

The By-product Is the Target

Europe's 2026 Gene-Editing Framework, Low-Glycoalkaloid Potatoes and the Missing Bridge from Crop Status to Ingredient-Grade Evidence

José M. López · Research Director.

ABSTRACT

Europe's Regulation (EU) 2026/1388 creates a future pathway for certain genome-edited plants, but its central distinction between category 1 and category 2 does not establish the technological fitness or safety of every ingredient extracted from those plants. A 2026 study of CRISPR-edited starch potatoes offers a revealing industrial case: **reducing steroidal glycoalkaloid biosynthesis can lower these natural toxicants in both tubers and protein** and fibre-rich processing side-streams. Yet the same experiments also expose agronomic trade-offs, altered sterol metabolism and the need for fraction-specific verification. This article connects the new European framework with toxicology, protein recovery, circular processing, analytical traceability, patents and diverging UK and US rules. It argues that breeding should increasingly be evaluated against the specification of the ingredient ultimately produced, without mistaking legal genomic equivalence for product-level evidence. A proposed Trait-to-Fraction Evidence Passport provides a testable research architecture for linking plant genetics, industrial fractionation, exposure and market-specific compliance.

KEYWORDS: *New genomic techniques; glycoalkaloids; potato protein; food-grade co-products; CRISPR; regulatory equivalence; ingredient traceability; circular bioprocessing*

CATEGORY: Biotechnology | Food Ingredients & Additives | Regulatory Affairs

SEO SLUG: gene-edited-potatoes-ingredient-safety-ngt-eu-2026

META DESCRIPTION: EU gene-editing rules could unlock safer potato proteins and fibres, but ingredient safety requires evidence beyond crop status and reduced glycoalkaloids.

INTERNAL TAGS: New Genomic Techniques; Potato Protein; Glycoalkaloids; Circular Ingredients; Food Safety; EU Food Law; Gene Editing; Traceability

1 | The regulatory event and the industrial question

On 17 June 2026, the European Parliament and Council adopted Regulation (EU) 2026/1388 on plants obtained by certain new genomic techniques (NGTs) and their products. The Regulation entered into force on 16 July 2026 but, crucially, its principal market pathways do not apply until 17 July 2028. Until that date, the existing European genetically modified organism (GMO) regime continues to govern relevant NGT plants and their food and feed. The distinction between entry into force and application is essential: publication of a new legal route is not a present authorisation to sell a particular edited crop. [1–3]

The Commission has already begun preparing the delegated and implementing measures required for operation of the regime. Its 31 August 2026 call for evidence closed on 28 September, and an implementation conference is scheduled for 3 December 2026. The timing makes October 2026 a useful moment for ingredient businesses to reconsider what they should ask of breeders before the first new-route applications are received. [2,3]

The more interesting industrial question is not whether genome editing can generate a legally acceptable plant. It is whether a modified crop can reliably generate a better, safer and more useful ingredient fraction at commercial scale. This distinction is especially important when the value is not in the harvested tuber or grain alone but in a protein, fibre, starch, oil or other fraction recovered from processing side-streams.

2 | Why the starch-potato case deserves attention

A research article first published online in October 2025 and appearing in the 2026 volume of *Plant Biotechnology Journal* investigated DNA-free CRISPR/Cas9 editing of glycoalkaloid-biosynthesis genes in the starch potato cultivar ‘Kuras’. The investigators targeted six genes in pathways operating before or after cholesterol formation. They screened edited events, grew selected plants under greenhouse and field conditions, and analysed not only tubers but also protein- and fibre-rich fractions arising during starch processing. [6]

The practical result is striking but must be described precisely. Several edited lines exhibited very low steroidal glycoalkaloid concentrations in tubers, and selected protein and fibre fractions from the processing side-streams also had substantially reduced concentrations. This suggests a route to greater valorisation of materials that otherwise require intensive purification or face restricted food/feed applications. It does not establish that all such fractions are already commercial food-grade ingredients, nor that the edited cultivar is authorised under the future EU NGT procedure. [6]

The research therefore offers a stronger thesis than a generic claim that gene editing improves crop quality: the target of breeding can be a downstream manufacturing fraction whose risk profile, yield and functionality determine whether circularity is economically real.

