

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Fong Loke <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 1:52 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

I am most unhappy with genetically modified foods. Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants.

Gene editing techniques cause DNA double strand breaks and can be used sequentially to make dramatic differences to DNA. They are also prone to additional unexpected mutations. The risks associated with these techniques warrant pre-market safety assessment and approval.

Yours sincerely, Fong Loke McKinnon, Victoria, 3204, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Fong Loke via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Fong provided an email address (aliceloke6@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Fong Loke at aliceloke6@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Angela Ketas <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 4:00 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

Dear Consultation Paper People

Thank you for hearing my concerns.

I do not want to eat, nor do I want my children or grandchildren to eat GM food that has not been adequately tested for safety.

Even if the GM food has been tested to be safe, I believe the food labels should still disclose if ANY part of the food manufacturing process contains GM products so that I can make informed choices for myself and my family.

It is my humble suggestion that your inquiry be human focused, not money focused. If you put the lives of humans first over profit then you will be in a better position to make decisions that will sustain us all into the future.

Yours sincerely, Angela Ketas Lemon Tree Passage, New South Wales, 2319, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Angela Ketas via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Angela provided an email address (angela.ketas@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Angela Ketas at angela.ketas@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Pi Wei Lim <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 6:33 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

I am a farmer and I think that genetically modified organisms put all organisms at risk and we are dabbling in an area that we know very little about.

There is still so much to understand about nature before we start tampering with her very essence. We have shown ourselves to be such lousy stewards in the realms of what we do know about the environment we do not have the right to venture further into unknown territory.

Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants.

Nature is not a commodity for us to alter as we see fit for our short term market exigencies.

Yours sincerely, Pi Wei Lim Robertson, New South Wales, 2577, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Pi Wei Lim via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Pi Wei provided an email address (plim@people.net.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Pi Wei Lim at plim@people.net.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Trevor Anton <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 6:35 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

I have been following the GMO debate since 1996 and so for I have come to realise that the multinational have lied to us. They have even fooled the scientist. They have been no real testing of the safety of these foods and plants. In fact independent scientist has revealed that these foods and plants are damaging to our bodies and the environment. The safety of the scientific testing conducted on GMO has been based on a lie. If you want to now the history of how this untested foods came about you should read the book 'Altered Genes, Twisted Truth' by Steven M. Druker published by Clear River Press USA. Steven Druker is a public interest attorney who initiated a lawsuit that forced the US Foods and Drug Administration (FDA) to divulge its files on genetically engineered foods. The FDA own scientist recommended not to sell these foods in the shops because of possible dangers attached to these plants and foods.

So I am asking you the FSANS not to allow any more deregulate of a range of new genetic modification (GM) techniques in animals, plants and microbes. It is bad enough already.

- Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants.
- CRISPR was only invented 5 years ago . Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks (e.g. off target effects) posed by new GM techniques such as CRISPR. They recommended that products derived from these techniques require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments.
- Gene editing techniques cause DNA double strand breaks and can be used sequentially to make dramatic differences to DNA. They are also prone to additional unexpected mutations. The risks associated with these techniques warrant pre-market safety assessment and approval.
- RNA interference is a GM technique and can result in heritable genetic changes so must also be assessed for safety before being used in our food.
- GM plants, animals and microbes all pose unique risks so assessing the GM production process is appropriate

Yours sincerely, Trevor Anton

This email was sent by Trevor Anton via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Trevor provided an email address (tganton@aapt.net.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Trevor Anton at tganton@aapt.net.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Judith Fisk <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 6:39 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

I do not agree to Australia continuing down the track of genetically modified foods. This has seriously consequences for all of us

Yours sincerely, Judith Fisk

_____ This email was sent by Judith Fisk via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Judith provided an email address (rjmackeyre@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Judith Fisk at rjmackeyre@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Simic Gaaylawu <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 7:00 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

Australia needs to join the 30 countries across the globe that ban gm products completely.

Complete ban because there shouldn't have to exist a petition that requests labelling and safety tests. Labelling and safety tests should be a given. That such a request is needed shows the corruption inherent. If the product was safe (via independent non biased testing) and proven so, labelling would be a point of pride.

Additionally GM tech is unnecessary and redundant. Food exists in plentiful supply. Feeding people is a question of distribution not availability. Australia needs to follow UN recommendations that small scale biodynamic farming is the way to feed people.

