 67: USA soybeans: potential soil carbon sequestration (1996 to 2011)**

	Total carbon sequestered (million kg)	Average (kg carbon/ha/yr)
1996	4,589.38	176.7
1997	5,186.81	183.1
1998	5,523.56	189.5

<sup>118</sup> The actual rate of soil carbon sequestered by tillage system is, however, dependent upon soil type, soil organic content, quantity and type of crop residue, so these estimates are indicative averages.

1999	5,669.55	190.0
2000	5,743.85	190.5
2001	5,819.00	194.0
2002	5,835.35	197.5
2003	6,083.49	204.8
2004	6,419.49	212.0
2005	6,169.18	213.6
2006	6,577.32	215.2
2007	5,638.74	219.0
2008	6,590.66	218.2
2009	6,743.58	218.2
2010	6,823.39	216.2
2011	6,437.10	214.2

Cumulatively, since 1996 the increase in soil carbon due to the increase in RT and NT in USA soybean production systems has been 12,667 million kg of carbon which, in terms of carbon dioxide emissions, equates to a saving of 46,488 million kg of carbon dioxide that would otherwise have been released into the atmosphere (Table 68). This estimate does not take into consideration the potential loss in carbon sequestration that might arise from a return to conventional tillage.

**Table 68: USA soybeans: potential additional soil carbon sequestration (1996 to 2011)**

	Annual increase in carbon sequestered based on 1996 average (kg carbon/ha)	Crop area (million ha)	Total carbon sequestered (million kg)	Carbon dioxide (million kg)
1996	0.0	26.0	0.00	0.00
1997	6.4	28.3	181.93	667.69
1998	12.8	29.1	374.36	1,373.89
1999	13.4	29.8	398.45	1,462.32
2000	13.9	30.1	417.99	1,534.01
2001	17.4	30.0	521.04	1,912.23
2002	20.9	29.5	616.89	2,264.00
2003	28.1	29.7	835.71	3,067.05
2004	35.4	30.3	1,071.19	3,931.26
2005	37.0	28.9	1,067.48	3,917.65
2006	38.5	30.6	1,178.08	4,323.56
2007	42.3	25.8	1,089.61	3,998.88
2008	41.5	30.2	1,254.47	4,603.90
2009	41.5	30.9	1,283.58	4,710.72
2010	39.5	31.6	1,247.99	4,580.13
2011	37.5	30.1	1,128.23	4,140.60
<b>Total</b>			<b>12,667.00</b>	<b>46,487.90</b>

Assumption: carbon sequestration remains at the 1996 level of 176.7 kg carbon/ha/year

#### 4.2.4.2 Argentina

Since 1996, the area planted to soybeans in Argentina has increased by 220% (from 5.91 to 18.9 million ha). Over the same period, the area planted using NT practices also increased by an

estimated 669%, from 2.15 to 16.53 million ha, whilst the area planted using conventional tillage decreased 36.2%, from 3.76 to 2.4 million ha (Table 69).

As in the USA, a key driver for the growth in NT soybean production has been the availability of GM HT soybean cultivars, which in 2011 accounted for 99% of the total Argentine soybean area. The most important reasons for the adoption of GM HT soybean cultivars in Argentina have been analysed by Finger *et al* (2009) based on a survey of Argentine soybean growers. This analysis concluded that the combination of herbicide tolerance and no-till have been the key drivers to adoption of GM HT soybeans to facilitate easier crop management and reduced herbicide costs. As indicated in section 3, the availability of this technology has also provided an opportunity for growers to 'second crop soybeans' in a NT system with wheat. Thus, whereas in 1997 when 6% of the total soybean crop was a second crop following on from wheat (in the same season), in 2011 the share of soybean plantings accounted for by second crop soybeans had risen to 25% of total plantings (4.6 million ha).

It should be noted that the Argentine No Till Farmers Association (AAPRESID) estimated, in the early 1990s, that NT farming could help reduce soil erosion by 90% (from about 10 tonnes plus per hectare of soil loss to about 1 tonne/ha) and contribute to additional water accumulated in the top four soil inches of soil. This also contributed to higher crop yields of up to 11% as well as reducing fuel use and labour costs (Peiretti (1999)). The availability of inexpensive, effective broad-spectrum herbicides is also attributed to have played an important role in the widespread adoption of NT farming in Argentina (Gianessi and Williams (2011)).

**Table 69: Argentine soybeans: tillage practices and the adoption of GM HT cultivars 1996-2011 (million ha)**

	Total area	No-till (NT)	Conventional till (CT)	Total GM HT area	Total conventional area	NT GM HT area	CT GM HT area
1996	5.91	2.15	3.76	0.04	5.87	0.04	0.00
1997	6.39	2.87	3.52	1.76	4.63	1.76	0.00
1998	6.95	3.32	3.63	4.80	2.15	3.32	1.48
1999	8.18	3.78	4.40	6.64	1.54	3.78	2.86
2000	10.59	5.02	5.57	9.00	1.59	5.02	3.98
2001	11.50	6.66	4.84	10.93	0.57	6.66	4.27
2002	12.96	8.67	4.29	12.45	0.51	8.67	3.78
2003	13.50	9.78	3.72	13.23	0.27	9.78	3.45
2004	14.34	11.39	2.95	14.06	0.28	11.39	2.67
2005	15.20	11.54	3.66	15.20	0.00	11.54	3.66
2006	16.15	12.41	3.74	15.84	0.31	12.41	3.43
2007	16.59	13.56	3.03	16.42	0.17	13.56	2.86
2008	16.77	14.59	2.18	16.60	0.17	14.59	2.01
2009	18.60	15.83	2.77	18.18	0.42	15.83	2.35
2010	18.20	15.83	2.37	18.02	0.18	15.83	2.19
2011	18.93	16.53	2.40	18.70	0.23	16.53	2.17

Adapted from Benbrook, Trigo and AAPRESID (2012)

#### a) Fuel consumption

Between 1996 and 2011 total fuel consumption associated with soybean cultivation doubled from 231.5 to 479.5 million litres/year. However, during this period the average quantity of fuel used per ha fell 35.2% from 39.1 to 25.3 litres/ha, due predominantly to the widespread use of GM HT soybean cultivars and NT systems. If the proportion of NT soybeans in 2011 (applicable to the total 2011 area planted) had remained at the 1996 level, an additional 2,096 million litres of fuel would have been used. At this level of fuel usage, an additional 5,597 million kg of carbon dioxide would otherwise have been released into the atmosphere (Table 70).

**Table 70: Argentine soybeans: permanent reduction in tractor fuel consumption and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (1996-2011)**

	Annual reduction based on 1996 average of 39.1 (litres/ha)	Crop area (million ha)	Total fuel saving (million litres)	Carbon dioxide (million kg)
1996	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.00
1997	2.3	6.4	14.7	39.16
1998	3.1	7.0	21.5	57.39
1999	2.7	8.2	21.9	58.54
2000	3.0	10.6	31.6	84.45
2001	5.8	11.5	67.2	179.41
2002	8.3	13.0	107.3	286.57
2003	9.8	13.5	132.2	352.90
2004	11.7	14.3	167.4	447.02
2005	10.7	15.2	163.0	435.19
2006	11.0	16.2	177.4	473.74
2007	12.3	16.6	204.2	545.15
2008	13.7	16.8	230.4	615.13
2009	13.2	18.6	245.9	656.53
2010	13.7	18.2	249.8	667.06
2011	13.8	18.9	261.6	698.53
<b>Total</b>			<b>2,096.1</b>	<b>5,596.6</b>

Note: based on 21.89 litres/ha for NT and 49.01 litres/ha for CT

*b) Soil carbon sequestration*

Over the two decades to the late 1990s, soil degradation levels are reported to have increased in the humid and sub-humid regions of Argentina. The main cause of this is attributed to leaving land fallow following a wheat crop in a wheat: first soybean crop rotation, which resulted in soils being relatively free of weeds and crop residues but exposed to heavy summer rains which often led to extensive soil degradation and loss.

Research into ways of reducing soil degradation and loss was undertaken (mostly relating to the use of NT systems<sup>119</sup>) and this identified that NT systems could play an important role. As such, in the last ten years, there has been an intensive programme of research and technology transfer targeted at encouraging Argentine growers to adopt NT systems.

<sup>119</sup> Trials conducted by INTA found that direct sowing increases the yields of wheat and second soybean crop in rotation. Other benefits observed were: less soil inversion leaving a greater quantity of stubble on the surface, improvements in hydraulic conductivity, more efficient use of soil water, and higher soil organic matter contents.

Specific research into soil carbon sequestration in Argentina is, however, limited although Fabrizzi *et al* (2003) indicated that a higher level of total organic carbon was retained in the soil with NT system compared with a CT system, although no quantification was provided.

Applying a conservative estimate of soil carbon retention of 175 kg/carbon/ha/yr for NT and a release of 25 kg/carbon/ha/yr for soybean cropping in Argentina, a cumulative total of 15,459 million kg of carbon, which equates to a saving of 56,733 million kg of carbon dioxide, has been retained in the soil that would otherwise have been released into the atmosphere (Table 71).

**Table 71: Argentine soybeans: potential additional soil carbon sequestration (1996 to 2011)**

	Annual increase in carbon sequestered based on 1996 average (kg carbon/ha)	Crop area (million ha)	Total carbon sequestered million kg	Carbon dioxide (million kg)
1996	0.0	5.9	0.00	0.00
1997	16.9	6.4	108.17	396.98
1998	22.8	7.0	158.52	581.78
1999	19.8	8.2	161.68	593.38
2000	22.0	10.6	233.27	856.09
2001	43.1	11.5	495.53	1,818.58
2002	61.1	13.0	791.51	2,904.83
2003	72.2	13.5	974.71	3,577.19
2004	86.1	14.3	1,234.69	4,531.31
2005	79.1	15.2	1,202.00	4,411.35
2006	81.0	16.2	1,308.48	4,802.13
2007	90.8	16.6	1,505.72	5,526.00
2008	101.3	16.8	1,699.00	6,235.34
2009	97.5	18.6	1,813.37	6,655.06
2010	101.2	18.2	1,842.45	6,761.81
2011	101.9	18.9	1,929.4	7,080.80
<b>Total</b>			<b>15,458.50</b>	<b>56,732.60</b>

Assumption: NT = +175 kg carbon/ha/yr, CT = -25 kg carbon/ha/yr

Recent research by Steinbach and Alvarez (2006) on the potential of NT cropping across the Argentine Pampas indicated a potential to increase SOC by 74 Tg carbon if the whole Pampean cropping area was converted to NT. This rate of carbon sequestration is about twice the annual carbon emissions from total fossil fuels consumption in Argentina.

#### 4.2.4.3 Brazil

In previous reports we have excluded Brazil from the analysis of carbon savings associated with the facilitating role of GM HT soybeans on the adoption of NT/RT systems in the Brazilian soybean sector, largely because NT/RT systems were commonplace in the sector before the legal availability of GM HT soybeans in 2003. However, after consultation with several analysts in Brazil who have examined the factors influencing the adoption of NT/RT systems in Brazil, we have partially included some of the Brazilian GM HT soybean area in the calculations of carbon savings (included first in the report covering the period 1996-2010). Therefore this analysis

includes the area devoted to GM HT soybeans in the southern states of Santa Catarina, Paraná and Rio Grande de Sol where the agricultural conditions are similar to those in Argentina and where the availability of GM HT soybean technology is considered to have played an important role in allowing farmers to remain in NT/RT systems.

From 1997 when GM HT soybeans were first planted in Brazil (illegally), the total area of GM HT soybeans has increased from 0.1 million ha to 20.5 million ha in 2011, of which these southern states accounted for 37.3% (7.66 million ha) in 2011. The vast majority of the soybean production in these states is using NT systems (85%: 7.74 million ha), with virtually all of the NT area being GM HT soybeans (7.64 million ha: 99%: Table 72).

**Table 72: Southern Brazil (Santa Catarina, Parana and Rio Grande de Sol states) soybeans: tillage practices and the adoption of biotech cultivars 1997-2011 (million ha)**

	Total area	No-till	Conventional tillage	Total GM HT area	Total conventional area	NT GM HT area	NT non-GM HT
1997	6.19	1.86	4.33	0.10	6.09	0.10	1.76
1998	6.12	2.14	3.98	0.50	5.62	0.50	1.64
1999	6.05	2.42	3.63	1.18	4.87	1.18	1.24
2000	5.98	2.69	3.29	1.30	4.68	1.30	1.39
2001	6.84	3.42	3.42	1.31	5.53	1.31	2.11
2002	7.49	4.12	3.37	1.74	5.74	1.74	2.38
2003	8.21	4.93	3.28	2.87	5.34	2.87	2.06
2004	8.59	5.58	3.01	3.01	5.58	3.01	2.57
2005	8.30	5.81	2.49	3.32	4.98	3.32	2.49
2006	8.25	6.19	2.06	5.36	2.89	5.36	0.83
2007	8.19	6.14	2.05	5.98	2.21	5.98	0.16
2008	8.23	6.58	1.65	6.09	2.14	6.09	0.49
2009	8.90	7.39	1.51	7.03	1.87	7.03	0.36
2010	9.13	7.76	1.37	7.67	1.46	7.67	0.09
2011	9.11	7.74	1.37	7.65	1.46	7.66	0.09

Adapted from FEBRAPDP, AMIS Global, CONAB (June 2012) and personal communications (November 2011)

NT = No-till

#### *a) Fuel consumption*

The Brazilian Federation of 'direct planting' (FEBRAPDP) and the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (Embrapa) estimate that the conversion from CT to NT results in fuel savings of between 60-70% (Plataforma Plantio Direto (2006)). This compares with findings from the USA, used in earlier sub-sections, of 55% (reductions). In our analysis presented below (Table 73) we adopt a conservative approach and apply the fuel consumption rates used in the USA (21.89 litres/ha for NT and 49.01 litres/ha for CT - a reduction of 55% for NT relative to CT) to the GM HT soybean area planted in the three southern Brazilian states.

As a result of the use of GM HT soybeans and their facilitating role in allowing farmers to remain in NT, total fuel consumption associated with soybean cultivation (1997-2011) decreased by 6.6% from 253 to 236.4 million litres/year. During this period the average quantity of fuel used per ha



also fell 36.4% from 40.9 to 26 litres/ha. If the proportion of NT soybeans in 2011 (applicable to the total 2011 area planted in the three southern states) had remained at the 1997 level, an additional 1,087 million litres of fuel would have been used. At this level of fuel usage, an additional 2,903 million kg of carbon dioxide would otherwise have been released into the atmosphere (Table 73)

**Table 73: Brazil (3 southernmost states) soybeans: permanent reduction in tractor fuel consumption and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (1997-2011)**

	Annual reduction based on 1997 average of 40.8 (litres/ha)	Crop area (million ha)	Total fuel saving (million litres)	Carbon dioxide (million kg)
1997	0.00	6.19	0.00	0.00
1998	1.36	6.12	8.30	22.15
1999	2.71	6.05	16.40	43.80
2000	4.07	5.98	24.34	65.00
2001	5.42	6.84	37.09	99.03
2002	6.78	7.49	50.76	135.53
2003	8.14	8.21	66.83	178.43
2004	9.49	8.59	81.52	217.65
2005	10.85	8.30	89.98	240.26
2006	12.20	8.25	100.65	268.73
2007	12.20	8.19	99.89	266.71
2008	13.56	8.23	111.56	297.86
2009	14.37	8.90	127.94	341.60
2010	14.92	9.13	136.24	363.75
2011	14.92	9.11	135.82	362.64
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,087.32</b>	<b>2,903.13</b>

Note: based on 21.89 litres/ha for NT and RT and 49.01 litres/ha for CT

*b) Soil carbon sequestration*

The rate of carbon sequestration in Brazil has been researched by several leading groups over the last 15 years. Bayer *et al* (2006) estimated the mean rate of carbon sequestration in NT Brazilian tropical soils to be 0.35 t/ha/year, similar to the 0.34 t/ha/year reported for soils from temperate regions, but lower than the 0.48 t/ha/year estimated for southern Brazilian sub-tropical soils. Amado and Bayer (2008) estimated an average carbon sequestration rate of 0.17 t/ha/year (0.0 – 0.44 t/ha/year) for NT soils in the south (sub-tropical) and middle-west (tropical) regions of Brazil. The highest level of carbon sequestration (0.36 to 0.42 t/ha/year) occurs in intensive cropping systems because of relatively high crop residue levels in the maize/soybean rotation or where winter and summer cover crops are used.

Applying a conservative soil carbon retention of 175 kg of carbon/ha/yr for NT soybean cropping in Brazil (as applied in Argentina), a cumulative total of 8,019 million kg of carbon (equal to a saving of 29,428 million kg of carbon dioxide) has been retained in the soil that would otherwise have been released into the atmosphere (Table 74).

