

## NBT Consult Submissions

---

**From:** Alissa Geddes <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 17 April 2018 10:42 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'

To whom it may concern, I am deeply concerned about the safety of any GM food technology, new or old. I have not found much research on the long term effects of GM food consumption on human health and I worry that the control of food staples would ultimately be in the hands of a few companies.

I want to know if there are GM products in the foods that I buy so I can make an informed decision about my purchases. The current labelling laws are totally inadequate at this point. I also want high quality unbiased research into the safety of any GM product in our food supply. The fact that GM techniques such as CRISPR have not been properly assessed for consumer safety seems fairly suspect to me and until this issue is resolved I will buy organic produce and avoid the big food brands and encourage my loved ones to do likewise. Thank you for your time.

Yours sincerely, Alissa Geddes Seaford, Victoria, 3198, Australia

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Alissa Geddes 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 Alissa provided an email address (algedyoun@yahoo.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alissa Geddes at algedyoun@yahoo.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Mark Jones <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 18 April 2018 1:06 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 FSANZ,

Please find below my submission 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, Mark Jones Verrierdale, Queensland, 4562, Australia

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Mark Jones 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 Mark provided an email address (ms\_j1000@hotmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Mark Jones at ms\_j1000@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Steffan Browning <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 18 April 2018 10:32 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'

Kia ora tatou

with concern about the risk assessment processes and advice of FSANZ I submit that this consultation is invalid until genuine independence and objectivity of scientific advice, risk assessment and process is followed by FSANZ.

I have submitted in the past as spokesperson for Soil & Health New Zealand on various notified applications to FSANZ, I have met with FSANZ officials, both formally and informally, and also in Select Committee during my term as a Member of Parliament in New Zealand. Unfortunately I have not been able to get confidence that independence and objectivity to ensure the best and consistent outcomes for the food safety and well being for citizens of New Zealand and Australia is always or even often occurring through the FSANZ system.

That FSANZ has consistently approved GE derived foods, regardless the known risks of some, and the lack of appropriate safety testing, makes it all the more important that Food Derived From 'New' Breeding Techniques be disallowed until more in-depth, independent, and objective research is undertaken about the safety of such foods. Genuine precaution must be the cornerstone of decisions around food safety using new technologies.

I support the submission of Friends of the Earth, and note that they have pointed out in their GM 2.0 AUSTRALIAN REGULATORS ENGINEERING THE TRUTH; '...In 2012 and 2013 FSANZ convened an expert panel – comprised almost entirely of genetic engineers with gene technology patents – to look at whether these new GM techniques should be considered genetic engineering. Furthermore, FSANZ also appears to have deliberately misled the Senate, in response to Senate questions, by stating “FSANZ is not aware that any members of the expert panel have potential conflicts of interest.” FSANZ would have been aware of these patents and other potential conflicts at the time, as this information is well documented and publicised. ...'

Independently in an email to friends I commented similarly including a few notes and items easily discovered that show flaws in what consumers would expect of independence in the science advice that FSANZ has chosen to accept.

My comments;

FSANZ and its industry mates are pushing further on diminishing consumer protection and choice around foods derived from GE techniques.

I applaud those that will submit to FSANZ consultation paper <http://www.foodstandards.gov.au/consumer/gmfood/Pages/Review-of-new-breeding-technologies-.aspx> but feel extremely sceptical about the process. This email is an FYI for those not already aware of the shonkiness of FSANZ and how conflicted it is. Very much in the same vein as the NZ EPA it seems. Rotten to the core. So just a few observations and attachments. It could be so much more. I believe strong action

against these rotten agencies is needed to get objective and precautionary outcomes in the best interests of the community.

FSANZ is a deeply compromised agency, long promoting the interests of the big agri-food companies rather than consumers, eg always granting GE food applications. This current consideration of food derived from new breeding techniques smacks of the same, with a history of individuals (not all) who are conflicted by pro-GE/industry interests, involved in the panels giving advice. I don't know them all nor am I about to research them all, but John Knight (infamous for his biased survey of tourists views around GE) and Goetz Laible (GE cows infamy) are a very very bad start in the list of members of the Expert Advisory Group for the Food derived using new breeding techniques – review. One Aussie long used by FSANZ on a quick search shows; “Dr Allan Green has been a pioneer in the genetic modification of fatty acid composition in oilseed crops to provide improved nutritional value...”

Prof. Barbara Burlingame – Massey University, New Zealand Dr Allan Green – CSIRO Agriculture and Food, Australia Prof. John Knight – Otago University, New Zealand Dr Goetz Laible – AgResearch, New Zealand Dr Rob Lanfear – Australian National University, Australia Prof. Dianne Nicol – University of Tasmania, Australia Prof. Brian Priestly – Monash University, Australia Dr Sally Symes – Victorian Dept. of Health & Human Services, Australia Dr Mark Tizard – CSIRO Australian Animal Health Laboratory, Australia

Dr Allan Green was also on a panel in 2013 for consideration of ‘New Plant Breeding Techniques’ for FSANZ, you might say the first round in this current consultation. That panel was chaired by Professor Peter Langridge who I have written about before (attached Pastoral Genomics Director not-independent) whose past research facility received big \$\$\$ (millions) from DuPont, Dow and also some from Monsanto. I have also attached a couple of other pieces/clips from various authors showing the flaws in independence/objectivity in science advice to FSANZ, particularly Langridge.