3 | Glycoalkaloids are a real hazard, not merely a marketing defect

Potatoes naturally contain steroidal glycoalkaloids, predominantly **α-solanine** and **α-chaconine**. Concentrations depend on cultivar, tissue, light exposure, mechanical damage, sprouting and storage. Their acute toxicity is established, and gastrointestinal effects are among the relevant human outcomes. In its 2020 assessment, EFSA identified a lowest-observed-adverse-effect level of 1 mg total potato glycoalkaloids per kilogram body weight per day for acute risk characterisation. That is a toxicological reference point, not an authorised ingredient specification. [7]

A frequently cited benchmark of 200 mg/kg refers to total glycoalkaloids in raw, unpeeled potato tubers. It should not be casually converted into a harmonised EU legal maximum for potato protein isolates, dry fibres or all potato-derived foods. The 2020 EFSA opinion documented differing national practices and the absence, at that time, of an EU-wide maximum for glycoalkaloids. Product-specific safety decisions require current national and EU checks, exposure assessment and analytical evidence. [7]

This is why processing side-streams matter. Glycoalkaloids can associate with protein - and fibre-containing fractions. A concentration acceptable in a raw tuber on a fresh-weight basis cannot simply be transferred to a concentrated protein powder on a dry-weight basis. The denominator, concentration factor, intended portion size and consumer population all change.

4 | What the edited-potato experiments establish and what they do not

The researchers reported editing efficiencies of approximately 20-49% across targeted genes and detected mutations in 497 of 1,435 regenerated shoots. Among 39 low-glycoalkaloid events selected for greenhouse growth evaluation, some exhibited substantially reduced plant height or tuber yield; other events retained more normal growth and production. The authors found changes in sterol metabolism, which are mechanistically plausible when genes near sterol pathways are modified. [6]

The important scientific finding is not simply that a targeted edit reduced an unwanted metabolite. It is that different edited events combined the desired chemical outcome with different agronomic and metabolic outcomes. Selection must therefore account for the whole phenotype: yield, storage, starch content, metabolite redistribution, field stability and industrial recoverability. A low-glycoalkaloid laboratory result is necessary for this application, but it is not sufficient. [6]

Moreover, the authors' comparison with recommended upper levels for protein and fibre fractions is an application-oriented benchmark. It is not a regulatory approval, a clinical safety trial or proof that extraction plants can abandon all purification controls. Claims of complete elimination should be avoided when methods have finite limits of detection and quantification.

5 | The hidden unit of assessment: the industrial fraction

A breeding programme traditionally optimises traits measured at plant level: disease resistance, yield, maturity, drought response or raw-material composition. Ingredient manufacturing adds another unit of assessment: the recovered fraction. In potato processing, starch, fruit juice, pulp, protein concentrate and dietary fibre can each exhibit different partitioning of natural toxicants, proteins, phenolics and minerals. [6,7]

An apparently favourable edit can therefore produce four different answers. The tuber may have a lower glycoalkaloid burden, the protein fraction may or may not retain native functionality, the fibre fraction may or may not meet a defensible contaminant specification and the extraction line may or may not achieve higher economic recovery after accounting for yield and energy. These questions cannot be answered by sequencing alone.

The appropriate analytical object is a paired set of genotype, agronomic lot, process history and finished fraction. A research dossier that stops at a plant-level metabolite result is incomplete for ingredient development, even where it may be adequate for a narrower scientific hypothesis.

6 | A mass-balance perspective on source reduction

A simple mass balance clarifies the opportunity. Let M_0 denote total glycoalkaloid mass entering a plant with the raw tubers, and let f_i represent the fraction of that mass distributed into product stream i . The contaminant concentration in that stream is $C_i = (M_0 \times f_i) / m_i$, where m_i is the stream mass. The equation is descriptive: the partition coefficient f_i and the stream mass must be measured under real process conditions.