Yours sincerely, Gaaylawu Simic

_____ This email was sent by Simic Gaaylawu via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Simic provided an email address (kirstykiloh@hotmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Simic Gaaylawu at kirstykiloh@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Alex Mijatovic <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 7:44 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

I do not support genetically modified organisms in any form including new breeding techniques. I demand full transparency and labelling for any and all versions in our foods and crops already and FULL regulation. It is your utmost duty of care to protect me and my child and other innocent citizens from this corruption and poisoning.

Yours sincerely, Alex Mijatovic Bedford, Western Australia, 6052, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Alex Mijatovic via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Alex provided an email address (Alexmijatovic@yahoo.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alex Mijatovic at Alexmijatovic@yahoo.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Paul Qualtrough <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 7:58 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

With as much force as I can respectfully muster, I URGE YOU to mandate labeling of ALL food products that include any ingredients which arise from “new breeding techniques”, or ANY similar laboratory-based gene-based technology.

I UTTERLY reject the notion that these technologies are safe in the food chain. I base my deep concern on two observations:

- certain scientists have been making bold, well-meaning, but flawed claims ever since they realised there were commercial gains to be made.
- commercial forces have been rushing half-baked ideas to market early for as long as anyone can remember, partly because they want to grab as much market share as possible as early as possible, and partly because they understand the market appeal of the latest bright shiny new thing. Case in point: why were these techniques called "new breeding techniques" rather than "artificial breeding techniques"? Both are true, but that latter carries a MANIPULATIVE marketing advantage.

Science and commerce are terrible bedfellows. The two of them brought the disasters of possums, stoats and weasels to my country (New Zealand), and cane toads to Australia. They brought us thalidomide, DDT and countless others. But even without commerce pushing it in directions it may not wish to go, science is still prone to disastrous failures to foresee unexpected consequences – Marie Curie died from radiation poisoning.

Does science know everything? OF COURSE NOT! And therefore ordinary people – the vast majority of whom are too busy in their lives to even know that they can submit an opinion on such matters, let alone to find the time to do so – RELY HEAVILY on regulatory bodies like yourselves TO PROTECT them from unexpected unforeseen consequences of technologies that commercially-motivated parties will swear black-and-blue are safe, are no different than anything already in use in the field, and so on.

As far as I'm concerned, you should TELL THESE PARTIES TO ELIMINATE CANE TOADS FIRST, and then reapply for release of their technologies. If they manage that, tell them to come to New Zealand and eliminate possums, stoats and weasels. I personally will not ever willingly consume as much as a microgram of any of these ingredients. And regardless of whether I am paranoid, highly informed, delusional or whatever, NONE OF MY MENTAL STATE OR ACUITY MATTERS IN THE SLIGHTEST – all that matters is that I, as an individual human being, should have the absolute right to know EXACTLY what I am putting in my body. No fudging, no prevarication, no covering up – if ever ingredients based on these technologies make their way into the food chain (whether for human or animal consumption) they MUST have clear labeling. Personally, I would also advocate for a mandatory 5-10 year program of actively seeking unintended health consequences.

My father-in-law died a painful death courtesy of asbestos – another of the results of science coupling with commerce, and one that took decades to appear. The company primarily responsible – James Hardy – skipped the country to avoid having to pay for the damage it caused. The ordinary people of our two countries rely on regulatory authorities like you to keep us safe from the James Hardies of this world. Please

do your job, and resist the pressure from those who dream up MANIPULATIVE twaddle like “new breeding techniques”.

A final thought: why is fresh produce labelled with (often infuriating) sticky labels? It's not solely to provide a code to assist the checkout operator. If that was the only purpose, all the labels would be identical except for the code. No: each producer wants to have their produce stand out from others. In short: when you have a product that you know people want, you WANT to label it.

So until these corporations want to label their laboratory-produced ingredients, you should should treat the lack of desire to label as an admission that the product is inferior and/or undesirable, and therefore keep those ingredients out of the food chain.