**Table 74: Brazil (3 southernmost states) soybeans: potential additional soil carbon sequestration (1997 to 2011)**

	Annual increase in carbon sequestered based on 1997 average (kg carbon/ha)	Crop area (million ha)	Total carbon sequestered million kg	Carbon dioxide (million kg)
1997	0.0	6.2	0.00	0.00
1998	10.0	6.1	61.19	224.57
1999	20.0	6.0	120.98	444.00
2000	30.0	6.0	179.52	658.84
2001	40.0	6.8	273.52	1,003.82
2002	50.0	7.5	374.35	1,373.86
2003	60.0	8.2	492.84	1,808.72
2004	70.0	8.6	601.16	2,206.26
2005	80.0	8.3	663.60	2,435.41
2006	90.0	8.2	742.23	2,723.98
2007	90.0	8.2	736.65	2,703.51
2008	100.0	8.2	822.70	3,019.31
2009	106.0	8.9	943.51	3,462.67
2010	110.0	9.1	1,004.69	3,687.19
2011	110.0	9.1	1,001.62	3,675.93
<b>Total</b>			<b>8,018.56</b>	<b>29,428.07</b>

Assumption: NT/RT = +175 kg carbon/ha/yr, CT = -25 kg carbon/ha/yr

#### 4.2.4.4 Bolivia, Paraguay and Uruguay

NT systems have also become important in soybean production in Bolivia, Paraguay and Uruguay, where the majority of production in these countries use NT systems. Across the three countries, the area planted to soybeans has increased from 1.8 million ha to 4.7 million ha between 1999 and 2011 (Paraguay 1.17 to 2.7 million ha, Uruguay 90,000 ha to 0.9 million ha and Bolivia 0.63 to 1.05 million ha) and the area of GM soybeans from 60,000 ha to 4.53 million ha.

##### a) Fuel consumption

Using the findings and assumptions applied to Argentina<sup>120</sup> (see above), the savings in fuel consumption for soybean production between 1999 and 2011 (associated with changes in no/reduced tillage systems, the adoption of GM HT technology and comparing the proportion of NT soybeans in 2010 with the 1999 level) has been 330 million litres. At this level of fuel saving, the reduction in the level of carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere has been 881 million kg.

##### b) Soil carbon sequestration

Applying the same rate of soil carbon retention for NT soybeans as Argentina, the cumulative increase in soil carbon since 1999, due to the increase in NT in Bolivia, Paraguay and Uruguay

<sup>120</sup> We are not aware of any country-specific studies into NT/RT systems in these three countries. However, analysts consulted in each country have confirmed that the availability of GM HT technology in soybeans has been an important driver behind the use of NT/RT production systems. We have applied carbon change assumptions in these countries based on findings from Argentina because this represents the only available data from a neighbouring country. We acknowledge this represents a weakness to the analysis and the findings should be treated with caution.

soybean production systems, has been 2,433 million kg of carbon. In terms of carbon dioxide emission this equates to a saving of 8,928 million kg of carbon dioxide that may otherwise have been released into the atmosphere.

## 4.2.5 Herbicide tolerant maize

### 4.2.5.1 The USA

Over the 1998-2011 period<sup>121</sup>, the area of maize cultivated in the US has fluctuated from 30.6 million ha (2001) to 37.9 million ha (2007). In 2011, the area planted to maize was 34.4 million ha. Over the same period, the maize area using conventional tillage fell from about 41% in 1998 to 36.5% in 2011, whilst the NT maize area nearly doubled from 5.9 million ha to 10.2 million (Table 75).

The most rapid rate of adoption of the GM HT maize technology has been by growers using NT systems (GM HT cultivars accounted for an estimated 99% of total NT maize in 2011). This compares with conventional tillage systems for maize where GM HT cultivars may account for about 29% of total conventional tillage maize plantings (Table 75).

**Table 75: USA maize: tillage practices and the adoption of GM HT cultivars 1998-2011 (million ha)**

	Total area	No-till	Reduced till	Conventional till	Total GM HT area	Total conventional area	No till GM HT area	Reduced till GM HT area	Conventional tillage GM HT area
1998	32.44	5.95	13.32	13.17	1.66	30.78	0.95	0.71	0.00
1999	31.32	6.17	12.13	13.02	1.47	29.85	0.93	0.54	0.00
2000	32.19	6.77	11.73	13.69	2.25	29.94	1.29	0.97	0.00
2001	30.64	6.57	11.14	12.93	2.45	28.19	1.45	1.00	0.00
2002	31.93	6.98	11.59	13.36	3.83	28.10	2.09	1.74	0.00
2003	31.81	7.11	11.50	13.20	4.77	27.04	2.70	2.07	0.00
2004	32.47	7.42	11.69	13.36	6.49	25.98	4.08	2.40	0.01
2005	33.10	8.10	11.75	13.25	8.60	24.50	5.67	2.73	0.20
2006	31.70	8.27	11.09	12.34	11.41	20.29	6.62	3.88	0.91
2007	37.88	10.21	13.88	13.79	19.70	18.18	9.70	9.02	0.98
2008	31.82	8.35	11.84	11.63	20.05	11.77	8.27	10.06	1.72
2009	32.21	9.59	11.04	11.58	21.90	10.31	9.49	9.83	2.58
2010	32.78	9.47	11.27	12.04	22.95	9.83	9.38	10.15	3.42
2011	34.35	10.20	11.63	12.52	24.73	9.62	10.09	11.05	3.59

Source: Adapted from Conservation Tillage and Plant Biotechnology (CTIC) 1998, 2000, 2002, 2006, 2007 and 2008, GfK Kynetec  
Reduced tillage includes mulch till and ridge till

<sup>121</sup> GM HT maize was first planted commercially in the US in 1997. However, 1998 was the first year of widespread adoption of the technology

*a) Fuel consumption*

Based on the maize crop area planted by tillage system, type of seed planted (biotech and conventional) and applying the fuel usage consumption rates presented in section 4.2.1 for corn, the total consumption of tractor fuel has increased by only 0.9% (13.4 million litres) from 1,523 to 1,536 million litres (1998 to 2011: Table 77) while the area planted increased by 6%, some 1.9 million ha. Over the same period, the average fuel usage fell 4.7% (from 46.9 litres/ha to 44.7 litres/ha). A comparison of GM HT versus conventional production systems shows that in 2011, the average tillage fuel consumption on the GM HT planted area was 41.2 litres/ha compared to 53.7 litres/ha for the conventional crop.

**Table 76: USA maize: consumption of tractor fuel used for tillage (1998-2011)**

	Total fuel consumption (million litres)	Average (litre/ha)	Conventional average (litre/ha)	GM HT average (litres/ha)
1998	1,522.6	46.9	47.4	37.6
1999	1,465.0	46.8	47.3	36.4
2000	1,501.1	46.6	47.3	37.4
2001	1,425.5	46.5	47.4	37.0
2002	1,482.5	46.4	47.6	37.8
2003	1,473.5	46.3	47.9	37.4
2004	1,500.4	46.2	48.7	36.3
2005	1,517.7	45.9	49.3	36.0
2006	1,442.3	45.5	49.8	37.8
2007	1,710.8	45.2	51.8	39.0
2008	1,441.5	45.3	53.2	40.7
2009	1,438.4	44.7	53.4	40.5
2010	1,470.7	44.9	53.4	41.2
2011	1,535.9	44.7	53.7	41.2

The cumulative permanent reduction in tillage fuel use in US maize is summarised in Table 77. This amounted to a reduction in tillage fuel usage of 503.35 million litres which equates to a reduction in carbon dioxide emission of 1,344 million kg.

**Table 77: USA maize: permanent reduction in tractor fuel consumption and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (1998-2011)**

	Annual reduction based on 1998 average (litres/ha)	Crop area (million ha)	Total fuel saving (million litres)	Carbon dioxide (million kg)
1998	0.00	32.44	0.00	0.00
1999	0.15	31.32	4.81	12.84
2000	0.31	32.19	9.89	26.41
2001	0.40	30.64	12.34	32.96
2002	0.50	31.93	15.92	42.50
2003	0.61	31.81	19.39	51.78

2004	0.72	32.47	23.40	62.48
2005	1.08	33.10	35.62	95.09
2006	1.43	31.70	45.38	121.16
2007	1.77	37.88	67.00	178.90
2008	1.64	31.82	52.11	139.14
2009	2.27	32.21	73.25	195.57
2010	2.07	32.78	67.88	181.24
2011	2.22	34.35	76.36	203.89
<b>Total</b>			<b>503.35</b>	<b>1,343.96</b>

Assumption: baseline fuel usage is the 1998 level of 46.9 litres/ha

*b) Soil carbon sequestration*

Based on the crop area planted by tillage system and type of seed planted (GM HT and conventional) and using estimates of the soil carbon sequestered by tillage system for corn and soybeans in continuous rotation (the NT system is assumed to store 375 kg of carbon/ha/year, the RT system assumed to store 175 kg carbon/ha/year and the CT system assumed to release 25 kg carbon/ha/year)<sup>122</sup>, our estimates of total soil carbon sequestered are (Table 78):

- an increase of 1,310 million kg carbon/year (from 4,235 million kg in 1998 to 5,545 million kg carbon/year in 2011 due to the increase in crop area planted and the increase in the NT corn area);
- the average level of carbon sequestered per ha increased by nearly 24% from 130.5 to 161.4 kg carbon/ha/year.

**Table 78: USA maize: potential soil carbon sequestration (1998 to 2011)**

	<b>Total carbon sequestered (million kg)</b>	<b>Average (kg carbon/ha/yr)</b>
1998	4,234.66	130.5
1999	4,110.98	131.3
2000	4,249.65	132.0
2001	4,090.45	133.5
2002	4,311.37	135.0
2003	4,349.79	136.7
2004	4,495.25	138.5
2005	4,761.83	143.9
2006	4,732.81	149.3
2007	5,913.02	156.1
2008	4,913.38	154.4
2009	5,236.69	162.6
2010	5,223.53	159.3
2011	5,545.19	161.4

Cumulatively, since 1998 the increase in soil carbon due to the increase in RT and NT in US maize production systems has been 6,563 million kg of carbon which, in terms of carbon dioxide

<sup>122</sup> The actual rate of soil carbon sequestered by tillage system is, however, dependent upon soil type, soil organic content, quantity and type of crop residue, so these estimates are indicative averages.

emissions, equates to a saving of 24,087 million kg of carbon dioxide that would otherwise have been released into the atmosphere (Table 79). This estimate does not take into consideration the potential loss in carbon sequestration that might arise from a return to conventional tillage.

**Table 79: USA maize: potential additional soil carbon sequestration (1998 to 2011)**

	Annual increase in carbon sequestered based on 1998 average (kg carbon/ha)	Crop area (million ha)	Total carbon sequestered (million kg)	Carbon dioxide (million kg)
1998	0.0	32.4	0.00	0.00
1999	0.7	31.3	23.04	84.55
2000	1.5	32.2	47.36	173.82
2001	3.0	30.6	91.53	335.91
2002	4.5	31.9	143.81	527.77
2003	6.2	31.8	197.63	725.30
2004	7.9	32.5	257.20	943.91
2005	13.3	33.1	441.81	1,621.43
2006	18.8	31.7	595.20	2,184.39
2007	25.6	37.9	968.62	3,554.84
2008	23.9	31.8	759.29	2,786.58
2009	32.1	32.2	1,032.36	3,788.77
2010	28.8	32.8	944.46	3,466.15
2011	30.9	34.4	1,061.00	3,893.88
<b>Total</b>			<b>6,563.31</b>	<b>24,087.30</b>

Assumption: carbon sequestration remains at the 1998 level of 130.5 kg carbon/ha/year

#### 4.2.5.2 Other countries

No additional contribution to carbon dioxide savings in other countries where GM HT technology has been widely used is included in our analysis. This is because:

- in Argentina, GM HT maize has only become widely used in the last few years (accounting for about two-thirds of the total crop in 2011) despite being first used commercially in 2004. It is therefore doubtful if the availability of GM HT technology has played any role in the development of NT/RT farming in the Argentine maize crop;
- in Brazil, GM HT maize was first adopted on a widespread basis in 2011. Any use of NT/RT in the maize sector up to this date therefore cannot be attributed to any facilitating role of the technology;
- in both of these countries, there is a lack of recent data available to assess if the area of NT/RT in maize has recently or is currently increasing.

#### 4.2.6 Herbicide tolerant canola

The analysis presented below relates to Canada only and does not include the US GM HT canola crop as the area devoted to canola in the US is relatively small by comparison to the area in Canada (0.45 million ha in the US in 2011 compared to 7.47 million ha in Canada).

Smyth *et al* (2011) surveyed nearly 600 canola farmers in the three prairie provinces of Western Canada over a three year period 2007-2009 to evaluate the environmental impacts of the adoption of HT canola. As well as a reduction in the total number of herbicide applications (resulting in a

decrease of herbicide active ingredient being applied), there were fewer tillage passes, improving moisture conservation, decreasing soil erosion and a substantial contribution to carbon sequestration in annual cropland. This research estimated that, by 2009, approximately 1 million tonnes of carbon (3.67 million tonnes of carbon dioxide) had either been sequestered or no longer released under land management systems facilitated by HT canola production, as compared to 1995.

*a) Fuel consumption*

Our estimate for the cumulative, permanent reduction in tillage fuel use in Canadian canola for the period 1996-2011 is 393 million litres, which equates to a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 1,049 million kg (Table 80).

**Table 80: Canadian canola: permanent reduction in tractor fuel consumption and reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (1996-2011)**

	Annual reduction based on 1996 average 30.6 (l/ha)	Crop area (million ha)	Total fuel saving (million litres)	Carbon dioxide (million kg)
1996	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.00
1997	0.9	4.9	4.3	11.51
1998	0.9	5.4	4.8	12.83
1999	0.9	5.6	4.9	13.15
2000	0.9	4.9	4.3	11.48
2001	1.8	3.8	6.7	17.89
2002	2.7	3.3	8.7	23.12
2003	3.5	4.7	16.6	44.32
2004	4.4	4.9	21.9	58.35
2005	5.3	5.5	29.2	77.85
2006	6.2	5.2	32.5	86.64
2007	6.5	5.9	38.7	103.36
2008	7.1	6.5	46.0	122.77
2009	8.0	6.4	50.8	135.59
2010	8.8	6.5	57.7	153.93
2011	8.9	7.5	66.1	176.54
<b>Total</b>			<b>393.0</b>	<b>1049.33</b>

Notes: fuel usage NT/RT = 17.3 litres/ha CT = 35 litres/ha

*b) Soil carbon sequestration*

Our analysis of soil carbon sequestration levels associated with GM HT canola in Canada is based on the carbon sequestration co-efficients/assumptions derived by McConkey *et al* (2007). Table 81 summarises this analysis and shows a cumulative increase in soil carbon storage associated with the increase in RT and NT in Canadian canola production between 1996 and 2011, of 1,443 million kg of carbon, which in terms of carbon dioxide emissions, equates to a saving of 5,297 million kg of carbon dioxide that would otherwise have been released into the atmosphere. Readers should note these estimates are based on soil sequestration rate of 0.055 t/ha/year (based on McConkey *et al* (2007)) which is significantly lower than the rate used in the USA for soybeans (0.375 t/ha/year) due to a combination of lower temperatures and different soil types in the Canadian canola growing regions compared to the US soybean production belt.

**Table 81: Canadian canola: potential additional soil carbon sequestration (1996 to 2011)**

	Annual increase in carbon sequestered based on 1996 average (kg carbon/ha)	Crop area (million ha)	Total carbon sequestered (million kg)	Carbon dioxide (million kg)
1996	0.0	3.5	0.00	0.00
1997	3.3	4.9	15.83	58.09
1998	3.3	5.4	17.64	64.75
1999	3.3	5.6	18.08	66.37
2000	3.3	4.9	15.79	57.96
2001	6.5	3.8	24.60	90.30
2002	9.8	3.3	31.80	116.71
2003	13.0	4.7	60.96	223.72
2004	16.3	4.9	80.26	294.55
2005	19.5	5.5	107.07	392.96
2006	22.8	5.2	119.17	437.36
2007	24.1	5.9	142.16	521.72
2008	26.0	6.5	168.86	619.71
2009	29.3	6.4	186.50	684.44
2010	32.5	6.5	211.72	777.00
2011	32.5	7.5	242.81	891.10
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,443.25</b>	<b>5,296.74</b>

Notes: NT/RT = +55 kg of carbon/ha/yr CT = -10 kg of carbon/ha/yr

#### 4.2.7 Herbicide tolerant cotton

The contribution to reduced levels of carbon sequestration arising from the adoption of GM HT cotton is likely to have been marginal and hence no assessments are presented. Although the area of NT cotton has increased significantly in countries such as the US, it still only represented 23.7% of the total cotton crop in 2009<sup>123</sup>. Therefore, no analysis has been undertaken relating to possible fuel usage and soil carbon sequestration savings associated with the adoption of GM HT cotton in the US. However, the importance of GM HT cotton in facilitating NT cotton tillage has been confirmed by Doane Marketing Research (2002) which identified the availability of GM HT cotton as a key driver for the adoption of NT production practices.