Reducing M_0 by breeding could lower the load confronting downstream purification. But it does not guarantee a proportional reduction in C_i if processing yield, tissue distribution or binding behaviour also changes. Conversely, a low contaminant level in a protein stream may reflect a lower source burden, selective partitioning, more effective removal, dilution or a combination of these. Causal attribution requires controls.

The industrial hypothesis is that source reduction and gentle purification can be complementary rather than competing strategies. A lower upstream burden may permit less aggressive processing and better retention of protein solubility, foaming, emulsification or gelation. That is plausible, not yet a universal finding for the edited lines investigated. It must be tested using matched process conditions and independently replicated material.

7 | Protein quality is a separate scientific claim

Potato proteins are attractive because of their amino-acid profile and potential functionality, but composition is only one dimension of ingredient quality. A commercial protein dossier must establish protein content and true-protein basis, amino-acid composition, digestibility where relevant, solubility across pH, thermal behaviour, emulsifying and foaming properties, microbiological status, residual glycoalkaloids, residual phenolics and shelf-life stability.

Lowering a toxicant in the plant does not demonstrate that an isolate retains native protein structure after industrial recovery. Acid precipitation, heating, membrane processing and drying may have different effects on performance. A

food-grade protein intended for beverages, meat analogues or bakery systems will face different acceptance criteria. The correct target specification must be derived from the intended use, not from the edit itself.

Nor should a reduction in one endogenous toxin be equated with a comprehensive allergenicity assessment. Potato protein allergy is less prominent than some major allergens but cannot be assumed absent in every context. Changes in composition, processing and exposure should be assessed according to the actual food and applicable regulatory framework.

8 | Fibre and the circularity test

Potato pulp contains cell-wall polysaccharides with potential value in fibre ingredients, but the term ‘fibre’ does not settle compositional identity, physiological function or regulatory status. A recovered fibre may differ in soluble/insoluble distribution, pectin content, particle size, water binding, fermentability and contaminant profile. Those properties determine both product functionality and the evidence needed for a defensible claim.

Circularity should be evaluated on a net basis. If a modified crop yields a cleaner side-stream but reduces tuber productivity, requires more inputs or performs poorly during storage, the total environmental and economic balance may be ambiguous. The potato study reports both promising low-glycoalkaloid events and growth/yield penalties in some lines; it therefore supports prospective life-cycle and techno-economic evaluation rather than an automatic sustainability claim. [6]

A meaningful assessment should use a declared functional unit -such as kilograms of specification-compliant protein recovered per hectare or per ton of tubers- and account for starch co-production, waste treatment, energy, water, processing losses and possible feed displacement.

9 | Category 1 is a legal verification, not an ingredient certificate

Regulation (EU) 2026/1388 establishes two categories for plants obtained by targeted mutagenesis or cisgenesis. Category 1 status requires compliance with the equivalence criteria in Annex I and the absence of specified excluded traits, notably herbicide tolerance and production of a known insecticidal substance conveyed by the genetic modification. Category 1 status is verified through the prescribed procedure; it is not self-declared merely because an edit is small or transgene-free. [1,3]

Once verified under the new regime, category 1 plants and their products are treated similarly to conventional plants for the relevant GMO-law purposes, while remaining subject to the ordinary body of food, feed, seed and other product legislation. Category 2 plants remain within the GMO framework with tailored adaptations, including authorisation, risk assessment, traceability and labelling. [1,3]

Neither route answers whether a specific potato protein isolate is microbiologically controlled, nutritionally adequate, functional in a beverage or low enough in glycoalkaloids for its intended exposure. Equivalence in a defined genomic regulatory sense is not equivalent to technological interchangeability, compositional identity or a blanket exemption from general food-law obligations.