Yours sincerely, Paul Qualtrough

This email was sent by Paul Qualtrough via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Paul provided an email address (paulq@epco.co.nz) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Paul Qualtrough at paulq@epco.co.nz.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Anna March <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 8:07 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

Please consider these vital points I'd like to make along with the community:

Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants. CRISPR was only invented 5 years ago. Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks (e.g. off target effects) posed by new GM techniques such as CRISPR. They recommended that products derived from these techniques require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments. Gene editing techniques cause DNA double strand breaks and can be used sequentially to make dramatic differences to DNA. They are also prone to additional unexpected mutations. The risks associated with these techniques warrant pre-market safety assessment and approval. RNA interference is a GM technique and can result in heritable genetic changes so must also be assessed for safety before being used in our food. GM plants, animals and microbes all pose unique risks so assessing the GM production process is appropriate

Yours sincerely, Anna March Drouin South, Victoria, 3818, Australia

This email was sent by Anna March via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Anna provided an email address (itsadrianna@hotmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Anna March at itsadrianna@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Eleanor Di Bella <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 9:13 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants. CRISPR was only invented 5 years ago. Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks (e.g. off target effects) posed by new GM techniques such as CRISPR. They recommended that products derived from these techniques require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments. Gene editing techniques cause DNA double strand breaks and can be used sequentially to make dramatic differences to DNA. They are also prone to additional unexpected mutations. The risks associated with these techniques warrant pre-market safety assessment and approval. RNA interference is a GM technique and can result in heritable genetic changes so must also be assessed for safety before being used in our food. GM plants, animals and microbes all pose unique risks so assessing the GM production process is appropriate.

Yours sincerely, Eleanor Di Bella Robertson, New South Wales, 2577, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Eleanor Di Bella via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Eleanor provided an email address (elladibella@yahoo.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Eleanor Di Bella at elladibella@yahoo.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Anne Simmonds <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Friday, 30 March 2018 11:15 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

Please allow people to know which foods contain GM ingredients. Not doing so creates a chaos and confusion. Please realise we need to know what we are buying and eating. Yours sincerely, Anne Simmonds
White Gum Valley, Western Australia, 6162, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Anne Simmonds via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Anne provided an email address (psychikung@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Anne Simmonds at psychikung@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Melanie Archibald <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 31 March 2018 3:08 AM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

Dear Sir/Madam

I am very disappointed & disheartened to hear about deregulation of the food laws that affect food safety.

Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants.

CRISPR was only invented 5 years ago . Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks (e.g. off target effects) posed by new GM techniques such as CRISPR. They recommended that products derived from these techniques require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments. Gene editing techniques cause DNA double strand breaks and can be used sequentially to make dramatic differences to DNA. They are also prone to additional unexpected mutations. The risks associated with these techniques warrant pre-market safety assessment and approval. RNA interference is a GM technique and can result in heritable genetic changes so must also be assessed for safety before being used in our food. GM plants, animals and microbes all pose unique risks so assessing the GM production process is appropriate.

Yours sincerely Melanie Archibald

PO Box 574 South Fremantle WA, 6162

_____ This email was sent by Melanie Archibald via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Melanie provided an email address (gogirl8@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Melanie Archibald at gogirl8@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Patricia Peacock <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 31 March 2018 8:37 AM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants.

Yours sincerely, Patricia Peacock Mount Murray, New South Wales, 2577, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Patricia Peacock via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Patricia provided an email address (patsy@patsypeacock.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Patricia Peacock at patsy@patsypeacock.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Pedro Rafael Ramos <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 31 March 2018 11:20 AM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

Work with nature, not against it. We have already lost 94% of our world seed diversity. Look it up. When people express how worried they are about decisions you make, it may be a good idea to stop and think about the decisions you're making and their repercussions.

Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants. CRISPR was only invented 5 years ago . Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks (e.g. off target effects) posed by new GM techniques such as CRISPR. They recommended that products derived from these techniques require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments. Gene editing techniques cause DNA double strand breaks and can be used sequentially to make dramatic differences to DNA. They are also prone to additional unexpected mutations. The risks associated with these techniques warrant pre-market safety assessment and approval. RNA interference is a GM technique and can result in heritable genetic changes so must also be assessed for safety before being used in our food. GM plants, animals and microbes all pose unique risks so assessing the GM production process is appropriate.

Yours sincerely, Pedro Rafael Ramos Eatons Hill, Queensland, 4037, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Pedro Rafael Ramos via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Pedro Rafael provided an email address (pqr.amos@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Pedro Rafael Ramos at pqr.amos@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Elizabeth Morgan <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 31 March 2018 1:39 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

My parents and grandparents grew to very old age. They did so before GM technology and heavy toxic spraying of food and certainly before GM foods were introduced. They, for the most part, lived long healthy lives and ate food that was often organically/compost grown and produced.