#### 4.2.8 Insect resistant cotton

The cultivation of GM IR cotton has resulted in a significant reduction in the number of insecticide spray applications. Between 1996 and 2011, the global cotton area planted with GM IR cultivars increased from 0.77 million ha to 19.68 million ha. Based on a conservative estimate of four fewer insecticide sprays being required for the cultivation of GM IR cotton relative to conventional cotton, and applying this to the global area (excluding Burkina Faso, China, Pakistan, Burma and India<sup>124</sup>) of GM IR cotton over the period 1996-2011, suggests that there has been a reduction of 168 million ha of cotton being sprayed. The cumulative saving in tractor fuel consumption has been 141 million litres. This represents a permanent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 377 million kg (Table 82).

<sup>123</sup> 2008 is the latest year for which no tillage data in cotton is available.

<sup>124</sup> Excluded because all spraying is assumed to be undertaken by hand.



**Table 82: Permanent reduction in global tractor fuel consumption and carbon dioxide emissions resulting from the cultivation of GM IR cotton (1996-2011)**

	Total cotton area in GM IR growing countries excluding Burkina Faso, India, Pakistan, Burma and China (million ha)	GM IR area (million ha) excluding Burkina Faso, India, Pakistan, Burma and China	Total spray runs saved (million ha)	Fuel saving (million litres)	CO2 emissions saved (million kg)
1996	7.49	0.86	3.45	2.90	7.73
1997	7.09	0.92	3.67	3.09	8.24
1998	7.11	1.05	4.20	3.53	9.43
1999	7.15	2.11	8.44	7.09	18.92
2000	7.42	2.43	9.72	8.17	21.81
2001	7.07	2.55	10.18	8.55	22.84
2002	6.36	2.17	8.69	7.30	19.49
2003	5.34	2.17	8.70	7.30	19.50
2004	6.18	2.79	11.17	9.38	25.05
2005	6.28	3.21	12.84	10.78	28.79
2006	7.90	3.94	15.75	13.23	35.33
2007	6.07	3.25	12.99	10.91	29.14
2008	4.51	2.54	10.16	8.53	22.78
2009	5.33	2.96	11.83	9.94	26.54
2010	7.13	4.59	18.37	15.43	41.21
2011	6.61	4.47	17.89	15.03	40.12
<b>Total</b>			<b>168.06</b>	<b>141.16</b>	<b>376.92</b>

Notes: assumptions: 4 tractor passes per ha, 0.84 litres/ha of fuel per insecticide application

#### 4.2.9 Insect resistant maize

Limited analysis of the possible contribution to reduced level of carbon sequestration from the adoption of GM IR maize (via fewer insecticide spray runs) and the adoption of Corn Rootworm Resistance (CRW) maize is presented. This is because the impact of using these technologies on carbon sequestration is likely to have been small for the following reasons:

- in some countries (eg, Argentina) insecticide use for the control of pests such as the corn borer has traditionally been negligible;
- even in countries where insecticide use for the control of corn boring pests has been practised (eg, the US), the share of the total crop treated has been fairly low (under 10% of the crop) and varies by region and year according to pest pressure. The main exception to this has been in Brazil (see below);
- nominal application savings have occurred in relation to the adoption of GM CRW maize where 19.6 million ha were planted in 2011. The adoption of the GM CRW maize may become increasingly important with wider adoption of no-till cultivation systems due to the potential increase in soil-borne pests.

In respect of the impact of using GM IR maize in Brazil (since 2008), in general, farmers using the technology have reduced the average number of insecticide spray runs by three (from five to

two). This has resulted in a reduction of 67 million ha of maize being sprayed (for the four years 2008-2011), with a cumulative saving in tractor fuel of 56.3 million litres. This is equivalent to a permanent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 150 million kg.

#### 4.2.10 Summary of carbon sequestration impact

A summary of the carbon sequestration impact is presented in Table 83. This shows the following key points:

- The permanent savings in carbon dioxide emissions (arising from reduced fuel use of 5,471 million litres of fuel) since 1996 have been about 14,609 million kg;
- The additional amount of soil carbon sequestered since 1996 has been equivalent to 170,961 million tonnes of carbon dioxide that has not been released into the global atmosphere<sup>125</sup>. The reader should note that these soil carbon savings are based on savings arising from the rapid adoption of NT/RT farming systems in North and South America (Argentina and Southern Brazil), for which the availability of GM HT technology has been cited by many farmers as an important facilitator. GM HT technology has therefore probably been an important contributor to this increase in soil carbon sequestration, but is not the only factor of influence. Other influences such as the availability of relatively cheap generic glyphosate (the real price of glyphosate fell threefold between 1995 and 2000 once patent protection for the product expired) have also been important. Cumulatively, the amount of carbon sequestered may be higher than these estimates due to year-on-year benefits to soil quality, however it is equally likely that the total cumulative soil sequestration gains have been lower because only a proportion of the crop area will have remained in NT/RT. For example, NT/RT data from the USA shows that about 80% of the soybean crop is typically using NT/RT, whilst 64% of the maize crop derives from NT/RT. Given that the soybean:maize rotation is a common system in the USA (though not the only system of production for either crop), this suggests that an important area in RT/NT one year (whilst planted to maize) remain in NT the next year for a following soybean crop. The estimate provided above of 170,961 million tonnes of carbon dioxide not released into the atmosphere should be treated with caution. It is a theoretical potential, with the actual level of carbon dioxide savings occurring across a wide variation.

**Table 83: Summary of carbon sequestration impact 1996-2011**

Crop/trait/country	Permanent fuel saving (million litres)	Potential carbon dioxide saving from fuel saving (million kg)	Potential carbon dioxide saving from soil carbon sequestration (million kg)
US: GM HT soybeans	865	2,308	46,488
Argentina: GM HT soybeans	2,096	5,597	56,733
Brazil GM HR	1,087	2,903	29,428

<sup>125</sup> These estimates are based on fairly conservative assumptions and therefore the true values could be higher. Also, some of the additional soil carbon sequestration gains from RT/NT systems may be lost if subsequent ploughing of the land occurs. Estimating the possible losses that may arise from subsequent ploughing would be complex and difficult to undertake. This factor should be taken into account when using the estimates presented in this section of the report.

soybeans			
Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay: GM HT soybeans	330	881	8,928
US: GM HT maize	503	1,344	24,087
Canada: GM HT canola	393	1,049	5,297
Global GM IR cotton	141	377	0
Brazil GM IR maize	56	150	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,471</b>	<b>14,609</b>	<b>170,961</b>

Examining further the context of the carbon sequestration benefits, Table 84 measures the carbon dioxide equivalent savings associated with planting of biotech crops for the latest year (2011), in terms of the number of car use equivalents. This shows that in 2011, the permanent carbon dioxide savings from reduced fuel use (1,887 million kg carbon dioxide) was the equivalent of removing 0.84 million cars from the road for a year and the additional soil carbon sequestration gains (21,108 million kg carbon dioxide) were equivalent to removing 9.38 million cars from the roads. In total, biotech crop-related carbon dioxide emission savings in 2011 were equal to the removal from the roads of 10.2 million cars, equal to 36% of all registered cars in the UK.

**Table 84: Context of carbon sequestration impact 2011: car equivalents**

Crop/trait/country	Permanent carbon dioxide savings arising from reduced fuel use (million kg of carbon dioxide)	Permanent fuel savings: as average family car equivalents removed from the road for a year ('000s)	Potential additional soil carbon sequestration savings (million kg of carbon dioxide)	Soil carbon sequestration savings: as average family car equivalents removed from the road for a year ('000s)
US: GM HT soybeans	205	91	4,141	1,840
Argentina: GM HT soybeans	699	311	7,081	3,147
Brazil GM HR soybeans	363	161	3,676	1,634
Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay: GM HT soybeans	141	63	1,425	633
US: GM HT maize	204	91	3,894	1,731
Canada: GM HT canola	177	79	891	396
Global GM IR cotton	40	18	0	0
Brazil IR maize	58	26	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,887</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>21,108</b>	<b>9,381</b>

Due to the limitations referred to above, no estimates of cumulative (1996-2011) carbon dioxide savings as car-equivalents have been provided.

## Appendix 1: Base yields used where GM technology delivers a positive yield gain

In order to avoid over-stating the positive yield effect of GM technology (where studies have identified such an impact) when applied at a national level, average (national level) yields used have been adjusted downwards (see example below). Production levels based on these adjusted levels were then cross checked with total production values based on reported average yields across the total crop.

### Example: GM IR cotton (2011)

Country	Average yield across all forms of production (t/ha)	Total cotton area ('000 ha)	Total production ('000 tonnes)	GM IR area ('000 ha)	Conventional area ('000 ha)	Assumed yield effect of GM IR technology	Adjusted base yield for conventional cotton (t/ha)	GM IR production ('000 tonnes)	Conventional production ('000 tonnes)
US	0.886	3,83	3,393	2,872	958	+10%	0.825	2,607	786
China	1.326	5,50	7,293	3,932	1,578	+105	1.238	5,355	1,938

Note: Figures subject to rounding

## Appendix 2: Impacts, assumptions, rationale and sources for all trait/country combinations

### IR corn (resistant to corn boring pests)

Country	Yield impact assumption used	Rationale	Yield references	Cost of technology data/assumptions	Cost savings (excluding impact of seed premium) assumptions	Costs references
<b>GM IR corn: resistant to corn boring pests</b>						
US & Canada	+7% all years	Broad average of impact identified from several studies/papers and latest review/analyses covering 1996-2010 period	Carpenter & Gianessi (2002) <sup>12</sup> found yield impacts of +9.4% 1997, +3% 1998, +2.5% 1999 Marra et al (2002) <sup>13</sup> average impact of +5.04% 1997-	\$25 1996 & 1997 \$20 1998 & 1999 \$22 2000-2004 \$17.3 2005-2007 \$24.71 2008 \$28.2, 2009 \$32.06 2010 \$22.5 2011	\$15.5 all years to 2004 \$15.9 2005 onwards	The same reference sources as yield were used. Industry sources also confirmed costs of technology and estimated cost saving values for Canada 2008 onwards. Seed premia based on weighted cost of seed sold as single and stacked traits

			<p>2000 based a review of five studies, James (2003)<sup>15</sup> average impact of +5.2% 1996-2002, Sankala &amp; Blumenthal (2003 &amp; 2006<sup>9,10</sup>) range of +3.1% to +9.9%. Hutchison et al (2010<sup>14</sup>) +7% examining impact over the period 1996-2010. Canada - no studies identified – as US - impacts qualitatively confirmed by industry sources (annual personal communications)</p>			
Argentina	+9% all years to 2004, +5.5% 2005 onwards	Average of reported impacts in first seven years, later revised downwards for more recent years to reflect professional opinion	<p>James (2003<sup>15</sup>) cites two unpublished industry survey reports; one for 1996-1999 showing an average yield gain of +10% and one for 2000-2003 showing a yield gain of +8%, Trigo</p>	<p>As US to 2005 then 61 pesos 2006, 103 pesos 2007 106 pesos 2008 125 pesos 2009 onwards</p>	None as maize crops not traditionally treated with insecticides for corn boring pest damage	<p>Cost of technology drawn from Trigo (2002<sup>16</sup>) and Trigo &amp; Cap (2006<sup>17</sup>), ie, costed/priced at same level as US Trigo personal communications 2007, 2009 &amp; 2010</p>

			(2002) <sup>16</sup> Trigo & Cap (2006) <sup>17</sup> +10%, Trigo (2007 & 2008) personal communicati on estimates average yield impact since 2005 to be lower at between +5% and +6%			
Philippine s	+24.6% to 2006, 2007-11 +18%	Average of three studies used all years to 2006. Thereafter based on Gonzales et al (2009 <sup>18</sup> )	Gonzales (2005 <sup>19</sup> ) found average yield impact of +23% dry season crops & +20% wet season crops; Yorobe (2004 <sup>20</sup> ) +38% dry season crops & +35% wet season crops; Ramon (2005 <sup>21</sup> ) found +15.3% dry season crops & +13.3% wet season crops. Gonzales et al (2009 <sup>18</sup> ) +18%	\$1,673 Pesos all years	651 Pesos all years	Based on Gonzales (2005 <sup>18</sup> ) & Gonzales et al (2009 <sup>19</sup> ) – the only sources to break down these costs
South Africa	+11% 2000 & 2001 +32% 2002 +16% 2003 +5% 2004 +15% 2005- 2007, +10.6%	Reported average impacts used for years available (2000-2004), 2005-2007 based on average of other years. 2008 onwards based on Van	Gouse et al (2005 <sup>22</sup> ), Gouse et al (2006 a) <sup>23</sup> & b <sup>24</sup> ) reported yield impacts as shown (range of +11% to +32%), Van der Wald	84 Rand 2000 & 2001 90 Rand 2002 94 Rand 2004 & 2005 113 Rand 2006 onwards	97 Rand all years	Based on the same papers as used for yield, plus confirmation in 2006- 2011 that these are representative values from industry sources

	2008 onwards	der Welt (2009 <sup>25</sup> )	(2010 <sup>25</sup> )			
Spain	+6.3% 1998- 2004 +10% 2005- 2008. 2009 onwards +12.6%	Impact based on authors own detailed, representative analysis for period 1998- 2002 then updated to reflect improved technology based on industry analysis. From 2009 based on Riesgo et al (2012) <sup>26</sup>	Brookes (2003 <sup>27</sup> ) identified an average of +6.3% using the Bt 176 trait mainly used in the period 1998- 2004 (range +1% to +40% for the period 1998- 2002). From 2005, 10% used based on Brookes (2008 <sup>28</sup> ) which derived from industry (unpublishe d sources) commercial scale trials and monitoring of impact of the newer, dominant trait Mon 810 in the period 2003- 2007. Gomez Barbero & Rodriguez- Corejo (2006 <sup>29</sup> ) reported an average impact of +5% for Bt 176 used in 2002-2004. Riesgo et al (2012) +12.6% identified as average yield gain	30 Euros 1998 & 1999 28 Euros 2000 18.5 Euros 2001- 2005 35 Euros 2006 onwards	42 Euros all years to 2008, 6.41 Euros 2009 onwards	Based on Brookes (2003 <sup>27</sup> ) the only source to break down these costs. The more recent cost of technology costs derive from industry sources (reflecting the use of Mon 810 technology). Industry sources also confirm value for insecticide cost savings as being representative. From 2009, based on Riesgo et al (2012) <sup>26</sup>

Other EU	France +10%, Germany +4%, Portugal +12.5%, Czech Republic +10%, Slovakia +12.3%, Poland +12.5%, Romania +7.1% 2007, +9.6% 2008 & +4.8% 2009 & 2010	Impacts based on average of available impact data in each country	Based on Brookes (2008 <sup>28</sup> ) which drew on a number of sources. For France average yield impacts of +5% to +17%, for Germany the sole source had average annual impacts of +3.5% and +9.5% over a two year period, for Czech Republic three studies identified average impacts in 2005 of an average of 10% and a range of +5% to +20%; for Portugal, commercial trial and plot monitoring reported +12% in 2005 and between +8% and +17% in 2006; in Slovakia based on trials for 2003-2007 and 2006/07 plantings with yield gains averaging between +10% and	France & Germany 40 euros, Portugal, Czech & Slovak Republics, Poland 35 euros, Romania 32 euros	France & Germany 50 euros, Portugal, Slovakia, Poland & Romania nil, Czech Republic 18 euros	Data derived from the same source(s) referred to for yield
----------	---	---	--	--	--	--



			+14.7%; in Poland based on variety trial tests 2005 and commercial trials 2006 which had a range of +2% to +26%; Romania based on reported impact by industry sources			
Uruguay	As Argentina	As Argentina	No country-specific studies identified, so impact analysis from nearest country of relevance (Argentina) applied	As Argentina	As Argentina	As Argentina
Brazil	+4.66% 2008, +7.3% 2009 & 2010, +20.1% 2011	Farmer surveys	Galveo A (2009, 2010, 2012 <sup>30,31,32</sup> )	\$21.59 2008, \$58.84 2009 \$ 53.99 2010 \$ 69.38 2011	\$41.98 2008, \$44.21 2009 \$48.60 2010 \$ 23.13 2011	Data derived from Galveo A (2009, 2010, 2012 <sup>30,31,32</sup> ). Seed premium based on weighted average of seed sales
Honduras	+13% 2003-2006 +24% 2007-2011	Trials results 2002 and farmer survey findings in 2007	James (2003 <sup>15</sup> ) cited trials results for 2002 with a 13% yield increase (it should be noted all of Honduras's crop is effectively trials) Falk Zepeda J et al (2009 <sup>33</sup> ) undertook a farmer survey in	\$30 based on average of rates in S Africa & the Philippines (seed provided to farmers in farm level trials are largely provided free to date)	Nil – no insecticide assumed to be used on conventional crops	As indicated

