

Labeling GMOs not equivalent to nutritional labels, will be costly

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis.

In the fight over GMO labeling, one of the more egregiously inaccurate claims made by proponents is that the costs of mandatory labeling would be minimal. For example, Consumers Union, a product-testing and advocacy group, released an analysis last year claiming that the median cost of labeling would be \$2.30 per person per year, with a broad range of estimates, from \$0.32 to \$15.01.

But CU's analysis made the wrong assumptions. Changes in *nutritional* labeling do indeed incur a relatively small one-time cost—the expense of printing a new label on a package. But a “genetically modified” label is far more expensive, because crops would need to be kept segregated to ensure compliance.

Offering both genetically modified and certified GMO-free products requires food processors to operate separate production runs, which costs much more. Retailers' shelf space is limited, and they don't want to stock GM and non-GM versions of the same item.

Evidence from the European Union indicates that when food processors and retailers have been faced with these constraints they have typically avoided GM ingredients.

The result is that the majority of non-livestock-based foods in the EU are not derived from GM crops. Thus, the mandatory labeling requirement has delivered *less* rather than more choice.

A 2014 [analysis](#) from Cornell University predicted that labeling could raise the cost of food by \$800 annually for a family of four.

When all the relevant factors are taken into consideration, the price tag for mandatory labeling of GM ingredients in the United States is orders of magnitude higher than was suggested by the simplistic analysis by Consumers Union.

Read full, original post: [Don't Believe The Anti-GMO Activists: The Costs Of A 'Genetically Modified' Label Are Huge](#)