10 | A crucial boundary: the new law does not cover precision-fermented microbes

The 2026 NGT Regulation is limited to certain techniques applied to plants and their derived food and feed. It does not establish a new market pathway for genome-edited production microorganisms, cultivated animal cells or transgenic plants involving genetic material from non-crossable species. These remain governed by their respective existing legal frameworks. [2,3]

This boundary is strategically relevant to biotechnology businesses with both plant-ingredient and fermentation interests. It would be a regulatory category error to cite Regulation (EU) 2026/1388 as authority for a genetically modified microbial production strain used to make an enzyme or precision-fermented protein. Product identity, organism status, processing history and the applicable authorisation pathway must be determined independently.

11 | The October 2026 implementation window

The Regulation was published in June 2026 and entered into force in July, but the principal procedures become applicable on 17 July 2028. The Commission’s 2026 implementation programme anticipates delegated and implementing acts, technical guidance, databases and administrative arrangements. EFSA identifies 30 September

2027 and 30 November 2027 as milestones for the supporting delegated and implementing acts respectively, with scientific and administrative guidance due by 17 July 2028. [2–4]

Accordingly, a developer should not treat a 2026 concept dossier as if every technical requirement for a 2028 verification had already been fixed. The sound approach is to build a modular evidence package with dated legal assumptions, version-controlled molecular information and robust analytical characterisation, then update it as binding implementing rules and guidance appear.

The 3 December 2026 Commission conference is a concrete forthcoming forum for implementation questions. It is not itself an authorisation event, nor evidence that any particular edited potato line will qualify as category 1. [2]

12 | Food safety survives deregulation of a breeding route

In the EU, Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 places general obligations on food business operators not to place unsafe food on the market and to maintain traceability. Rules on food information, contaminants, hygiene and any applicable specific product regimes remain relevant. A simplified plant-status route cannot be used to bypass those obligations. [1,15,16]

For an ingredient made from an edited potato, the safety case should include an exposure model for glycoalkaloids in the actual dry or reconstituted ingredient; the effect of the ingredient on the whole finished food; representative sampling across lots and storage conditions; analytical recovery and uncertainty; and a hazard review extending beyond the targeted metabolite.

The key distinction is between the public-law permission to use a plant under a specified genetic framework and the operator's continuing responsibility for the safety of the actual food placed on the market. Neither one logically replaces the other.

13 | Analytical traceability: the limit of a DNA-only strategy

A 2023 report by the European Network of GMO Laboratories concluded that analytical testing is not feasible for every plant product obtained through targeted mutagenesis and cisgenesis, for both technical and implementation reasons. A sequence variant that also occurs naturally or through conventional breeding may not identify the breeding process that generated it. Furthermore, industrial fractionation can reduce or remove recoverable DNA. [8]

This does not imply that genome sequencing is useless. It means that an end-product assay may not answer the provenance question, especially in refined starches, oils, purified proteins or highly processed fractions. A defensible chain-of-custody system may need seed/variety information, breeder declarations, verification status, lot genealogy, mass-balance reconciliation and targeted analytical tests where feasible.

The new EU framework makes this distinction particularly salient. Category 1 seeds and other reproductive material are to be labelled NGT-1, while category 1 foods are not generally subject to GMO labelling. Public databases and variety catalogues provide transparency at earlier supply-chain stages. Organic production excludes NGT plants, although the Regulation treats adventitious or technically unavoidable category 1 presence differently from intentional use. [1,3]

14 | The low-gluten wheat warning: trait language can outrun evidence

The Commission's Joint Research Centre has already examined the socioeconomic potential of gene-edited low-gluten wheat. The case illustrates the possibility of designing crops for a specific food-processing or nutritional purpose, but also the danger of compressing distinct endpoints into a single product description. Reduced gluten content is not automatically equivalent to clinical suitability for coeliac disease, and analytical characterisation must address relevant immunogenic epitopes and exposure. [9]

The same reasoning applies to potato co-products. 'Low glycoalkaloid' is a quantitative analytical statement tied to a method and matrix; 'food-grade protein' is a much broader specification and compliance statement. A useful innovation dossier should preserve the chain of inference rather than collapsing both into one marketing claim.