			2007 – finding average yield differences with non GM corn of +24%			
Colombia	+22%	Mendez et al (2011 <sup>34</sup> )	Mendez et al (2011 <sup>34</sup> ) farm survey from 2009	88,850 pesos/ha	299,050 pesos/ha savings	Mendez et al (2011 <sup>34</sup> )
<b>GM IR corn (resistant to corn rootworm)</b>	<b>Yield impact assumption used</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Yield references</b>	<b>Cost of technology data/assumptions</b>	<b>Cost savings (excluding impact of seed premium) assumptions</b>	<b>Costs references</b>
US & Canada	+5% all years	Based on the impact used by the references cited	Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 <sup>9</sup> & 2006 <sup>10</sup> ) used +5% in analysis citing this as conservative, themselves having cited impacts of +12%-+19% in 2005 in Iowa, +26% in Illinois in 2005 and +4%-+8% in Illinois in 2004. Johnson S & Strom S (2008 <sup>35</sup> ) used the same basis as Sankala & Blumenthal Rice (2004 <sup>36</sup> ) range of +1.4% to +4.5% (based on trials) Canada - no studies identified – as US - impacts	\$42 2003 and 2004 \$35 2005-2007. 2008 \$24.71, 2009 \$28.21, 2010 \$32.06 2011 \$21.84	\$32 2003 \$37 2004 onwards	Data derived from Sankala & Blumenthal (2006 <sup>10</sup> ) and Johnson S & Strom S (2008 <sup>35</sup> ). Seed costs 2008 onwards based on weighted seed sales of single and stacked traits Canada - no studies identified – as US - impacts qualitatively confirmed by industry sources (personal communications 2005-2011)

			qualitatively confirmed by industry sources (personal communications 2005, 2007 & 2010)			
IR cotton	Yield impact assumption used	Rationale	Yield references	Cost of technology data/assumptions	Cost savings (excluding impact of seed premium) assumptions	Costs references
US	+9% 1996-2002 +11% 2003 & 2004 +10% 2005 onwards	Based on the (conservative) impact used by the references cited	Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 <sup>9</sup> ) & (2006 <sup>10</sup> ) drew on earlier work from Carpenter and Gianessi (2002 <sup>12</sup> ) in which they estimated the average yield benefit in the 1996-2000 period was +9%. Marra et al (2002 <sup>13</sup> ) examined the findings of over 40 state-specific studies covering the period 1996 up to 2000, the approximate average yield impact was +11%. The lower of these two values was used for the period to 2002. The higher values applied from	\$58.27 1996-2002 \$68.32 2003 & 2004 \$49.6 2005 & 2006, \$25.7 2007 onwards	\$63.26 1996-2002 \$74.1 2003-2005 \$41.18 2006, \$28.4/ha 2007 onwards	Data derived from the same sources referred to for yield

			2003 reflect values used by Sankala & Blumenthal (2006 <sup>10</sup> ) and Johnson & Strom (2008 <sup>35</sup> ) that take into account the increasing use of Bollgard II technology, and draws on work by Mullins & Hudson (2004 <sup>11</sup> ) that identified a yield gain of +12% relative to conventional cotton. The values applied 2005 onwards were adjusted downwards to reflect the fact that some of the GM IR cotton area has still been planted to Bollgard I			
China	+8% 1997-2001 +10% 2002 onwards	Average of studies used to 2001. Increase to 10% on basis of industry assessments of impact and reporting of unpublished work by Schuchan	Pray et al (2002 <sup>37</sup> ) surveyed farm level impact for the years 1999-2001 and identified yield impacts of +5.8% in 1999, +8% in 2000 and	\$46.3 all years to 2005 366 Yuan 2006 onwards	\$261 2000 \$438 2001 average of these used all other years to 2004 1,530 Yuan 2005 onwards	Data derived from the same sources referred to for yield

			+10.9% in 2001 Monsanto China personal communications (2007-2011)			
Australia	None	Studies have usually identified no significant average yield gain	Fitt (2001 <sup>38</sup> ) Doyle (2005 <sup>39</sup> ) James (2002 <sup>40</sup> ) CSIRO (2005 <sup>41</sup> )	\$Aus 245 1996 & 1997 \$Aus 155 1998 \$Aus 138 1999 \$Aus 138 2000-2001 \$ Aus 155 2002, \$Aus 167 2003 \$Aus 190 2004 \$Aus 250 2005-2007 \$Aus300 2008 \$Aus 315, 2009 & 2010 and 2011 \$Aus 291	\$Aus 151 1996 \$Aus 157 1997 \$Aus 188 1998 \$Aus 172 1999 \$Aus 267 2000-2002 \$Aus 598 2003 \$Aus 509 2004 \$Aus 553 2005 onwards	Data derived from the same sources referred to for yield covering earlier years of adoption, then CSIRO <sup>45</sup> for later years. For 2006-2009 cost of technology values confirmed by personal communication from Monsanto Australia
Argentina	+30% all years	More conservative of the two pieces of research used	Qaim & De Janvry (2002 <sup>42</sup> & 2005 <sup>43</sup> ) analysis based on farm level analysis in 1999/00 and 2000/01 +35% yield gain, Trigo & Cap (2006 <sup>17</sup> ) used an average gain of +30% based on work by Elena (2001 <sup>44</sup> )	\$86 all years to 2004 116 pesos 2005 onwards	51 pesos all years	Data derived from the same sources referred to for yield. Cost of technology in 2006-2008 also confirmed from industry sources
South Africa	+24% all years	Lower end of estimates applied	Ismael et al (2002 <sup>45</sup> ) identified yield gain of +24% for the years 1998/99 & 1999/2000. Kirsten et al (2002 <sup>46</sup> ) for	149 Rand all years to 2005 345 Rand 2006 onwards	127 Rand all years	Data derived from the same sources referred to for yield. Values for cost of technology and cost of insecticide cost savings also provided/confirmed from industry sources

			2000/01 season found a range of +14% (dry crops/large farms) to +49% (small farmers) James (2002 <sup>40</sup> ) also cited a range of impact between +27% and +48% during the years 1999-2001			
Mexico	+37% 1996 +3% 1997 +20% 1998 +27% 1999 +17% 2000 +9% 2001 +6.7% 2002 +6.4% 2003 +7.6% 2004 +9.25% 2005 +9% 2006 +9.28 2007 & 2008, +14.2% 2009, +10.34% 2010 and 2011	Recorded yield impact data used as available for almost all years	The yield impact data for 1997 and 1998 is drawn from the findings of farm level survey work by Traxler et al (2001 <sup>7</sup> ). For all other years the data is based on the commercial crop monitoring reports required to be submitted to the Mexican government (source: Monsanto Mexico (various years))	540 pesos all years to 2005 760 Pesos 2006-2008, 2009 1,319 pesos, 2010 and 2011 749 pesos	985 pesos all years to 2009, 253 pesos 2010 and 2011	Data derived from the same sources referred to for yield. 2009 seed cost based on weighted average of single and stacked trait seed sales
India	+45% 2002 +63% 2003 +54% 2004 +64% 2005	Recorded yield impact used for years where available	Yield impact data 2002 and 2003 is drawn from Bennett et al (2004 <sup>4</sup> ), for 2004 the average of	2,636 Rupees 2002 2,512 Rupees 2003 2,521 Rupees 2004 2,307 Rupees 2005	2,032 Rupees 2002 1,767 Rupees 2003 1,900 Rupees 2004 1,362 Rupees 2005 2,308 Rupees 2006 1,857 Rupees 2007 onwards	Data derived from the same sources referred to for yield. 2007 onwards cost of technology confirmed from industry sources and cost savings for 2007 onwards taken

	+50% 2006 & 2007 +40% 2008, +35% 2009 & 2010		2002 and 2003 was used. 2005 and 2006 are derived from IMRB (2006 <sup>5</sup> & 2007 <sup>6</sup> ). 2007 impact data based on lower end of range of impacts identified in previous 3 years (2007 being a year of similar pest pressure to 2006). 2008 onwards based on them being years of fairly low average pest pressure & industry estimates and Herring and Rao (2012) <sup>47</sup>	2,211 Rupees 2006 801 Rupees 2007 onwards		as average of past 3 years
Brazil	+6.23% 2006 -3.6% 2007 -2.7% 2008, - 3.8% 2009, 2010 nil 2011 +3.04%	Recorded yield impacts for each year	2006 unpublished farm survey data – source: Monsanto (2008 <sup>48</sup> ) 2007- 2010 farm survey data from Galveo (2009, 2010, 2012 <sup>49,32</sup> ))	Real 87 2006 Real 67.1 2007 Real 79.4 2008, Real 83 2009 onwards	Real 141 2006 Real 134 2007 Real 161 2008, Real 115 2009 onwards	Data derived from the same sources referred to for yield
Colombia	+30% all years except 2009 +15%, 2010 +10%	Farm survey 2007 comparing performance of GM IR versus conventional growers. 2009	Based on Zambrano P et al (2009 <sup>50</sup> ) and trade estimates (2009 & 2011)	Assumed as Mexico – no breakdown of seed premium provided in Zambrano et al (2009 <sup>50</sup> ). From 2008 based on	423,912 pesos all years to 2009, 160,000 pesos 2010 onwards	Data derived from Zambrano P et al (2009 <sup>50</sup> ). Cost savings exc seed premium derived from Zambrano as total cost savings less assumed seed

		onwards based on trade estimates		weighted cost of seed sold as single and stacked traits 314,800 pesos 2008 onwards		premium. 2010 seed premium & cost savings from industry sources
Burkina Faso	+20 2008, +18.9% 2009 onwards	Trials 2008, farm survey 2009	Vitale J et al (2008 <sup>51</sup> ) & Vitale J et al (2010 <sup>52</sup> )	\$42 2008 Assumed as S Africa as no premium available from trials	\$62 all years	Based on Vitale J et al (2008 <sup>51</sup> & 2010 <sup>52</sup> )
Pakistan	+12.6%	Farm survey	Nazli H et al (2010) <sup>53</sup>	487 rupees	1,730 rupees	Nazli et al (2010) <sup>53</sup>
Burma	+30%	Extension service estimates	USDA (2011 <sup>54</sup> )	No data available so based on India and Pakistan	No data available so based on Pakistan	
<b>GM HT soybeans</b>	<b>Yield impact assumpti on used</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Yield references</b>	<b>Cost of technology data/assumptio ns</b>	<b>Cost savings (excluding impact of seed premium) assumptions</b>	<b>Costs references</b>
US: 1 <sup>st</sup> generation	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	\$14.82 1996-2002 \$17.3 2003 \$19.77 2004 \$24.71 2005- 2008. \$38.79 2009, \$37.95 2010	\$25.2 1996-97 \$33.9 1998-2002 \$73.4 2003 \$60.1 2004 \$69.4 2005 \$57.06 2006 \$85.2 2007 \$57.12 2008, \$54.72 2009, \$66.20 2010 \$32.64 2011	Marra et al (2002 <sup>13</sup> ) Carpenter & Gianessi (2002 <sup>12</sup> ) Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 <sup>9</sup> & 2006 <sup>10</sup> ) Johnson S & Strom S (2008 <sup>35</sup> ) & updated post 2008 to reflect herbicide price and common product usage
Canada: 1 <sup>st</sup> generation	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	32 Can \$ 1997- 2002 48 Can \$ 2003 45 Can \$ 2004 & 2005 41 Can \$ 2006- 22-9, Can \$ 26.31 2010 onwards	Range of 66 to 89 Can \$ 1997-2007, Can 60 \$ 2008, Can \$ 60.38 2009, Can \$45.25 2010	George Morris Center (2004 <sup>35</sup> ) & updated for 2008 to reflect herbicide price changes
US & Canada: 2 <sup>nd</sup> generation	+5%	Reported findings	Farm level monitoring and farmer feedback to seed companies	\$65.21 2009 \$50.14 2010 \$48.01 2011& Can \$43.54	as 1 <sup>st</sup> generation	As 1 <sup>st</sup> generation
Argentina	Nil but second crop	Not relevant except 2 <sup>nd</sup> crop – see separate	Not relevant	\$3-\$4 all years to 2001 \$1.2 2002-2005	\$24-\$30: varies each year to 2007 according to	Qaim & Traxler (2005 <sup>56</sup> ), Trigo & CAP (2006 <sup>17</sup> ) & updated



	benefits	table		(reflecting all use of farm saved seed) \$2.5 2006 onwards (Monsanto royalty rate)	exchange rate. \$13.87 2008, \$16.42 2009, \$18.13 2010 \$17.43 2011	from 2008 to reflect herbicide price changes
Brazil	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	As Argentina to 2002 (illegal plantings) \$9 2003 \$15 2004 \$16 2005 \$19.8 2006 \$21.11 2007 \$19.63 2008, \$20.26 2009, \$19.49 2010 \$24.81 2011	\$88 in 2004 applied to all other years to 2006 at prevailing exchange rate. \$29.83 2007 \$64.07 2008, \$47.93 2009, \$50.28 2010 \$45.57 2011	Data from the Parana Department of Agriculture (2004 <sup>37</sup> ). Also agreed royalty rates from 2004 applied to all years to 2006. 2007 onwards based on Galveo (2009, 2010, 2012 <sup>31,32</sup> )
Paraguay	Nil but second crop benefits	Not relevant except 2 <sup>nd</sup> crop	Not relevant	As Argentina to 2004 2005 \$4.86 2006 \$3.09 2007 & 2008 \$9.64, \$4.4 2009 onwards	As Argentina	As Argentina: no country-specific analysis identified. Impacts confirmed from industry sources (annual personal communications 2006-2011). Seed cost based on royalty rate since 2007
South Africa	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	170 Rand all years to 2005 195 Rand 2006 onwards	230 Rand each year to 2007, 2008 210 Rand, 2009 212 Rand, 2010 onwards 247 Rand	No studies identified - based on Monsanto S Africa (personal communications 2005, 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2011)
Uruguay	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	As Argentina	As Argentina	As Argentina: no country-specific analysis identified. Impacts confirmed from industry sources (personal communications 2006, 2008, 2009 & 2011)
Mexico	+9.1% 2004 & 2005 +3.64% 2006 +3.2% 2007 +2.4% 2008	Recorded yield impact from studies	From Monsanto (various years <sup>8</sup> ) – annual monitoring reports submitted to government	212 pesos all years to 2008, 310 pesos 2009 onwards	770 pesos 2004-2007 580 pesos 2008, 150 pesos 2009 onwards	No published studies identified based on Monsanto annual monitoring reports

	+13% 2009, +4% 2010 and 2011		(of crop which are all technically trials)			
Romania	+31% , 15% 2006	Based on only available study covering 1999-2003 (note not grown in 2007) plus 2006 farm survey	For previous year – based on Brookes (2005 <sup>58</sup> ) – the only published source identified. Also, Monsanto Romania (2007) <sup>59</sup>	\$160 1999-2000 \$148 2001 \$135 2002 \$130 2003 & 2004 \$121 2005 \$100 2006 Not permitted for use in EU 2007 All years includes 4 litres of herbicide	\$150-\$192 1999-2006 depending on Euro to \$ exchange rate 2007 not applicable – trait not permitted for growing in EU	Brookes (2005 <sup>58</sup> ) Monsanto Romania (2007) <sup>59</sup>
Bolivia	+15%	Based on survey in 2007-08	Fernandez W et al (2009 <sup>60</sup> ) farm survey of GM HT versus conventional growers	\$3.32 all years	\$9.28 all years	Fernandez W et al (2009 <sup>60</sup> )
<b>GM HT corn</b>	<b>Yield impact assumption used</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Yield references</b>	<b>Cost of technology data/assumptions</b>	<b>Cost savings (excluding impact of seed premium) assumptions</b>	<b>Costs references</b>
US	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	\$14.8 all years to 2004 \$17.3 2005 \$24.71 2006-2008 \$26.35 2009, \$29.35 2010	\$39.9 all years to 2003 \$38.47 2004 \$38.61 2005 \$ 29.27 2006 \$42.28 2007 \$39.29 2008 \$39.18 2009, \$41.12 2010 \$57.64 2011	Carpenter & Gianessi (2002 <sup>12</sup> ) Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 <sup>9</sup> & 2006 <sup>10</sup> ) Johnson S & Strom S (2008 <sup>35</sup> ). 2008 and 2009 updated to reflect changes in common treatments and prices. Seed cost based on weighted seed sales (sold as single and stacked traits)
Canada	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	\$ Can 27 1999-2005 \$ Can 35 2006 onwards	\$Can 48.75 all years to 2007 \$ Can 41.12 2008, \$44.67 2009, \$41.44 2010	No studies identified – based on personal communications with industry sources, including Monsanto Canada. 2008 & 2009 updated to reflect herbicide price

						changes
Argentina: sold as single trait	+3% corn belt +22% marginal areas	Based on only available analysis - Corn Belt = 70% of plantings, marginal areas 30% - industry analysis (note no significant plantings until 2006)	No studies identified – based on personal communicati ons with industry sources in 2007 and 2008 Monsanto Argentina & Grupo CEO (personal communicati ons 2007, 2008 & 2011)	61 pesos all years to 2008. 72 pesos 2009 & 2010	61 pesos all years to 2007. 43.4 pesos 2008, 53.66 pesos 2009, 64.15 pesos 2010 and 2011	No studies identified - based on Monsanto Argentina & Grupo CEO (personal communications 2007 & 2008). 2008 & 2009 updated to reflect herbicide price changes
Argentina: sold as stacked trait	+10.25%	Farmer level feedback to seed suppliers	Unpublished farm level survey feedback to Monsanto: +15.75% yield impact overall – for purposes of this analysis, 5.5% allocated to IR trait and balance to HT trait	2007 125 peso, 2008 130 peso, 2009 & 2010 153 peso	As single trait	As single trait
South Africa	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	80 Rand 2003- 2005 120 Rand 2006 onwards	162 Rand all years to 2007. 101.6 Rand 2008, 106.5 Rand 2009, 124.8 Rand 2010 and 2011	No studies identified - based on Monsanto S Africa (personal communications 2005, 2007 & 2008). 2008 onwards updated to reflect herbicide price changes
Philippine s	+15% 2006 and 2007, +5% 2008 & 2009	Farm survey	Based on unpublished industry analysis for 2006 & 2007, thereafter Gonsales L et al (2009 <sup>18</sup> )	1,232 pesos all years	Not known originally so conservative assumption of zero used to 2007 2008 & 2009 1,644 pesos, 2010 1,834 pesos	Monsanto Philippines (personal communications 2007 & 2008). Gonsales L et al (2009 <sup>18</sup> ). 2010 updated to reflect changes in herbicide costs
Brazil	+2.5% 2010 +3.6%	Farm survey	Galveo (2010 and 2012 <sup>21,32</sup> ))	Real 31	Real 71	Data derived from the same sources referred to for yield