Today we are bombarded by extraordinary levels of sickness including debilitating health problems. Whilst as yet an insufficient number of people in positions of power are saying that there is a direct link to sickness with food quality and disease, there is nevertheless a growing body of people who have moved towards healthy lifestyle choices in order to obviate these serious trends.

The GM industry has not been sufficiently tested. If the biotechnology industry gets its way, Australia will be the first country in the world to deregulate a range of new genetic modification (GM) techniques in animals, plants and microbes. They will enter our food chain and our environment with no safety testing and no labelling. The risks are enormous and the results could be catastrophic. Serious sickness will increase rapidly. The national health debt will increase rapidly and beyond all expectations.

Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks these new GM techniques pose. They recommended that products derived from them require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments.

I beg the government to reconsider any plans to deregulate a range of new GM techniques be it in plants, animals and microbes until substantial evidence has been obtained over a longer period to secure the health and safety of Australians and our life in this still fabulous country.

Yours sincerely, Elizabeth Morgan AM Taringa, Queensland, 4068, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Elizabeth Morgan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Elizabeth provided an email address (e.morgan@griffith.edu.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Elizabeth Morgan at e.morgan@griffith.edu.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Sean Corrigan <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Saturday, 31 March 2018 9:00 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

Please read the email tips above for some points you could include in your own comments.

If the biotechnology industry gets its way, Australia will be the first country in the world to deregulate a range of new genetic modification (GM) techniques in animals, plants and microbes. They will enter our food chain and our environment with no safety testing and no labelling. The risks are enormous and the results could be catastrophic.

Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks these new GM techniques pose. They recommended that products derived from them require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments.

Yours sincerely, Sean Corrigan Trinity Beach, Queensland, 4879, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Sean Corrigan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Sean provided an email address (quoll_fnq@optusnet.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sean Corrigan at quoll_fnq@optusnet.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Ben Garland <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 1 April 2018 8:59 AM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

I want to be able to identify foods that are grown using different techniques to traditional breeding such as the following; Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants. CRISPR was only invented 5 years ago . Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks (e.g. off target effects) posed by new GM techniques such as CRISPR. They recommended that products derived from these techniques require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments. Gene editing techniques cause DNA double strand breaks and can be used sequentially to make dramatic differences to DNA. They are also prone to additional unexpected mutations. The risks associated with these techniques warrant pre-market safety assessment and approval. RNA interference is a GM technique and can result in heritable genetic changes so must also be assessed for safety before being used in our food. GM plants, animals and microbes all pose unique risks so assessing the GM production process is appropriate. Subject:

Yours sincerely, Ben Garland Corndale, New South Wales, 2480, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Ben Garland via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Ben provided an email address (bunyipben79@bigpond.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Ben Garland at bunyipben79@bigpond.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Cara Ogier <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 1 April 2018 1:14 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

I am deeply concerned that if FSANZ bows to pressure and the biotechnology industry gets its way, Australia and New Zealand will be the first countries in the world to deregulate a range of new genetic modification (GM) techniques in animals, plants and microbes. I urge Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) to act in the best interests of citizens and make the decision regulate that products of NGMTs be strictly regulated as GMOs.

Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks these new GM techniques pose. They recommended that products derived from them require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments. Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants.

CRISPR was only invented 5 years ago . Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks (e.g. off target effects) posed by new GM techniques such as CRISPR. They recommended that products derived from these techniques require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments.

Gene editing techniques cause DNA double strand breaks and can be used sequentially to make dramatic differences to DNA. They are also prone to additional unexpected mutations. The risks associated with these techniques warrant pre-market safety assessment and approval.

RNA interference is a GM technique and can result in heritable genetic changes so must also be assessed for safety before being used in our food. It would be a gross injustice to allow foods modified using these techniques to enter our food chain and our environment with no safety testing and no labelling. The risks are enormous and the results could be catastrophic.

GM plants, animals and microbes all pose unique risks so assessing the GM production process is appropriate. The proponents of NGMTs are lobbying strongly to prevent regulations of these new techniques, or at least to give them a lesser ('light touch') regulated status, in order to allow swift marketing. To allow this to happen would be to ignore or deny the uncertainties and risks which are inherent in the genetic modification process.

I urge FSANZ to follow the EU regulatory approach which is based on the precautionary principle, as opposed to the US approach which is based on deregulation, and what has been termed the “proof of harm principle”, which puts the burden of proof of harm on the shoulders of those who are harmed. I also urge FSANZ to take into account the information and views contained in the September 2017 statement from the European Network of Scientists For Social and Environmental Responsibility, regarding these NGMTs and how products derived from them should be strictly regulated as GMOs.