15 | Great Britain: a different, already operational route

England's Genetic Technology (Precision Breeding) Regulations 2025 entered into force on 13 November 2025. The Food Standards Agency's guidance, updated on 4 September 2026, describes a process involving Defra confirmation and

food/feed marketing authorisation, with Tier 1 and Tier 2 safety routes differentiated by the nature of the characteristics and potential risks. A crop being genome edited does not alone confer marketing permission. [11,12]

The territorial position within the United Kingdom is not uniform. The English framework applies to England. The FSA explains that UK Internal Market Act market-access principles can permit certain England-authorised foods to be sold in Wales and Scotland, but they do not automatically cover further processing there; Northern Ireland has distinct arrangements, including the Northern Ireland Retail Movement Scheme for eligible goods. A processor cannot simply write 'UK approved' in a dossier without mapping destination and operations. [11]

For an ingredient manufacturer, this creates a concrete design problem: a protein isolate made by processing an English-authorised precision-bred crop in England may require a different analysis from a fraction manufactured or further processed in Wales or Scotland and then placed on the market.

16 | United States: the overlooked APHIS reversal

In the United States, the FDA's February 2024 guidance applies a risk-based food-safety approach to foods from genome-edited plants and describes voluntary premarket meetings and consultations. Those interactions do not relieve developers and manufacturers of their underlying duty to market safe, lawful food. [13]

An especially important regulatory correction concerns the USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). The widely cited 2020 SECURE rule was vacated by a federal district court on 2 December 2024. APHIS states that it resumed the earlier permitting, notification and petition processes during 2025; certain earlier determinations remain valid. It is therefore misleading in October 2026 to describe the vacated 2020 rule as the currently controlling general pathway without qualification. [14]

US oversight involves distinct agencies and legal questions. APHIS plant-pest jurisdiction and FDA food-safety responsibilities are not the same decision. A US supply dossier should record the applicable APHIS status, the food-safety evaluation and any relevant labelling or other obligations rather than assume that a favourable result from one authority resolves all issues.

17 | Patents show that purification is not an empty innovation space

Public patent disclosure WO2021260039A2 describes separation of potato proteins and insoluble fibres from phenolic and/or glycoalkaloid compounds using cross-flow membrane filtration and diafiltration. Related disclosures concern native potato protein isolation and contaminant reduction. The existence of these disclosures establishes that glycoalkaloid removal and potato protein recovery were active technical subjects before the recent edited-starch-potato research. [17]

Accordingly, the proposition that reducing upstream glycoalkaloids could complement downstream processing is a plausible development strategy, not proof of a new patentable invention. Freedom to operate depends on claims, jurisdictions, prosecution histories, expiry, licences and the specific process or biological material used. Publication numbers are evidence of prior disclosure, not automatic evidence of current enforceable rights.

The new EU NGT Regulation adds patent-transparency and access-related provisions, including work on a code of conduct and monitoring of effects on breeders and farmers. These provisions do not remove the need for independent patent and plant-variety-rights due diligence for ingredient manufacturers. [1,3]

18 | Industrial implementation: five linked dossiers

A credible programme should maintain five linked but separately reviewable dossiers. The genetic dossier records the edited line, target changes, molecular characterisation, breeding history, verification or authorisation status and any relevant intellectual-property constraints. The agronomic dossier covers field yield, disease response, storage, stability across sites and seasons, and material variability.

The process dossier records raw-material inputs, extraction sequence, mass balance, yields, membrane or precipitation performance, water and energy requirements, cleaning, microbiological controls and scale-up behaviour. The ingredient dossier contains identity, purity, glycoalkaloid assay, residual phenolics, protein or fibre composition, functional properties, contaminants, microbiology, shelf life and intended use. The legal dossier maps EU/Spain, England, Scotland/Wales, Northern Ireland and US requirements to a dated version of the actual product.