	2011					
Colombia	Zero	Mendez et al (2011) <sup>34</sup>	Mendez et al (2011 <sup>34</sup> ) farm survey from 2009	43,340 pesos	221,035 pesos savings	Mendez et al (2011 <sup>34</sup> )
<b>GM HT Cotton</b>	<b>Yield impact assumption used</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Yield references</b>	<b>Cost of technology data/assumptions</b>	<b>Cost savings (excluding impact of seed premium) assumptions</b>	<b>Costs references</b>
US	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	\$12.85 1996-2000 \$21.32 2001-2003 \$34.55 2004 \$68.22 2005 \$70.35 2006 \$70.61 2007 \$71.56 2008 \$76.2 2009, \$81.24 2010 \$81.6 2011	\$34.12 1996-2000 \$66.59 2001-2003 \$83.35 2004 \$71.12 2005 \$73.66 2006 \$76.01 2007 \$77.7 2008 \$83.69 2009, \$94.81 2010 \$99.24 2011	Carpenter & Gianessi ( <sup>12</sup> ) Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 <sup>9</sup> & 2006 <sup>10</sup> ) Johnson S & Strom S (2008 <sup>35</sup> ) and updated from 2008 to reflect changes in weed control practices and prices of herbicides. Seed costs 2008 onwards weighted by single, stack Roundup Ready and Roundup Ready Flex seed sales
Australia	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	\$ Aus 50 all years to 2007 \$ Aus 75 2008 \$ Aus 79 2009, \$ Aus 75 2010	+\$ Aus 60 all years to 2007 +\$ Aus 104.5 2008, \$ Aus 113 2009, \$ Aus 114.4 2010	Doyle et al (2003 <sup>61</sup> ) Monsanto Australia (personal communications 2005, 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2012)
South Africa	Nil	Not relevant	Not relevant	133 Rand 2001-2004 101 Rand 2005 165 Rand 2006 and 2007 182.5 Rand, 2008 onwards	160 Rand all years to 2004 485 Rand 2005 513 Rand 2006 & 2007 555 Rand 2008 460 Rand, 449 Rand 2009, 479 Rand 2010 and 2011	No studies identified - based on Monsanto S Africa (personal communications 2005, 2007, 2008, 2010 and 2012)
Argentina	Nil on area using farm saved seed, +9.3% on area using certified seed	Based on only available data – company monitoring of commercial plots	No studies identified – based on personal communications with Grupo CEO and Monsanto Argentina (2007, 2008,	122 pesos all years to 2007, 75 pesos 2008 onwards	68 pesos all years to 2007, 106 pesos 2008 onwards	No published studies identified – based on personal communications with Grupo CEO and Monsanto Argentina (2007, 2008 & 2010)

			2012)			
Mexico	+3.6% all years to 2007 0% 2008, +5.11% 2009, +18.1% 2010, +5.1% 2011	Based on only available data – company monitoring of commercial ‘trial’ plots & annual reporting to government	Same as source for cost data	720 pesos all years to 2007 758 pesos 2008, 385 pesos 2009, 643 pesos 2010 and 2011	1,150 pesos all years to 2007 961 pesos 2008, 230 pesos 2009, 358 pesos 2010 and 2011	No published studies identified - based on personal communications with Monsanto Mexico and their annual reporting of the trials to government (annually)
Colombia	+4%	Based on only available data – company monitoring of commercial plots	As cost data	\$95.8 all years to 2009, \$177 2010 and 2011	\$88.2 all years to 2009, \$205 2010 and 2011	No published studies identified – based on personal communications with Monsanto Colombia (2010 and 2012)
Brazil	+2.35% 2010 +3.1% 2011	Farm survey	Galveo (2010 and 2012 <sup>49,31</sup> ))	Real 83 2010	Real 242 2010	Data derived from the same sources referred to for yield
<b>GM HT canola</b>	<b>Yield impact assumption used</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Yield references</b>	<b>Cost of technology data/assumptions</b>	<b>Cost savings (excluding impact of seed premium) assumptions</b>	<b>Costs references</b>
US	+6% all years to 2004. Post 2004 based on Canada – see below	Based on the only identified impact analysis – post 2004 based on Canadian impacts as same alternative (conventional HT) technology to Canada available	Same as for cost data	\$29.5 1999-2001 \$33 2002-2004 \$12 2005 onwards for glyphosate tolerant \$ 17.3 all years for glufosinate tolerant to 2004 \$12 2005-2007 \$17.3 2008 onwards	<i>glyphosate tolerant</i> \$60.75 1999-2001 \$67 2002 & 2003 \$69 2004 \$49 2005 \$40 2006 \$64 2007 \$60.4 2008 \$62.2 2009, \$66.2 2010 \$32.5 2011 <i>glufosinate tolerant</i> \$44.89 all years to 2003 \$44 2004 \$40 2005 \$ 34.6 2006 \$ 18.2 2007 \$20.2 2008 \$20.7 2009, \$21.3 2010 \$34.46 2011	Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 <sup>9</sup> & 2006 <sup>10</sup> ) Johnson S & Strom S (2008 <sup>35</sup> ). These are the only studies identified that examine GM HT canola in the US. Updated for 2008 & 2009 based on changes in herbicide prices
Canada	+10.7% all years to 2004. Post 2004; for GM glyphosa	After 2004 based on differences between average annual variety trial results for	Same as for cost data	\$ Can 44.63 all years to 2003 2004 onwards based on difference seed premium and technology fee	Glyphosate tolerant \$ Can 39 all years to 2003 \$ Can 40 2004 & 2005 \$ Can 53.46 2006	Based on Canola Council (2001 <sup>62</sup> ) to 2003 then adjusted to reflect main current non GM (HT) alternative of ‘Clearfields’ – data

	<p>te tolerant varieties no yield difference 2004, 2005, 2008, +4% 2006 and 2007, +1.67% 2009. For GM glufosinate tolerant varieties: +12% 2004, +19% 2005, +10% 2006 &amp; 2007 +12% 2008 +11.8% 2009</p>	<p>Clearfields (non GM herbicide tolerant varieties) and GM alternatives. GM alternatives differentiated into glyphosate tolerant and glufosinate tolerant</p>		<p>relative to Clearfields HT canola; zero for GM glufosinate tolerance &amp; \$ Can 37 for glyphosate tolerance</p>	<p>\$ Can 53.5 2007 \$ Can 36.56 2008 \$ Can 37.7 2009, Can \$34.89 2010 Can \$42.28 2011 Glufosinate tolerant \$ Can 39 all years to 2003 \$ Can 10 2004 &amp; 2005 \$ Can 22.17 2006 \$ Can 21.81 2007 \$ Can 11.1 2008 \$ Can 11.37 2009, Can \$7.8 2010 Can \$19.87 2011</p>	<p>derived from personal communications with the Canola Council (2008) plus Gustafson et al (2009<sup>63</sup>) which includes spillover benefits of \$ Can13.49 to follow on crops – applied from 2006</p>
Australia	<p>+21.08% 2008 average across comparisons with hybrids and open pollinated varieties. 2009 onwards yield gains identified in original survey weighted according to sales of open pollinated and</p>	<p>Survey based</p>	<p>Based on survey of licence holders by Monsanto Australia</p>	<p>\$ Aus 47.02 2008, \$ Aus 46.52 2009, \$ Aus 31.9 2010</p>	<p>\$ Aus 22.87 2008, \$ Aus 22.72 2009, \$ Aus 21.8 2010 and 2011</p>	<p>Monsanto Australia survey of licence holders (2009<sup>64</sup>). Subsequent years weighted by seed sales</p>

	hybrid varieties					
<b>GM HT sugar beet</b>						
US & Canada	+12.58% 2007 +2.8% 2008 +3.3% 2009 onwards	Farm survey & extension service analysis	Kniss (2008 <sup>65</sup> ) Khan (2008 <sup>66</sup> )	\$130.96 2007 \$131.08 2008 \$152 2009-2010 \$148 2011	\$353.35 2007 \$142.5 2008-2010 \$101.8 2011	Kniss A (2008 <sup>65</sup> ) Khan M (2008 <sup>65</sup> ), Jon-Joseph et al (2010) <sup>66</sup>
<b>GM VR crops US</b>						
Papaya	between +15% and +77% 1999-2011 – relative to base yield of 22.86 t/ha	Based on average yield in 3 years before first use	Draws on only published source disaggregating to this aspect of impact	Nil 1999 to 2003 \$42 2004 \$148 2005-2007 \$494 2008 onwards	Nil – no effective conventional method of protection	Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006 <sup>9,10</sup> ), Johnson S & Strom S (2008 <sup>35</sup> ) and updating of these from 2008 and 2009
Squash	+100% on area planted	assumes virus otherwise destroys crop on planted area	Draws on only published source disaggregating to this aspect of impact	\$398 2004 & 2005 \$376 2006 \$736 2007 onwards	Nil – no effective conventional method of treatment	Sankala & Blumenthal (2003 & 2006 <sup>9,10</sup> ), Johnson S & Strom S (2008 <sup>35</sup> ) and updating of these from 2008

Readers should note that the assumptions are drawn from the references cited supplemented and updated by industry sources (where the authors have not been able to identify specific studies). This has been particularly of relevance for some of the herbicide tolerant traits more recently adopted in several developing countries. Accordingly, the authors are grateful to industry sources which have provided information on impact, (notably on cost of the technology and impact on costs of crop protection). Whilst this information does not derive from detailed studies, the authors are confident that it is reasonably representative of average impacts; in fact in a number of cases, information provided from industry sources via personal communications has suggested levels of average impact that are lower than that identified in independent studies. Where this has occurred, the more conservative (industry source) data has been used.

#### Farm level income impact of using GM HT soybeans in Argentina 1996-2011 (2): second crop soybeans

Year	Second crop area (million ha)	Average gross margin/ha for second crop soybeans (\$/ha)	Increase in income linked to GM HT system (million \$)
1996	0.45	128.78	Negligible
1997	0.65	127.20	25.4
1998	0.8	125.24	43.8
1999	1.4	122.76	116.6

2000	1.6	125.38	144.2
2001	2.4	124.00	272.8
2002	2.7	143.32	372.6
2003	2.8	151.33	416.1
2004	3.0	226.04	678.1
2005	2.3	228.99	526.7
2006	3.2	218.40	698.9
2007	4.94	229.36	1,133.6
2008	3.35	224.87	754.1
2009	3.55	207.24	736.0
2010	4.40	257.70	1,133.8
2011	4.60	257.40	1,184.0

Source & notes:

1. Crop areas and gross margin data based on data supplied by Grupo CEO and the Argentine Ministry of Agriculture . No data available before 2000, hence 2001 data applied to earlier years but adjusted, based on GDP deflator rates
2. The second cropping benefits are based on the gross margin derived from second crop soybeans multiplied by the total area of second crop soybeans (less an assumed area of second crop soybeans that equals the second crop area in 1996 – this was discontinued from 2004 because of the importance farmers attach to the GM HT system in facilitating them remaining in no tillage production systems)



## Appendix 3: Additional information relating to the environmental impact

US Soybeans: typical herbicide regimes for conventional no tillage production systems: Mid West

	Active ingredient (kg/ha)	Field EIQ/ha value
<i>Option 1</i>		
Glyphosate	1.00	15.26
2 4 D	0.66	10.05
Flumioxazin	0.07	1.78
Chlorimuron	0.02	0.4
Lactofen	0.17	2.52
Clethodim	0.11	1.83
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.02</b>	<b>31.84</b>
<i>Option 2</i>		
Glyphosate	1.00	15.26
2 4 D	0.66	10.05
Flumioxazin	0.07	1.78
Chlorimuron	0.02	0.4
Thifensulfuron	0.01	0.11
Fomesafen	0.26	6.39
Clethodim	0.11	1.83
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.12</b>	<b>35.76</b>
<i>Option 3</i>		
Glyphosate	1.00	15.26
2 4 D	0.66	10.05
Sulfentrazone	0.2	2.39
Cloransulam	0.06	0.8
Clethodim	0.11	1.83
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>30.33</b>

US Soybeans: typical herbicide regimes for conventional no tillage production systems: South

	Active ingredient (kg/ha)	Field EIQ/ha value
<i>Option 1</i>		
Glyphosate	1.00	15.26
2 4 D	0.66	10.05
Flumioxazin	0.07	1.78
Metalochlor	1.36	29.97
Fomesafen	0.30	7.32
Clethodim	0.11	1.83
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>66.19</b>
<i>Option 2</i>		
Glyphosate	0.97	14.88
2 4 D	0.63	9.63
Flumioxazin	0.07	1.78
Chlorimuron	0.02	0.4
Fomesafen	0.37	9.03
Clethodim	0.11	1.83
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>37.67</b>
<i>Option 3</i>		

Glyphosate	1.00	15.26
2 4 D	0.66	10.05
Metalochlor	1.36	29.97
Fomesafen	0.3	7.32
Acifloren	0.26	6.21
S Metalochlor	1.45	31.88
Clethodim	0.11	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.13</b>	<b>100.68</b>

**US Soybeans: typical herbicide regimes for conventional crop and tillage production systems:  
South**

	Active ingredient (kg/ha)	Field EIQ/ha value
<i>Option 1</i>		
Flumioxazin	0.07	1.78
Metalochlor	1.19	26.14
Fomesafen	0.26	6.38
Clethodim	0.11	1.83
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>36.13</b>
<i>Option 2</i>		
Flumioxazin	0.07	1.78
Chlorimuron	0.02	0.4
Fomesafen	0.26	6.39
Clethodim	0.11	1.83
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>10.4</b>
<i>Option 3</i>		
Metalochlor	1.36	29.97
Fomesafen	0.3	7.32
Acifloren	0.26	6.21
S Metalochlor	1.45	31.88
Clethodim	0.11	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>77.22</b>

Weighted average all by tillage types: ai/ha 2.02 kg/ha, EIQ/ha 38.47

**Estimated typical herbicide regimes for GM HT reduced/no till and conventional reduced/no till soybean production systems that will provide an equal level of weed control to the GM HT system in Argentina 2011**

	Active ingredient (kg/ha)	Field EIQ/ha value
<i>GM HT soybeans</i>	3.02	47.00
Source: AMIS Global dataset on pesticide use 2011		
<i>Conventional soybeans</i>		
<i>Option 1</i>		
Glyphosate	1.62	24.83
Metsulfuron	0.03	0.50
2 4 D	0.3	6.21
Imazethapyr	0.08	1.57
Diflufenican	0.05	0.88
Clethodim	0.16	2.72
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.24</b>	<b>36.71</b>
<i>Option 2</i>		
Glyphosate	1.62	24.83
Dicamba	0.08	2.11
Acetochlor	1.08	21.49
Haloxifop	0.096	2.13
Sulfentrazone	0.19	2.23
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.066</b>	<b>52.79</b>
<i>Option 3</i>		
Glyphosate	1.62	24.83
Atrazine	0.75	17.17
Bentazon	0.6	11.22
2 4 D ester	0.04	0.61
Imazaquin	0.024	0.37
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.034</b>	<b>54.2</b>
<i>Option 4</i>		
Glyphosate	1.8	27.59
2 4 D amine	0.384	7.95
Flumetsulam	0.06	0.94
Fomesafen	0.25	0.13
Chlorimuron	0.015	0.29
Fluazifop	0.12	3.44
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>46.34</b>
<i>Option 5</i>		
Glyphosate	1.8	27.59
Metsulfuron	0.05	0.84
2 4 D amine	0.75	15.53
Imazethapyr	0.1	1.96
Haloxifop	0.096	2.13
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>48.05</b>
<i>Option 6</i>		
Glyphosate	1.8	27.59
Metsulfuron	0.05	0.84
2 4 D amine	0.75	15.53
Imazethapyr	0.1	1.96

Clethodim	0.24	4.08
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>49.99</b>
<b>Average all six conventional options</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>48.00</b>