Yours sincerely, Cara Ogier

_____ This email was sent by Cara Ogier via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Cara provided an email address (Cara.o@windowsslive.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Cara Ogier at Cara.o@windowsslive.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Tracy Skippings <campaigns@good.do>
Sent: Sunday, 1 April 2018 1:36 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions; Joel Fitzgibbon; David Littleproud; Tony Zappia; Bridget McKenzie; Niall Blair; Jill Hennessy; Steven Miles; Alannah MacTiernan; Meegan Fitzharris
Subject: Submission re. Consultation paper on Food derived using 'new breeding techniques'

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

As a consumer I want to be reassured and convinced that all processes are safe and that GM tolerance remains at zero for all food and animal products. We do not want Australia to deregulate a range of new genetic modification (GM) techniques in animals, plants and microbes. Concerns include the danger of these modified or engineered products or processes entering our food chain and our environment. With no safety testing and no labelling the risks are enormous and could be catastrophic.

I draw to your attention to the fact that CRISPR was only invented 5 years ago. Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks (e.g. off target effects) posed by new GM techniques such as CRISPR. They recommended that products derived from these techniques require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments.

GM plants, animals and microbes all pose unique risks so assessing the GM production process is appropriate and indeed essential.

Labelling should include gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants so that we consumers are kept fully informed. It is our right as citizens of this planet.

Continued contamination of organic crops is an ongoing concern and there should be no relaxation and indeed increased regulations regarding the growing of GM crops. There should be stronger regulations imposed on GM crop growers to prevent contamination of other growers' crops and compensation for those whose crops are contaminated in any way.

Yours sincerely,

Tracy Skippings Margaret River, Western Australia, 6285, Australia

_____ This email was sent by Tracy Skippings via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Tracy provided an email address (tskipplings@iinet.net.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tracy Skippings at tskipplings@iinet.net.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

NOTE: Recipients of this email listed as <contact-forms@good.do> were actually sent the message via their online contact forms.

NBT Consult Submissions

From: Cara Ogier <cara.o@windowslive.com>
Sent: Sunday, 1 April 2018 2:06 PM
To: NBT Consult Submissions
Subject: Consultation paper - Submission

Consultation paper: Food derived using new breeding techniques

SUBMISSION

I am deeply concerned that if the biotechnology industry gets its way, Australia and New Zealand will be the first countries in the world to deregulate a range of new genetic modification (GM) techniques in animals, plants and microbes. I urge Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) to act in the best interests of citizens and regulate that products of NGMTs be strictly regulated as GMOs.

Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks these new GM techniques pose. They recommended that products derived from them require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments. Genetic modification techniques pose unique risks and all new genetic modification techniques should be assessed for safety before being allowed in our food. They should also be labelled so we are fully informed. This includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants.

CRISPR was only invented 5 years ago. Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks (e.g. off target effects) posed by new GM techniques such as CRISPR. They recommended that products derived from these techniques require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments.

Gene editing techniques cause DNA double strand breaks and can be used sequentially to make dramatic differences to DNA. They are also prone to additional unexpected mutations. The risks associated with these techniques warrant pre-market safety assessment and approval.

RNA interference is a GM technique and can result in heritable genetic changes so must also be assessed for safety before being used in our food. It would be a gross injustice to allow foods modified using these techniques to enter our food chain and our environment with no safety testing and no labelling. The risks are enormous and the results could be catastrophic.

GM plants, animals and microbes all pose unique risks so assessing the GM production process is appropriate. The proponents of NGMTs are lobbying strongly to prevent regulations of these new techniques, or at least to give them a lesser ('light touch') regulated status, in order to allow swift marketing. To allow this to happen would be to ignore or deny the uncertainties and risks which are inherent in the genetic modification process.

I urge FSANZ to follow the EU regulatory approach which is based on the "precautionary principle", as opposed to the US approach which is based on deregulation, and what has been termed the "proof of harm principle", which puts the burden of proof of harm on the shoulders of those who are harmed. I also urge FSANZ to take into account the information and views contained in the September 2017 statement from the European Network of Scientists For Social and Environmental Responsibility, regarding these NGMTs and why products derived from them should be strictly regulated as GMOs.

Yours sincerely,
Cara Ogier
301/16 Huron Street
Takapuna 0622
Auckland, NZ