The dossiers should be cross-linked by unique identifiers, but not merged into an unstructured collection of PDFs. An industrial claim should be traceable to the particular line, harvest lot, manufacturing batch, analytical method and jurisdiction on which it depends.

19 | Research & Innovation Opportunity

UNRESOLVED PROBLEM. Plant-genome verification, agronomic performance, fractionation engineering, contaminant analysis and market authorisation are often evaluated in separate workflows. This separation can conceal whether a genetically attractive line is actually a superior ingredient feedstock after industrial processing.

WHY IT MATTERS. Potato protein and fibre side-streams are candidates for higher-value uses, but glycoalkaloids, functional damage during purification, batch variability and jurisdictional uncertainty can prevent commercial translation. A reliable evidence bridge could improve project selection before expensive scale-up.

WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN. EFSA has characterised glycoalkaloid hazards; edited starch-potato lines with low glycoalkaloid fractions have been reported; membrane-based removal methods are publicly disclosed; and the EU has established a future two-category legal framework for certain NGT plants. These elements are not inventions of this article. [1,6–8,17]

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN. There is no validated, generally transferable prediction that a specified gene edit will yield a particular contaminant concentration, functional protein profile, processing cost and legal outcome across varieties, sites, seasons and plants. The commercial value of combining these data streams has not been established prospectively.

PROPOSED HYPOTHESIS. A Trait-to-Fraction Evidence Passport (TFEP) -a version-controlled, auditable data model linking edit identity, agronomic phenotype, process mass balance, fraction composition, intended use and jurisdiction- could identify superior ingredient feedstocks more reliably than genotype-only or single-analyte screening.

DEVELOPMENT PATHWAY. Establish a common data dictionary and matched edited/control lines. Measure tuber composition and process partitioning across multiple harvests. Generate standardized protein and fibre fractions at pilot scale; quantify α -solanine, α -chaconine and relevant broader metabolites; characterise functionality and microbiology; calculate recovery-adjusted life-cycle and techno-economic outcomes; and connect these results to dated legal decisions.

KEY VALIDATION STEPS. Use blinded cross-site replication; validate LC-MS/MS or other fit-for-purpose methods in each fraction; test process-lot variability and storage stress; quantify prediction errors and false-negative safety flags; compare TFEP-guided selection with conventional expert selection; and publish negative as well as positive outcomes. Clinical or human nutrition claims require separate appropriate studies.

REGULATORY CONSTRAINTS. TFEP would be a research and decision-support concept, not an authorisation system. It cannot determine category 1 status in place of competent authorities, waive food-safety duties, establish patent freedom to operate or prove that an ingredient is suitable for a vulnerable population.

POTENTIAL INDUSTRIAL RELEVANCE. The initial application would be potato starch co-products, followed -only if validated- by other crops where endogenous antinutrients, processing losses or quality-limiting metabolites constrain ingredient recovery. A useful output would be a defensible go/no-go decision for breeding lines and fractionation routes.

20 | A practical experiment that could falsify the proposal

A strong research proposal must be capable of failing. A prospective experiment could compare three selection strategies: conventional agronomic screening, agronomic screening plus tuber glycoalkaloid measurements, and a full TFEP integrating field, process, fraction and legal data. The primary endpoint could be kilograms of specification-compliant, functionally acceptable potato protein per hectare, adjusted for extraction energy and raw-material losses.

Secondary endpoints would include the corresponding fibre yield, contaminant distribution, stability across sites and storage periods, analytical uncertainty, total process cost and predictive calibration. If the full passport fails to outperform simpler selection methods, its additional complexity would not be justified. If it succeeds, the gain must be quantified rather than assumed.

This design is an editorial research proposal. No experiment of this form is claimed to have been completed, and no proprietary formula or manufacturing parameter is disclosed.

21 | Implications for ingredient and biotechnology businesses

For suppliers of plant proteins, fibres, starches and functional ingredients, the strategic opportunity is to move upstream in product design. Instead of treating a crop as a fixed commodity and relying entirely on downstream purification, businesses can help define target fraction specifications before breeding and field validation begin.