Sources: AAPRESID and Monsanto Argentina

#### GM HT versus conventional maize Argentina 2011

	Active ingredient (kg/ha)	Field eq/ha value
<b>Conventional</b>		
<i>Option 1</i>		
Glyphosate	1.75	26.83
Acetochlor	1.68	33.43
Atrazine	1.37	31.37
Misotrione	0.14	2.52
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.94</b>	<b>94.15</b>
<i>Option 2</i>		
Glyphosate	1.75	26.83
Acetochlor	1.68	33.43
Atrazine	1.37	31.37
Foramsulam	0.04	0.61
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.84</b>	<b>92.24</b>
<b>Average conventional</b>	<b>4.89</b>	<b>93.20</b>
<b>GM HT corn</b>		
Acetochlor	1.3	25.82
Atrazine	0.685	15.66
Glyphosate	2.24	34.34
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.225</b>	<b>75.82</b>

Sources: AMIS Global and Monsanto Argentina

#### Typical herbicide regimes for GM HT cotton in Argentina 2011

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional cotton</i>		
Glyphosate	1.8	27.59
Acetochlor	0.6	11.94
Diuron	1.034	27.40
Quizalofop	0.05	1.10
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.484</b>	<b>68.04</b>
<i>GM HT cotton</i>		
<b>Glyphosate</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>27.59</b>

Source: Monsanto Argentina

#### Typical herbicide regimes for GM HT soybeans Brazil 2011

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Burndown (applicable to conventional and GM HT)</i>	1.56	23.91
<i>GM HT over the top</i>	1.35	16.83
<b>GM HT total</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>40.74</b>
<i>Conventional over the top</i>	0.83	13.48
<b>Conventional total</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>37.39</b>

Source: derived from Kleffmann & AMIS Global

**Typical herbicide regimes for GM HT soybeans in South Africa 2011**

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional soybeans</i>		
<i>Option one</i>		
Alachlor	1.87	33.47
Chlorimuron	0.01	0.19
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.88</b>	<b>33.66</b>
<i>Option two</i>		
S Metolachlor	0.73	16.06
Dimethenamid	0.5	6.01
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.23</b>	<b>22.07</b>
<i>Option 3</i>		
S Metolachlor	0.73	16.06
Chlorimuron	0.01	0.19
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>16.25</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.28</b>	<b>24.00</b>
<i>GM HT soybeans – based on AMIS Global 2011</i>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>15.94</b>

Source: Monsanto South Africa AMIS Global

**Typical herbicide regimes for GM HT maize in South Africa 2011**

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional maize</i>		
Acetochlor	1.16	23.08
Atrazine	0.76	17.14
Mesotrione	0.16	2.99
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.08</b>	<b>43.21</b>
<i>GM HT maize</i>		
Acetochlor	0.58	11.54
Glyphosate	1.5	23.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>34.54</b>

Source: Monsanto South Africa

**Typical herbicide regimes for GM HT cotton in South Africa**

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional cotton</i>		
<i>Option one</i>		
Trifluralin	1.12	21.06
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>21.06</b>
<i>Option two</i>		
S Metolachlor	0.96	20.9
Flumeturon	0.4	5.72
Prometryn	0.5	7.70
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.85</b>	<b>34.48</b>
<i>Option 3</i>		
Trifluralin	1.12	21.06
Cyanazine	0.85	11.56
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>32.62</b>
<i>Option 4</i>		
Trifluralin	1.12	21.06
Flumeturon	0.4	5.72
Prometryn	0.5	7.70

Acetochlor	0.32	6.37
Atrazine	0.128	2.93
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.093</b>	<b>43.77</b>
<i>Option 5</i>		
Trifluralin	0.75	14.10
Flumeturon	0.4	5.72
Prometryn	0.5	7.70
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.65</b>	<b>27.52</b>
<b>Average conventional</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>31.86</b>
<i>GM HT cotton</i>		
<b>Glyphosate</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>27.59</b>

Source: Monsanto South Africa

**Typical herbicide regimes for GM HT maize in Canada**

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional maize</i>		
Metolachlor	1.3566	29.84
Atrazine	1.1912	27.28
Primsulfuron	0.0244	0.41
Dicamba	0.14	3.54
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.7122</b>	<b>61.07</b>
<i>GM glyphosate tolerant maize</i>		
Metolachlor	0.678	14.92
Atrazine	0.594	13.60
Glyphosate	0.56	8.58
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.832</b>	<b>37.10</b>
<i>GM glufosinate tolerant maize</i>		
Metolachlor	0.678	14.92
Atrazine	0.594	13.60
Glufosinate	0.37	7.49
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.642</b>	<b>36.01</b>

Sources: Weed Control Guide Ontario, industry

**Typical insecticide regimes for cotton in India 2011**

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional cotton</i>		
<i>Option 1</i>		
Imidacloprid	0.04	1.54
Thiomethoxam	0.05	1.67
Acetamiprid	0.08	2.30
Diafenthiuron	0.1	2.53
Buprofezin	0.06	2.10
Profenfos	1.23	73.18
Acephate	0.68	16.93
Cypermethrin	0.1	3.63
Metaflumizone	0.025	0.82
Novaluron	0.04	1.54
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>105.28</b>
<i>Option 2</i>		
Imidacloprid	0.04	1.54

Thiomethoxam	0.05	1.67
Acetamiprid	0.08	2.30
Diafenthiuron	0.1	2.53
Chlorpyrifos	0.66	17.75
Metaflumizone	0.025	0.82
Emamectin	0.011	0.29
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>26.90</b>
<b>Average conventional</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>66.09</b>
<i>GM IR cotton</i>		
Imidacloprid	0.04	1.54
Thiomethoxam	0.05	1.67
Acetamiprid	0.08	2.30
Diafenthiuron	0.1	2.53
Buprofezin	0.06	2.10
Acephate	0.68	16.93
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>27.06</b>
<i>Option 2</i>		
Imidacloprid	0.04	1.54
Thiomethoxam	0.05	1.67
Acetamiprid	0.08	2.30
Diafenthiuron	0.1	2.53
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>8.04</b>
<b>Average GM IR cotton</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>17.57</b>

Source: Monsanto India, AMIS Global

#### Typical insecticide regimes for cotton in China 2011

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional cotton</i>		
Imidacloprid	0.65	23.86
Abamectin	0.03	1.04
Chlorpyrifos	1.10	29.54
Cypermethrin	0.21	7.65
Fipronil	0.68	60.01
Acetamiprid	0.08	2.30
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>124.40</b>
<i>GM IR cotton</i>		
Imidacloprid	0.41	15.05
Abamectin	0.05	1.73
Chlorpyrifos	0.77	20.67
Cypermethrin	0.13	4.74
Fipronil	0.44	38.83
Acetamiprid	0.06	1.72
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.86</b>	<b>82.74</b>

Sources: Monsanto China, AMIS Global, Plant Protection Institute of the Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences

#### Typical herbicide regimes for canola in the US, Canada & Australia 2011

##### USA

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional canola</i>		

Ethafluralin	1.0	23.3
Quizalofop	0.06	1.33
Ethametsulfuron	0.05	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>25.53</b>
<i>GM glyphosate tolerant canola</i>		
<b>Glyphosate</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>15.64</b>
<i>GM glufosinate tolerant canola</i>		
Glufosinate	0.51	10.30
Quizalofop	0.03	0.66
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>10.97</b>

Based on Johnson & Strom (2008) and updated

### Canada

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional canola (Clearfields)</i>		
Imazamox	0.03	0.58
Imazapethayr	0.03	0.59
2 4 D	0.5	10.35
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>11.52</b>
<i>GM glyphosate tolerant canola</i>		
<b>Glyphosate</b>	<b>0.697</b>	<b>10.68</b>
<i>GM glufosinate tolerant canola</i>		
Glufosinate	0.322	6.50
Quizalofop	0.03	0.57
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>7.07</b>

### Australia

	Active ingredient (kg/ha)	Field EIQ/ha value
<i>Conventional triazine tolerant</i>		
<i>Option 1</i>		
Atrazine	0.66	15.11
Simazine	1.8	38.70
Clethodim	0.047	0.78
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.507</b>	<b>54.59</b>
<i>Option 2</i>		
Atrazine	0.66	15.11
Clethodim	0.046	0.78
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.706</b>	<b>15.89</b>
<i>Option 3</i>		
Trefluralin	0.48	9.02
Atrazine	0.66	15.11
Simazine	1.8	38.70
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>62.83</b>
<b>Average all options</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>44.44</b>
<b>Weighted average</b>	<b>1.85</b>	<b>40.35</b>
<i>Conventional Clearfield</i>		
<i>Option 1</i>		



Glyphosate	0.621	9.52
Clethodim	0.046	0.78
Imazamox	0.013	0.26
Imazethapyr	0.006	0.13
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.6858</b>	<b>10.69</b>
<i>Option 2</i>		
Trefluralin	0.48	9.02
Clethodim	0.0456	0.78
Imazamox	0.0132	0.26
Imazethapyr	0.006	0.13
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.5448</b>	<b>10.19</b>
<i>Option 3</i>		
Trefluralin	0.48	9.02
Imazamox	0.0132	0.26
Imazethapyr	0.006	0.13
Glyphosate	<b>0.621</b>	<b>9.52</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.1202</b>	<b>18.94</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.7836</b>	<b>13.27</b>
<b>Weighted average</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>14.69</b>
<b>GM HT canola</b>		
<i>Option 1</i>		
Glyphosate	0.621	9.52
<i>Option 2</i>		
Glyphosate	1.242	19.04
<i>Option 3</i>		
Glyphosate	0.621	9.52
Trefluralin	0.48	9.02
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.101</b>	<b>18.54</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.988</b>	<b>15.70</b>
<b>Weighted average</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>15.03</b>

Source:

Notes: Weighting on usage: TT canola, option 1: 45%, option 2: 40%, option 3: 15%, Clearfield canola, option 1: 25%, option 2: 25%, option 3: 50% GM HT canola, option 1: 40%, option 2: 40%, option 3: 20% 2010 crop weighting 40% of GMHT versus TT canola and 60% GMHT versus Clearfields canola giving an average all conventional usage of 1.34kg/ha and a field EIQ/ha of 17.78

#### Typical herbicide regimes for GM HT versus conventional sugar beet: USA 2011

	Active ingredient (kg/ha)	Field EIQ/ha value
<i>Conventional</i>		
Phenmedipham	0.16	2.62
Desmedipham	0.19	3.36
Ethofumesate	0.86	22.19
Clopyralid	0.18	3.26
Triflusalufuron	0.03	0.57
Clethodim	0.15	2.55
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>34.55</b>
<i>GM HT sugar beet</i>		
<b>Glyphosate</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>36.64</b>

Sources: GFK Kynetec and Monsanto US

**Typical herbicide regimes for GM HT soybeans in Mexico 2011**

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional soybeans</i>		
Metribuzin	0.376	10.68
Imazethapyr	0.1	1.96
Paraquat	0.3	7.41
Quizalafop	0.042	0.93
Fluazafop	0.1875	5.38
Linuron	0.75	14.67
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.7655</b>	<b>41.03</b>
<i>GM HT soybeans</i>		
<b>Glyphosate</b>	<b>1.62</b>	<b>24.79</b>

Source: Monsanto Mexico

**Typical herbicide regimes for GM HT cotton Australia 2011**

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional cotton</i>		
Trifluralin	1.15	21.62
Flumeturon	2.25	32.18
Prometryn	1.00	15.40
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>69.20</b>
<i>GM HT cotton</i>		
Pendimethalin	0.33	9.97
Fluometuron	0.50	7.15
Glyphosate	3.102	47.55
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.932</b>	<b>64.67</b>

Source: Monsanto Australia

**Typical insecticide regimes for cotton in Mexico 2011**

Active ingredient	Amount (kg/ha of crop)	Field EIQ/ha
<i>Conventional cotton</i>		
Lambda cyhalothrin	0.04	1.89
Cypermethrin	0.16	5.82
Monocrotophos	0.6	22.08
Methidathion	0.622	20.34
Triazophos	0.6	21.36
Methomyl	0.225	4.95
Chlorpyrifos	0.96	25.82
Chlorfenapyr	0.12	5.53
Endosulfan	1.08	41.69
Azinphos methyl	0.315	14.52
Parathion methyl	0.5	13.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.222</b>	<b>177.00</b>
<i>GM IR cotton</i>		
Lambda cyhalothrin	0.02	0.94
Cypermethrin	0.08	2.91
Monocrotophos	0.3	11.04
Methomyl	0.225	4.95
Chlorpyrifos	0.96	25.82
Chlorfenapyr	0.12	5.53
Endosulfan	1.08	41.69

Azinphos methyl	0.315	14.52
Parathion methyl	0.5	13.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>120.41</b>

**Typical conventional insecticide regime for maize (targeting corn boring pests) in Colombia 2011**

<b>Active ingredient</b>	<b>Amount (kg/ha of crop)</b>	<b>Field EIQ/ha</b>
Luferon	0.0225	0.37
Chlorifluzanon	0.05	1.82
Chlorpyrifos	0.325	8.73
Mathavin	0.162	4.97
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>15.89</b>

Source: Mendez et al (2011)

Note: GM IR maize replaces the above treatment

## Appendix 4: The Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ): a method to measure the environmental impact of pesticides

The material presented below is from the original by the cited authors of [J. Kovach](#), [C. Petzoldt](#), J. Degni, and J. Tette, IPM Program, Cornell University,

### Methods

Extensive data are available on the environmental effects of specific pesticides, and the data used were gathered from a variety of sources. The Extension Toxicology Network (EXTOXNET), a collaborative education project of the environmental toxicology and pesticide education departments of Cornell University, Michigan State University, Oregon State University, and the University of California, was the primary source used in developing the database (Hotchkiss et al. 1989). EXTOXNET conveys pesticide-related information on the health and environmental effects of approximately 100 pesticides. A second source of information used was CHEM-NEWS of CENET, the Cornell Cooperative Extension Network. CHEM-NEWS is a computer program maintained by the Pesticide Management and Education Program of Cornell University that contains approximately 310 US EPA - Pesticide Fact Sheets, describing health, ecological, and environmental effects of the pesticides that are required for the re-registration of these pesticides (Smith and Barnard 1992).

The impact of pesticides on arthropod natural enemies was determined by using the SELCTV database developed at Oregon State (Theiling and Croft 1988). These authors searched the literature and rated the effect of about 400 agrichemical pesticides on over 600 species of arthropod natural enemies, translating all pesticide/natural enemy response data to a scale ranging from one (0% effect) to five (90-100% effect).

Leaching, surface loss potentials (runoff), and soil half-life data of approximately 100 compounds are contained in the National Pesticide/Soils Database developed by the USDA Agricultural Research Service and Soil Conservation Service. This database was developed from the GLEAMS computer model that simulates leaching and surface loss potential for a large number of pesticides in various soils and uses statistical methods to evaluate the interactions between pesticide properties (solubility, adsorption coefficient, and half-life) and soil properties (surface horizon thickness, organic matter content, etc.). The variables that provided the best estimate of surface loss and leaching were then selected by this model and used to classify all pesticides into risk groups (large, medium, and small) according to their potential for leaching or surface loss.

Bee toxicity was determined using tables by Morse (1989) in the 1989 New York State pesticide recommendations, which contain information on the relative toxicity of pesticides to honey bees from laboratory and field tests conducted at the University of California, Riverside from 1950 to 1980. More than 260 pesticides are listed in this reference.

In order to fill as many data gaps as possible, Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) and technical bulletins developed by the agricultural chemical industry were also used when available.

Health and environmental factors that addressed some of the common concerns expressed by farm workers, consumers, pest management practitioners, and other environmentalists were

evaluated and are listed in Figure 1. To simplify the interpretation of the data, the toxicity of the active ingredient of each pesticide and the effect on each environmental factor evaluated were grouped into low, medium, or high toxicity categories and rated on a scale from one to five, with one having a minimal impact on the environment or of a low toxicity and five considered to be highly toxic or having a major negative effect on the environment.

All pesticides were evaluated using the same criteria except for the mode of action and plant surface persistence of herbicides. As herbicides are generally systemic in nature and are not normally applied to food crops we decided to consider this class of compounds differently, so all herbicides were given a value of one for systemic activity. This has no effect on the relative rankings within herbicides, but it does make the consumer component of the equation for herbicides more realistic. Also, since plant surface persistence is only important for post-emergent herbicides and not pre-emergent herbicides, all post-emergent herbicides were assigned a value of three and pre-emergent herbicides assigned a value of one for this factor.

