

s47G

8 Apr '20

Up to business end of changing the def for gun tech etc.
Hence done the investigation

Originally do they need to be reviewed

Concluded yes

Now it is how do we do that

- 1) Def \Rightarrow clearer. Currently uncertainly around what is captured
- 2) Diff way of defining doesn't rely on which technology has been used

3) Ensure we regulate food commensurate to risk that they pose

Current system based on the techniques used
- not a risk based approach

Now in diff situation to 20 yrs ago - increased knowledge
when making def clearance
also develop system that is more risk based

Food subject to def. are captured by labelling
if more to system that excludes food
then this could be excluded from labelling.

"From your perspective - what is important
what is the key things
What would you like to see"

FSANZ would like to be more outcome focused

NO the specific technology

This would be a paradigm shift

⇒ many have mis-aligned - as Food vs Gmo under ^{different} reg
plus 2 countries - diff. reg.

FSANZ - when do we put the boundaries about what
we capture

More examples of what is out there i.e. outcome
what has done to the food

Question of oversight - 'FSANZ if you exclude certain
foods from pre-market approval' - stakeholders are
concerned if the product is safe - decision of developer.
No govt. agency checking

FSANZ - mostly GM plants

↳ knowledge on animals - not as much

~~100%~~

these days smaller size companies getting involved
may not have all the processes in place.

Use polled as an example - only using template - GMØ

In GM plants - approval to 'original event'

this approval from anything derived from an event

FSANZ - requesting examples of types of product
insight into process + animal

Possibly with 2nd CFS

UK to send through actions - into world 1/1a

to send to [REDACTED]

Plus set up more regular catch-ups

'continuous engagement
of stakeholders'

- Reach out to the horticulture sector.