For INTABIOTECH-relevant ingredient domains, the appropriate contribution is not a claim to own or have validated gene-edited potato technology. It is the development of scientifically rigorous specifications, hazard-informed analytical plans, formulation-performance criteria and cross-jurisdictional evidence structures that could support partners working on new feedstocks.

Commercial claims should remain proportionate to evidence. ‘Potentially lower purification burden’ is a defensible hypothesis when linked to reduced starting contaminant load. ‘Guaranteed food-grade protein with no purification’ would not be defensible without full analytical, processing, safety and legal substantiation.

22 | Evidence status, limits and editorial interpretation

ESTABLISHED EVIDENCE. Regulation (EU) 2026/1388 was adopted and entered into force in 2026, with the main framework applying from July 2028; the European Commission and EFSA have published implementation materials; potato glycoalkaloids present an established acute toxicological concern; and published research demonstrates low-glycoalkaloid edited starch-potato events and fractions. [1–7]

EMERGING EVIDENCE. Field and processing observations for edited potato lines suggest promising routes to higher-value protein and fibre fractions, but industrial robustness, long-term stability and generalisability remain to be demonstrated. The 2026 EFSA horizon scan did not identify new hazards outside those previously considered in its NGT opinions; that is not a blanket declaration that every future edited ingredient is safe. [5,6]

EXPERT INTERPRETATION. A crop-level regulatory classification is not an ingredient-level performance or safety specification. Ingredient businesses should connect breeding, toxicology, fractionation and legal assessment earlier in development.

HYPOTHESES. Source reduction may permit gentler purification and improved protein functionality; an integrated evidence passport may improve selection efficiency. Neither outcome has been established for all edited potato lines or commercial plants.

PROPOSED RESEARCH. TFEP and the prospective validation design are editorial R&D proposals, not an existing standard, certified product or asserted patentable invention.

23 | Conclusions: breed for the ingredient, validate the fraction

The 2026 European NGT framework creates a consequential future route for certain edited plants, but the most productive industrial interpretation is broader than a debate over genetic technique. Plant breeding can be directed at the quality and safety of downstream ingredient streams, potentially reducing barriers that purification alone has struggled to overcome.

The low-glycoalkaloid starch-potato study makes that proposition tangible. It also supplies the essential caution: altered metabolism, variable agronomic performance, processing behaviour and legal status cannot be reduced to a single favourable analyte result. The food industry should neither dismiss genome editing as irrelevant to ingredient technology nor assume that a verified genomic category settles all ingredient questions.

The durable principle is straightforward: the crop is the source, the fraction is the product, and the evidence must follow both.

Related Knowledge Areas

- Biotechnology - targeted mutagenesis, plant metabolic pathways and trait validation.
- Food Safety - endogenous toxicants, exposure assessment and fraction-specific analytical control.
- Functional Ingredients - plant proteins, fibres and ingredient performance specifications.
- Processing Technologies - extraction, membrane separation, process mass balance and functionality.
- Regulatory Affairs - EU/Spain, England, devolved UK nations, Northern Ireland and United States.
- Sustainability - co-product valorisation, life-cycle assessment and recovery-adjusted economics.

- Emerging Research - genotype-to-fraction evidence systems and prospective validation.

Editorial Scope & Evidence Note

This is an original scientific, legal and industrial analysis prepared from primary sources available by 15 October 2026. It is not an EFSA opinion, an official regulatory interpretation, a patent freedom-to-operate opinion, a claim that any named edited line is commercially authorised, or an endorsement of any specific product. Future legal instruments and guidance may change implementation details. Patent disclosures are cited as prior art, not as proof of current enforceability.