The rating system used to develop the environmental impact quotient of pesticides (EIQ) model is as follows (1 = least toxic or least harmful, 5 = most toxic or harmful):

- *Mode of Action*: non-systemic- 1, all herbicides – 1, systemic – 3
- *Acute Dermal LD50 for Rabbits/Rats(m&/kg)*: >2000 – 1, 200 - 2000 – 3, 0 - 200 – 5
- *Long-Term Health Effects*: little or none – 1, possible- 3, definite – 5
- *Plant Surface Residue Half-life*: 1-2 weeks- 1, 2-4 weeks- 3, > 4 weeks – 5, pre-emergent herbicides – 1, post-emergent herbicides – 3
- *Soil Residue Half-life*: T1/2 <30 days – 1, T1/2=30-100 days – 3, T1/2 >100 days – 5
- *Toxicity to Fish-96 hr LC50*: > 10 ppm – 1, 1-10 ppm – 3, < 1 ppm – 5
- *Toxicity to Birds-8 day LC50*: > 1000 ppm – 1, 100-1000 ppm – 3, 1-100 ppm – 5
- *Toxicity to Bees*: relatively non toxic – 1, moderately toxic – 3, highly toxic – 5
- *Toxicity to Beneficials*: low impact- 1, moderate impact – 3, severe impact – 5
- *Groundwater and Runoff Potential*: small – 1, medium – 3, large -5

In order to further organise and simplify the data, a model was developed called the environmental impact quotient of pesticides (EIQ). This model reduces the environmental impact information to a single value. To accomplish this, an equation was developed based on the three principal components of agricultural production systems: a farm worker component, a consumer component, and an ecological component. Each component in the equation is given equal weight in the final analysis, but within each component, individual factors are weighted differently. Coefficients used in the equation to give additional weight to individual factors are also based on a one to five scale. Factors carrying the most weight are multiplied by five, medium-impact factors are multiplied by three, and those factors considered to have the least impact are multiplied by one. A consistent rule throughout the model is that the impact potential of a specific pesticide on an individual environmental factor is equal to the toxicity of the chemical times the potential for exposure. Stated simply, environmental impact is equal to toxicity times exposure. For example, fish toxicity is calculated by determining the inherent toxicity of the compound to fish times the likelihood of the fish encountering the pesticide. In this manner, compounds that are toxic to fish but short-lived have lower impact values than compounds that are toxic and long-lived.

### The EIQ Equation

The formula for determining the EIQ value of individual pesticides is listed below and is the average of the farm worker, consumer, and ecological components:

$$EIQ = [C[(DT*5) + (DT*P)] + [C*((S+P)/2)*SY] + (L)] + [(F*R) + (D*((S+P)/2)*3) + (Z*P*3) + (B*P*5)] / 3$$

DT = dermal toxicity, C = chronic toxicity, SY = systemicity, F = fish toxicity, L = leaching potential, R = surface loss potential, D = bird toxicity, S = soil half-life, Z = bee toxicity, B = beneficial arthropod toxicity, P = plant surface half-life.

Farm worker risk is defined as the sum of applicator exposure (DT\* 5) plus picker exposure (DT\*P) times the long-term health effect or chronic toxicity (C). Chronic toxicity of a specific pesticide is calculated as the average of the ratings from various long-term laboratory tests conducted on small mammals. These tests are designed to determine potential reproductive effects (ability to produce offspring), teratogenic effects (deformities in unborn offspring), mutagenic effects (permanent changes in hereditary material such as genes and chromosomes), and oncogenic effects (tumor growth). Within the farm worker component, applicator exposure is determined by multiplying the dermal toxicity (DT) rating to small laboratory mammals (rabbits or rats) times a coefficient of five to account for the increased risk associated with handling concentrated pesticides. Picker exposure is equal to dermal toxicity (DT) times the rating for plant surface residue half-life potential (the time required for one-half of the chemical to break down). This residue factor takes into account the weathering of pesticides that occurs in agricultural systems and the days to harvest restrictions that may be placed on certain pesticides. The consumer component is the sum of consumer exposure potential ( $C*((S+P)/2)*SY$ ) plus the potential groundwater effects (L). Groundwater effects are placed in the consumer component because they are more of a human health issue (drinking well contamination) than a wildlife issue. Consumer exposure is calculated as chronic toxicity (C) times the average for residue potential in soil and plant surfaces (because roots and other plant parts are eaten) times the systemic potential rating of the pesticide (the pesticide's ability to be absorbed by plants). The ecological component of the model is composed of aquatic and terrestrial effects and is the sum of the effects of the chemicals on fish ( $F*R$ ), birds ( $D*((S+P)/2)*3$ ), bees ( $Z*P*3$ ), and beneficial arthropods ( $B*P*5$ ). The environmental impact of pesticides on aquatic systems is determined by multiplying the chemical toxicity to fish rating times the surface runoff potential of the specific pesticide (the runoff potential takes into account the half-life of the chemical in surface water).

The impact of pesticides on terrestrial systems is determined by summing the toxicities of the chemicals to birds, bees, and beneficial arthropods. As terrestrial organisms are more likely to occur in commercial agricultural settings than fish, more weight is given to the pesticidal effects on these terrestrial organisms. Impact on birds is measured by multiplying the rating of toxicity to birds by the average half-life on plant and soil surfaces times three. Impact on bees is measured by taking the pesticide toxicity ratings to bees times the half-life on plant surfaces times three. The effect on beneficial arthropods is determined by taking the pesticide toxicity rating to beneficial natural enemies, times the half-life on plant surfaces times five. As arthropod natural enemies spend almost all of their life in agro ecosystem communities (while birds and bees are somewhat transient), their exposure to the pesticides, in theory, is greater. To adjust for this increased exposure, the pesticide impact on beneficial arthropods is multiplied by five. Mammalian wildlife toxicity is not included in the terrestrial component of the equation because mammalian exposure (farm worker and consumer) is already included in the equation, and these health effects are the results of tests conducted on small mammals such as rats, mice, rabbits, and dogs.

After the data on individual factors were collected, pesticides were grouped by classes (fungicides, insecticides/miticides, and herbicides), and calculations were conducted for each pesticide. When toxicological data were missing, the average for each environmental factor within a class was determined, and this average value was substituted for the missing values. Thus, missing data did not affect the relative ranking of a pesticide within a class.

The values of individual effects of each pesticide (applicator, picker, consumer, groundwater, aquatic, bird, bee, beneficials), the major components of the equation (farm worker, consumer, and ecological) and the average EIQ values are presented in separate tables (see references).

### **EIQ field use rating**

Once an EIQ value has been established for the active ingredient of each pesticide, field use calculations can begin. To accurately compare pesticides and pest management strategies, the dose, the formulation or percent active ingredient of the product, and the frequency of application of each pesticide need to be determined. To account for different formulations of the same active ingredient and different use patterns, a simple equation called the EIQ field use rating was developed. This rating is calculated by multiplying the EIQ value for the specific chemical obtained in the tables by the percent active ingredient in the formulation by the rate per acre used (usually in pints or pounds of formulated product);

$$\text{EIQ Field Use Rating} = \text{EIQ} \times \% \text{ active ingredient} \times \text{Rate}$$

By applying the EIQ Field Use Rating, comparisons can be made between different pest management strategies or programs. To compare different pest management programs, EIQ Field Use Ratings and number of applications throughout the season are determined for each pesticide, and these values are then summed to determine the total seasonal environmental impact of the particular strategy.

## References

- Alcade E (1999) Estimated losses from the European Corn Borer, Symposium de Sanidad Vegetal, Seveilla, Spain, cited in Brookes (2002)
- Almaraz J J (2009) Greenhouse gas fluxes associated with soybean production under two tillage systems in south western Quebec, *Soil & Tillage Research* 104, 134-139
- Alston J et al (2003) An ex-ante analysis of the benefits from adoption of corn rootworm resistant, transgenic corn technology, *AgBioforum* vol 5, No 3, article 1
- Amado T J C & Bayer C (2008) Revised Carbon sequestration rates in tropical and subtropical soil under no-tillage in Brazil, abstract Conservation Agriculture Carbon Offset Consultation, West Lafayette, USA
- American Soybean Association Conservation Tillage Study (2001).  
[http://www.soygrowers.com/ctstudy/ctstudy\\_files/frame.htm](http://www.soygrowers.com/ctstudy/ctstudy_files/frame.htm)
- Angers DA, Eriksen-Hamel NS (2008) Full-inversion tillage and organic carbon distribution in soil profiles: a meta-analysis. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 72, 1370-1374
- AAPRESID (2009) Evolution of Cropland under No Till Argentina (1977/78 - 2008/09 Campaigns),  
[http://www.aapresid.org.ar/english/archivos/Sup\\_SD.ppt](http://www.aapresid.org.ar/english/archivos/Sup_SD.ppt), accessed on 22 November 2011
- Asia-Pacific Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology (APCoAB) (2006) Bt cotton in India: a status report, ICRASTAT, New Delhi, India
- Baker, J.M et al (2007) Tillage and soil carbon sequestration—What do we really know? *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 118:1-5
- Bayer *et al* (2006) Carbon sequestration in two Brazilian Cerrado soils under no-till, *Soil and Tillage Research*, 86 (2) 237-245, April 2006
- Benbrook C (2005) Rust, resistance, run down soils and rising costs – problems facing soybean producers in Argentina, *Ag Biotech Infonet*, paper No 8
- Bennett R, Ismael Y, Kambhampati U, and Morse S (2004) Economic Impact of Genetically Modified Cotton in India, *Agbioforum* Vol 7, No 3, Article 1
- Bernacchi *et al* (2005) The conversion of the corn/soybean ecosystem to no-till agriculture may result in a carbon sink, *Global Change Biology*, 11 (11) 1867-1872, November 2005
- Blanco-Canqui H and Lal R (2007) No-tillage and soil-profile carbon sequestration: an on-farm assessment, *Soil Science Society of America Journal* 2008 72:693-701
- Brimner T A et al (2004) Influence of herbicide-resistant canola on the environmental impact of weed management. *Pest Management Science*
- Brookes G (2001) GM crop market dynamics, the case of soybeans, European Federation of Biotechnology, Briefing Paper 12
- Brookes G (2003) The farm level impact of using Bt maize in Spain, ICABR conference paper 2003, Ravello, Italy. Also on [www.pgeconomics.co.uk](http://www.pgeconomics.co.uk)
- Brookes G (2005) The farm level impact of using Roundup Ready soybeans in Romania. *Agbioforum* Vol 8, No 4. Also available on [www.pgeconomics.co.uk](http://www.pgeconomics.co.uk)
- Brookes G (2008) The benefits of adopting GM insect resistant (Bt) maize in the EU: first results from 1998-2006. [www.pgeconomics.co.uk](http://www.pgeconomics.co.uk). Also in the *International Journal of Biotechnology* (2008) vol 10, 2/3, pages 148-166
- Brookes G (2008b) Economic impact of low level presence of not yet approved GMOs on the EU food sector, GBC Ltd, for CIAA, Brussels
- Brookes G et al (2010) The production and price impact of biotech crops, Working Paper 10.WP 503, Centre for Agriculture and Rural Development, Iowa State University.  
[www.card.iastate.edu](http://www.card.iastate.edu). Also in *Agbioforum* 13 (1) 2010. [www.agbioforum.org](http://www.agbioforum.org)



- Brookes G, Barfoot P. (2006). Global impact of biotech crops: socio-economic and environmental effects 1996-2004, AgbioForum 8 (2&3) 187-196, Available on the World Wide Web: <http://www.agbioforum.org>
- Brookes G, Barfoot P (2007). Global impact of biotech crops: socio-economic and environmental effects 1996-2005, Agbioforum 9 (3) 1-13. Available on the World Wide Web: <http://www.agbioforum.org>
- Brookes G, Barfoot P (2008). Global impact of biotech crops: socio-economic and environmental effects 1996-2006, Agbioforum 11(1), 21-38. Available on the World Wide Web: <http://www.agbioforum.org>
- Brookes G, Barfoot P (2011). Global impact of biotech crops: socio-economic effects 1996-2009, Journal of Biotechnology, vol 12, Nos 1-2, 1-49
- Brookes G, Barfoot P (2011). Global impact of biotech crops: environmental effects 1996-2008, AgBioforum 13(1), 76-94. Available on the World Wide Web: <http://www.agbioforum.org>
- Brookes G, Barfoot P (2011). Global impact of biotech crops: environmental effects 1996-2009, GM Crops, vol 2, issue 1, 34-49
- Calegari A et al (2008) Impact of Long-Term No-Tillage and Cropping System Management on Soil Organic Carbon in an Oxisol: A Model for Sustainability, Agron Journal 100:1013-1019
- Canola Council of Canada (2001) An agronomic & economic assessment of transgenic canola, Canola Council, Canada. [www.canola-council.org](http://www.canola-council.org)
- Canola Council (2005) Herbicide tolerant volunteer canola management in subsequent crops, [www.canolacouncil.org](http://www.canolacouncil.org)
- Carpenter J & Gianessi L (1999) Herbicide tolerant soybeans: Why growers are adopting Roundup ready varieties, Ag Bioforum, Vol 2 1999, 65-72
- Carpenter J (2001) Comparing Roundup ready and conventional soybean yields 1999, National Centre for Food & Agriculture Policy, Washington
- Carpenter et al (2002) Comparative environmental impacts of biotech-derived and traditional soybeans, corn and cotton crops, Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST), USA
- Carpenter J & Gianessi L (2002) Agricultural Biotechnology: updated benefit estimates, National Centre for Food and Agricultural Policy (NCFAP), Washington, USA
- Council for Biotechnology Information Canada (2002) Agronomic, economic and environmental impacts of the commercial cultivation of glyphosate tolerant soybeans in Ontario
- Conservation Tillage and Plant Biotechnology (CTIC: 2002) How new technologies can improve the environment by reducing the need to plough. <http://www.ctic.purdue.edu/CTIC/Biotech.html>
- Crossan A & Kennedy I (2004) A snapshot of Roundup Ready cotton in Australia: are there environmental benefits from the rapid adoption of RR cotton, University of Sydney
- CSIRO (2005) The cotton consultants Australia 2005 Bollgard II comparison report, CSIRO, Australia
- CTIC (2007) 2006 Crop residue management survey: a survey of tillage systems usage by crop and acres planted
- Doyle B et al (2003) The Performance of Roundup Ready cotton 2001-2002 in the Australian cotton sector, University of New England, Armidale, Australia
- Doyle B (2005) The Performance of Ingard and Bollgard II Cotton in Australia during the 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 seasons, University of New England, Armidale, Australia
- Elena M (2001) Economic advantages of transgenic cotton in Argentina, INTA, cited in Trigo & Cap (2006)
- Falck Zepeda J et al (2009) Small 'resource poor' countries taking advantage of the new bio-economy and innovation: the case of insect protected and herbicide tolerant corn in Honduras, paper presented to the 13<sup>th</sup> ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy, June 2009

- Fabrizzi et al (2003). Soil Carbon and Nitrogen Organic Fractions in Degraded VS Non-Degraded Mollisols in Argentina. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 67:1831-1841
- Fernandez W et al (2009) GM soybeans in Bolivia, paper presented to the 13<sup>th</sup> ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy, June 2009
- Fernandez-Cornejo J & Klotz-Ingram C (1998) Economic, environmental and policy impacts of using GE crops for pest management. Presented to 1998 NE Agricultural & Resource Economics Association, Ithaca, USA. Cited in Fernandez-Cornejo J & McBride W (2000)
- Fernandez-Cornejo J & McBride W (2002) Adoption of bio-engineered crops, USDA, ERS Agricultural Economics Report No 810
- Fernandez-Cornejo J, Heimlich R & McBride W (2000) Genetically engineered crops: has adoption reduced pesticide use, USDA Outlook August 2000
- Fernandez-Cornejo J & McBride W (2000) Genetically engineered crops for pest management in US agriculture, USDA Economic Research Service report 786
- Finger R et al (2009) Adoption patterns of herbicide-tolerant soybeans in Argentina *AgBioForum*, 12 (3&4): 404-411
- Fischer J & Tozer P (2009) Evaluation of the environmental and economic impact of Roundup Ready canola in the Western Australian crop production system, Curtin University of Technology Technical Report 11/2009
- Fitt G (2001) Deployment and impact of transgenic Bt cotton in Australia, reported in James C (2001), Global review of commercialised transgenic crops: 2001 feature: Bt cotton, ISAAA
- Galvao A (2009, 2010 and 2012) Farm survey findings of impact of insect resistant corn in Brazil, Celeres, Brazil. [www.celeres.co.br](http://www.celeres.co.br)
- Galvao A (2009, 2010 and 2012) Farm survey findings of impact of herbicide tolerant soybeans and insect resistant cotton in Brazil, Celeres, Brazil. [www.celeres.co.br](http://www.celeres.co.br)
- George Morris Centre (2004) Economic & environmental impacts of the commercial cultivation of glyphosate tolerant soybeans in Ontario, unpublished report for Monsanto Canada
- Gianessi L & Carpenter J (1999) Agricultural biotechnology insect control benefits, NCFAP, Washington, USA
- Gomez-Barbero and Rodriguez-Cerezo (2006) The adoption of GM insect-resistant Bt maize in Spain: an empirical approach, 10<sup>th</sup> ICABR conference on agricultural biotechnology, Ravello, Italy, July 2006.
- Gonsales L (2005) Harnessing the benefits of biotechnology: the case of Bt corn in the Philippines. ISBN 971-91904-6-9. Strive Foundation, Laguna, Philippines
- Gonsales L et al (2009) Modern Biotechnology and Agriculture: a history of the commercialisation of biotechnology maize in the Philippines, Strive Foundation, Los Banos, Philippines, ISBN 978-971-91904-8-6
- Gouse M et al (2006a) Output & labour effect of GM maize and minimum tillage in a communal area of Kwazulu-Natal, *Journal of Development Perspectives* 2:2
- Gouse M et al (2005) A GM subsistence crop in Africa: the case of Bt white maize in S Africa, *Int Journal Biotechnology*, Vol 7, No1/2/3 2005
- Gouse et al (2006b) Three seasons of insect resistant maize in South Africa: have small farmers benefited, *AgBioforum* 9 (1) 15-22
- Gruere G et al (2008) Bt cotton and farmer suicides in India: reviewing the evidence, discussion paper No 808 International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington DC (also Gruere G 2011, same title in *J Dev Stud*, 47: 316
- Gusta M et al (2009) Economic benefits of GMHT canola for producers, University of Saskatchewan, College of Biotechnology Working Paper

- Heap I (2013) The International Survey of Herbicide Resistant Weeds. Accessed February 11, 2013. Available [www.weedscience.org](http://www.weedscience.org) Database. <http://www.weedscience.org/in.asp>.
- Herring R and Rao C (2012) On the 'failure of Bt cotton': analysing a decade of experience, *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol XLVII No 18
- Huang J et al (2003) Biotechnology as a alternative to chemical pesticides: a case study of Bt cotton in China, *Agricultural Economics* 25, 55-67
- Hutchison W et al (2010) Area-wide suppression of European Corn Borer with Bt maize reaps
- IMRB (2006) Socio-economic benefits of Bollgard and product satisfaction (in India), IMRB International, Mumbai, India
- IMRB (2007) Socio-economic benefits of Bollgard and product satisfaction (in India), IMRB International, Mumbai, India
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2006) Chapter 2: Generic Methodologies Applicable to Multiple Land-Use Categories. Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Volume 4. Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use. ([http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/4\\_Volume4/V4\\_02\\_Ch2\\_Gene ric.pdf](http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/4_Volume4/V4_02_Ch2_Gene ric.pdf)).
- Ismael Y et al (2002) A case study of smallholder farmers in the Mahathini flats, South Africa, ICABR conference, Ravello Italy 2002
- James C (2002) Global review of commercialized transgenic crops 2001: feature Bt cotton, ISAAA No 26
- James C (2006) Global status of Transgenic crops, various global review briefs from 1996 to 2006, ISAAA
- James C (2003) Global review of commercialized transgenic crops 2002: feature Bt maize, ISAAA No 29
- James C (2006) Global status of commercialised biotech/GM crops: 2006, ISAAA brief No 35. [www.isaaa.org](http://www.isaaa.org)
- James C (2007) Global status of commercialised biotech/GM crops: 2006 ISAAA Brief No 35
- James C (2008) Global status of commercialised biotech/GM crops: 2008 ISAAA Brief No 39
- Jasa P (2002) Conservation Tillage Systems, Extension Engineer, University of Nebraska
- Johnson et al (2005) Greenhouse gas contributions and mitigation potential of agriculture in the central USA. *Soil Tillage Research* 83 (2005) 73-94
- Johnson S & Strom S (2008) Quantification of the impacts on US agriculture of biotechnology-derived crops planted in 2006, NCFAP, Washington. [www.ncfap.org](http://www.ncfap.org)
- Jon-Joseph Q et al (2010) Weed management in wide-and narrow-row glyphosate resistant sugar beet, *Weed Technology* 2010, 24: 523-528
- Khan M (2008) Roundup Ready sugar beet in America. *British Sugar Beet Review* Winter 2008 vol 76, no 4, p16-19
- Kirsten J et al (2002) Bt cotton in South Africa: adoption and the impact on farm incomes amongst small-scale and large-scale farmers, ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy 2002
- Kleiter G et al (2005) The effect of the cultivation of GM crops on the use of pesticides and the impact thereof on the environment, RIKILT, Institute of Food Safety, Wageningen, Netherlands
- Kniss A (2009) Farm scale analysis of glyphosate resistant sugar beet in the year of commercial introduction in Wyoming, University of Wyoming
- Kovach, J. C. Petzoldt, J. Degni and J. Tette (1992). A method to measure the environmental impact of pesticides. *New York's Food and Life Sciences Bulletin*. NYS Agricul. Exp. Sta. Cornell

- University, Geneva, NY, 139. 8 pp. Annually updated  
<http://www.nysipm.cornell.edu/publications/EIQ.html>
- Lal et al (1998) The Potential for US Cropland to sequester Carbon and Mitigate the Greenhouse Effect. Ann Arbor Press, Chelsea. MI.
- Lal et al (1999) Managing US Crop Land to sequester carbon in soil. Journal of Soil Water Conservation, Vol 54: 374-81
- Lal R (2004). Soil Carbon Sequestration Impacts on Global Climate Change and Food Security. Science. 304: 5677: 1623-1627.
- Lal R. (2005). Enhancing Crop Yields in the Developing Countries through Restoration of the Soil Organic Carbon Pool in Agricultural Lands. Land Degradation and Development. 17: 2: 197-209.
- Lal R (2009) Agriculture and climate change: an agenda for negotiation in Copenhagen for food, agriculture, and the environment the potential for soil carbon sequestration  
 Focus 16, Brief 5, May 2009
- Lal R. (2010). Beyond Copenhagen: mitigating climate change and achieving food security through soil carbon sequestration, Food Security, 2 (2) 169-177
- Lazarus W F (2011) Machinery Cost Estimates May 2011, University of Minnesota Extension Service
- Lazarus & Selley (2005) Farm Machinery Economic Cost Estimates for 2005, University of Minnesota Extension Service
- Leibig et al (2005) Greenhouse gas contributions and mitigation potential of agriculture practices in northwestern USA and western Canada. Soil Tillage Research 83 (2005) 25-52
- Manjunath T (2008) Bt cotton in India: remarkable adoption and benefits, Foundation for Biotech Awareness and Education, India. [www.fbae.org](http://www.fbae.org)
- Marra M, Pardey P & Alston J (2002) The pay-offs of agricultural biotechnology: an assessment of the evidence, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, USA
- Marra M & Piggott N (2006) The value of non pecuniary characteristics of crop biotechnologies: a new look at the evidence, North Carolina State University
- Marra M & Piggott N (2007) The net gains to cotton farmers of a national refuge plan for Bollgard II cotton, Agbioforum 10, 1, 1-10. [www.agbioforum.org](http://www.agbioforum.org)
- Martinez-Carillo J & Diaz-Lopez N (2005) Nine years of transgenic cotton in Mexico: adoption and resistance management, Proceedings Beltwide Cotton Conference, Memphis, USA, June 2005
- McClelland et al (2000) Rou, Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station
- McConkey et al (2007). Canadian Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Monitoring Accounting and Reporting System: Methodology and greenhouse gas estimates for agricultural land in the LULUCF sector for NIR, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa, Ontario
- Mendez K et al (2011) Production cost analysis and use of pesticides in the transgenic and conventional crop in the valley of San Juan (Colombia), GM Crops, vol 2, issue 3, June-Dec 2011, pp 163-168
- Monsanto Comercial Mexico (2012) Official report to Mexican Ministry of Agriculture of the 2011 cotton crop, unpublished
- Monsanto Comercial Mexico (2009) Official report to Mexican Ministry of Agriculture of the 2009 cotton crop, unpublished
- Monsanto Comercial Mexico (2008) Official report to Mexican Ministry of Agriculture of the 2008 cotton crop, unpublished
- Monsanto Comercial Mexico (2007) Official report to Mexican Ministry of Agriculture of the 2007 cotton crop, unpublished
- Monsanto Comercial Mexico (2005) Official report to Mexican Ministry of Agriculture of the 2005 cotton crop, unpublished

- Monsanto Brazil (2008) Farm survey of conventional and Bt cotton growers in Brazil 2007, unpublished
- Monsanto Comercial Mexico (2008) Official report to Mexican Ministry of Agriculture of the 2008 cotton crop, unpublished
- Monsanto Australia (2009) Survey of herbicide tolerant canola licence holders 2008
- Monsanto Romania (2007) Roundup Ready soybeans: Survey growers crops in 2006 and intentions for 2007
- Morse S et al (2004) Why Bt cotton pays for small-scale producers in South Africa, *Nature Biotechnology* 22 (4) 379-380
- Moschini G, Lapan H & Sobolevsky A (2000) Roundup ready soybeans and welfare effects in the soybean complex, Iowa State University, *Agribusiness* vol 16: 33-55
- Mullins W & Hudson J (2004) Bollgard II versus Bollgard sister line economic comparisons, 2004 Beltwide cotton conferences, San Antonio, USA, Jan 2004
- Nazli H et al (2010) Economic performance of Bt cotton varieties in Pakistan. Conference paper at the Agricultural and Applied Economics Association 2010 AAEA, CAES and WACA Joint Annual Meeting, Denver, USA
- Omonode *et al* (2011) Soil Nitrous Oxide emissions in Corn following three decades of tillage and rotation, *Soil Fertility & Plant Nutrition*, 75 (1) 152-163, January-February 2011
- Parana Department of Agriculture (2004) Cost of production comparison: biotech and conventional soybeans, in USDA GAIN report BR4629 of 11 November 2004.  
[www.fas.usad.gov/gainfiles/200411/146118108.pdf](http://www.fas.usad.gov/gainfiles/200411/146118108.pdf)
- PG Economics (2003) Consultancy support for the analysis of the impact of GM crops on UK farm profitability, [www.pgeconomics.co.uk](http://www.pgeconomics.co.uk)
- Plataforma Plantio Direto, Sistema Plantation Direto 2006,  
<http://www.embrapa.br/imprensa/noticias/2001/abril/bn.2004-11-25.3947240961/>, accessed on 22 November 2011
- Pray C et al (2001) Impact of Bt cotton in China, *World Development*, 29(5) 1-34
- Pray C et al (2002) Five years of Bt cotton in China – the benefits continue, *The Plant Journal* 2002, 31 (4) 423-430
- Phipps R & Park J (2001) Environmental benefits of GM crops: global & European perspectives on their ability to reduce pesticide use, *Journal of Animal Sciences*, 11, 2002, 1-18
- Qaim M & De Janvry A (2002) Bt cotton in Argentina: analysing adoption and farmers willingness to pay, American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, California,
- Qaim M & De Janvry A (2005) Bt cotton and pesticide use in Argentina: economic and environmental effects, *Environment and Development Economics* 10: 179-200
- Qaim M & Traxler G (2002) Roundup Ready soybeans in Argentina: farm level, environmental and welfare effects, 6<sup>th</sup> ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy
- Qaim M & Traxler G (2005) Roundup Ready soybeans in Argentina: farm level & aggregate welfare effects, *Agricultural Economics* 32 (1) 73-86
- Qaim M & Matuschke J (2006) Impact of GM crops in developing countries: a survey, *Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture* 44 (3) 207-227
- Rao C and Dev M (2009) Biotechnology and pro-poor agricultural development, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44 (52): 56-64
- Ramon G (2005) Acceptability survey on the 80-20 bag in a bag insect resistance management strategy for Bt corn, Biotechnology Coalition of the Philippines (BCP)
- Reeder R (2010) No-till benefits add up with diesel fuel savings  
<http://www.thelandonline.com/currentedition/x1897235554/No-till-benefits-add-up-with-diesel-fuel-savings>



- Reicosky D C (1995) Conservation tillage and carbon cycling: soil as a source or sink for carbon. University of Davis
- Rice M (2004) Transgenic rootworm corn: assessing potential agronomic, economic and environmental benefits, *Plant Health Progress* 10, `094/php-2001-0301-01-RV
- Riesgo L et al (2012) How can specific market demand for non GM maize affect the profitability of Bt and conventional maize? A case study for the middle Ebro Valley, Spain. *Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research* 2012, 10 (4) 867-876
- Robertson et al (2000) Greenhouse Gases in Intensive Agriculture: Contributions of Individual Gases to the Radioactive Forces of the Atmosphere. *Science* Vol 289 September 15 2000 1922-1925
- Rocha P and Villalobos V (2012) Estudio comparativo entre el cultivo de soja genéticamente modificada y el convencional en Argentina, Brasil, Paraguay y Uruguay, Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Pesca de Argentina
- Runge Ford C & Ryan B (2004) The global diffusion of plant biotechnology: international adoption and research in 2004, University of Minnesota, USA
- Sankala S & Blumenthal E (2003) Impacts on US agriculture of biotechnology-derived crops planted in 2003- an update of eleven case studies, NCFAP, Washington. [www.ncfap.org](http://www.ncfap.org)
- Sankala S & Blumenthal E (2006) Impacts on US agriculture of biotechnology-derived crops planted in 2005- an update of eleven case studies, NCFAP, Washington. [www.ncfap.org](http://www.ncfap.org)
- Sexstone et al (1985) Temporal response of soil denitrification rates to rainfall and irrigation. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 49: 99-103.
- Smyth S & Gusta M (2008) Environmental benefits from GM HT canola production, 12<sup>th</sup> International ICABR conference on biotechnology, Ravello, Italy, June 2008
- Smyth *et al* (2011) Environmental impacts from herbicide tolerant canola production in Western Canada, *Agricultural Systems*, 104 (5) 403-410, June 2011
- Smyth *et al* (2010) Assessing the economic and ecological impacts of herbicide tolerant canola in Western Canada, <http://www.canolacouncil.org/uploads/Assessing%20the%20Economic%20and%20Ecological%20Impacts%20of%20Herbicide%20Tolerant%20Canola%20in%20Western%20Canada.pdf>, accessed on 22 November 2011
- Stachler J et al (2012) Survey of weed control and production practices on sugar beet in Minnesota and Eastern North Dakota in 2011, North Dakota State University, [www.sbreb.org/research/weed11/](http://www.sbreb.org/research/weed11/)
- Steinbach H S & Alvarez R (2006) Changes in Soil Organic Carbon Contents and Nitrous Oxide Emissions after the Introduction of No-Till in Pampean Agroecosystems. *Journal Environmental Qual* 35:3-13
- Taylor I (2003) Cotton CRC annual report, UNE, Armidale, Cotton Research Institute, Narrabri, Australia
- Traxler G et al (2001) Transgenic cotton in Mexico: economic and environmental impacts, ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy
- Trigo et al (2002) Genetically Modified Crops in Argentina agriculture: an opened story. *Libros del Zorzal*, Buenos Aires, Argentina
- Trigo E & Cap E (2006) Ten years of GM crops in Argentine Agriculture, ArgenBio
- Trigo E (2011) Fifteen years of GM crops in Argentine Agriculture, Argenbio
- University of Illinois (2006) Costs and fuel use for alternative tillage systems. [www.farmdoc.uiuc.edu/manage/newsletters/fefo06\\_07/fefo06\\_07.html](http://www.farmdoc.uiuc.edu/manage/newsletters/fefo06_07/fefo06_07.html)
- USDA (1999) Farm level effects of adopting genetically engineered crops, preliminary evidence from the US experience, *Economic issues in agricultural biotechnology*

USDA (1999) Farm level effects of adopting genetically engineered crops, preliminary evidence from the US experience, Economic Issues in Agricultural Biotechnology

USDA - The Voluntary Reporting of Greenhouse Gases-CarbOn Management Evaluation Tool (COMET-VR )

<http://www.cometvr.colostate.edu/>

USDA Energy Estimator: tillage. 2011 <http://ecat.sc.egov.usda.gov> .

USDA (2011) New technologies aiding Burmese cotton farmers, GAIN report BM 0025 of 14<sup>th</sup> January 2011

Van der Weld W (2009) Final report on the adoption of GM maize in South Africa for the 2008/09 season, South African Maize Trust

Vendrametto L P and Bonilla S H (2009) Contribuições da Contabilidade Ambiental em Energia para a Compreensão do Sistema de Produção da Soja na Perspectiva da Agricultura Sustentável (Contributions of Environmental Accounting in Energy for Understanding the Soybean Production System in the Perspective of a Sustainable Agriculture). International Workshop Advances in Cleaner Production. Key Elements for a Sustainable World, Energy, Water and Climate Change. São Paulo – Brazil – May 20th-22nd – 2009. Available at: <http://www.advancesincleanerproduction.net/second/files/sessoes/6a/3/L.%20P.%20Vendrametto%20-%20Resumo%20Exp.pdf>

Vitale, J et al (2006) The Bollgard II Field Trials in Burkina Faso: Measuring How Bt Cotton Benefits West African Farmers. Paper presented at the 10<sup>th</sup> ICABR Conference, Ravello, Italy

Vitale J et al (2008) The economic impact of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Bt cotton in West Africa: empirical evidence from Burkina Faso, International Journal of Biotechnology vol 10, 2/3 p 167-183

West T.O. and Post W.M. (2002) Soil Organic Carbon Sequestration Rates by Tillage and Crop Rotation: A Global Analysis. Soil Science Society of American Journal. Vol 66 November/December: 930-1046

Wu K et al (2008) Suppression of cotton bollworm in multiple crops in China in areas with Bt toxin containing cotton, Science 321, 1676-1678

Yorobe J (2004) Economics impact of Bt corn in the Philippines. Paper presented to the 45<sup>th</sup> PAEDA Convention, Querzon City

Zambrano P et al (2009) Insect resistant cotton in Colombia: impact on farmers, paper presented to the 13<sup>th</sup> ICABR conference, Ravello, Italy, June 2009