References and Primary Sources

- [1] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2026/1388 of 17 June 2026 on plants obtained by certain new genomic techniques and their products. OJ, 26 June 2026. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2026/1388/oj>
- [2] European Commission, DG SANTE. EU legislation on new genomic techniques for plants; implementation strategy, delegated/implementing acts and 3 December 2026 conference. https://food.ec.europa.eu/plants/new-genomic-techniques/legislation-plants_en
- [3] European Commission, DG SANTE. Questions and answers on the new EU rules on plants obtained by new genomic techniques. https://food.ec.europa.eu/plants/new-genomic-techniques/questions-and-answers_en
- [4] European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). New genomic techniques: regulatory framework and guidance timeline (reviewed 4 August 2026). <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/new-genomic-techniques>
- [5] EFSA et al. Literature horizon scan for new scientific data on plants, microorganisms and animals, and their products obtained by new genomic techniques (March 2026). EFSA Journal. 2026;24:e10230. DOI: 10.2903/j.efsa.2026.10230. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2026.10230>
- [6] Liu Y, Merino I, Gutensohn M, et al. Glycoalkaloid-Free Starch Potatoes Generated by CRISPR/Cas9-Mediated Mutations of Genes in the Glycoalkaloid Biosynthesis Pathway Enable More Sustainable Uses of By-Products From Starch Production. Plant Biotechnology Journal. 2026;24:1344–1358. First published 18 October 2025. DOI: 10.1111/pbi.70412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.70412>
- [7] EFSA CONTAM Panel. Risk assessment of glycoalkaloids in feed and food, in particular in potatoes and potato-derived products. EFSA Journal. 2020;18:e06222. DOI: 10.2903/j.efsa.2020.6222. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2020.6222>
- [8] European Network of GMO Laboratories (ENGL), Joint Research Centre. Detection of food and feed plant products obtained by targeted mutagenesis and cisgenesis. 2023. DOI: 10.2760/007925. <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC133689>
- [9] Sánchez Fernández B, Barro F, Smulders MJM, Gilissen LJWJ, Rodríguez Cerezo E. Socioeconomic impact of low-gluten celiac-safe wheat developed by gene editing. JRC technical report. 2023. DOI: 10.2760/280847. <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC131711>
- [10] EFSA GMO Panel. Statement on criteria for risk assessment of plants produced by targeted mutagenesis, cisgenesis and intragenesis. EFSA Journal. 2022;20:7618. DOI: 10.2903/j.efsa.2022.7618. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2022.7618>
- [11] UK Food Standards Agency. Precision bred organisms: application guidance. Published 25 February 2025; updated 4 September 2026. Applies to England. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/precision-bred-organisms-application-guidance>
- [12] UK Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs. Precision bred plants: releasing and marketing. Published 13 November 2025; updated 9 April 2026. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/precision-bred-plants-releasing-and-marketing>
- [13] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Foods Derived from Plants Produced Using Genome Editing. Final guidance, February 2024. <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/guidance-industry-foods-derived-plants-produced-using-genome-editing>
- [14] USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Court Vacatur of 2020 Biotechnology Regulations. Updated 13 January 2026. <https://www.aphis.usda.gov/vacatur-2020-regulations>
- [15] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2002/178/oj>
- [16] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2011/1169/oj>
- [17] WIPO. WO2021260039A2: Method for separation of potato proteins and insoluble fibers from phenolic and/or glycoalkaloid compounds. Published patent application, 2021/2022 family. <https://patents.google.com/patent/WO2021260039A2/en>
- [18] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 on genetically modified food and feed. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2003/1829/oj>
- [19] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EC) No 1830/2003 concerning traceability and labelling of genetically modified organisms and food and feed products produced from GMOs. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2003/1830/oj>

- [20] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2018/848 on organic production and labelling of organic products. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2018/848/oj>
- [21] Grbich M, Muñoz M, Zúñiga GE, et al. Transgene-Free Editing of PPO2 in Elite Potato Cultivar YAGANA for Reduced Postharvest Browning. *Agronomy*. 2026;16:216. DOI: 10.3390/agronomy16020216. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy16020216>

© 2026 José M. López · All rights reserved.