Name Position Professor Bernard Carroll School of Chemistry & Molecular Biosciences, University of Queensland Dr Rob Defeyter Intellectual Property Manager, CSIRO Plant Industry Dr Allan Green Deputy Chief, CSIRO Plant Industry Dr Roger Hellens[1] Science Group Leader, Genomics, Plant and Food Research NZ Professor Peter Langridge Director and CEO, Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics, University of Adelaide Dr Bill Taylor[2] Business Development Manager, CSIRO Plant Industry Professor Peter Waterhouse School of Molecular Bioscience, University of Sydney

Other workshop participants were staff from FSANZ, the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator, the Australian Government Department of Agriculture, and the New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries. The workshop was chaired by Professor Peter Langridge, a FSANZ Scientific Fellow.

FSANZ Fellow's include compromised Professor Peter Langridge (November 2017) “The FSANZ Fellows program was developed to create a network of experts who can provide FSANZ with objective expert advice and critical review. The program also helps to develop academic links and networks.”

<http://www.foodstandards.gov.au/science/expertise/fellows/Pages/default.aspx>

I resume my submission.

Until FSANZ can show a significant change in approach to its decision making processes, including selection of advisory panels, to ensure genuine independence and objectivity in the interests of consumer food safety, then Food derived using ‘new breeding techniques’ should not be allowed into the Aotearoa New Zealand and Australian food supply.

I would like the opportunity to speak to my submission in New Zealand.

Yours sincerely,

Steffan Browning Former Member of Parliament

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Steffan Browning 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](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Steffan provided an email address ([greeny25@xtra.co.nz](mailto:greeny25@xtra.co.nz)) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Steffan Browning at [greeny25@xtra.co.nz](mailto:greeny25@xtra.co.nz).

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

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

## NBT Consult Submissions

---

**From:** Linda Conyard <linda.conyard@bigpond.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 18 April 2018 10:33 AM  
**To:** NBT Consult Submissions  
**Subject:** NBT Consultation Paper

RE: NBT Consultation Paper

I wish to verbalise my concerns regarding the ideas put forward for implementation that have come out of the above paper.

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.

It is very clear that much more comprehensive testing is required before anything is released into our food chain.

There are many clear examples of when scientists have decided we need to introduce something to fix a problem, only to have what was introduced become a problem. Cane toads are the perfect example. It's time to stop reacting and start using time proven practices that actually work.

Yours sincerely,

Linda Conyard

Ocean View, Queensland, 4521, Australia

## NBT Consult Submissions

---

**From:** Alison Punton <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 18 April 2018 2:34 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 request that the government abandon the deregulation of the genetic modification techniques in animals, plants and microbes and instead highly regulate it. These techniques all need comprehensive case by case, long term, risk assessment.

I request that all foods are clearly labelled with the correct information regarding the ingredients in them, particularly when they have gm in part or full ingredients

in them. It should be the right of every person to know the exact ingredients in the foods that they are purchasing to eat with out immoral deception.

The Health and Agriculture Ministers have a moral responsibility to make sure that the public are protected from harm when making decisions. Allowing food products onto the market that have ingredients that are untested and unregulated the Ministers would not be fore filling their moral responsibility to the Australian public.

Corporations more often than not use deception to market their products because many times people would not purchase the product if they new the truth of exactly how that food was made and with what ingredients. This deception should stop.

If people were to become ill from untested, unlabelled food products that are on the market who would be to blame? Would it be the government ministers for not doing their job of protecting the population that they are paid to do? or would it be corporations that invent these artificial ingredient and that put them in our food chain?

The people that died and are still sick if they haven't all died from asbestos is a good example of how thing can go wrong. How was that product allowed to be used in Australia? Who let that happen?

Yours sincerely, Alison Punton

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Alison Punton 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 Alison provided an email address (puntilal@iinet.net.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alison Punton at untilal@iinet.net.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Suzanne Campbell <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 18 April 2018 4:58 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'

For people like me who are extra sensitive and already live with a range of health challenges it is vital to know exactly what is in my food and whether there is any types of genetic modification done to it. Please take this issue seriously. Choice is vital for everyone!

~ 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, Suzanne Campbell

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Suzanne Campbell 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 Suzanne provided an email address (suzicampbell@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Suzanne Campbell at suzicampbell@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Lois Nethery <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 18 April 2018 5:26 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'

There is insufficient evidence for the safety of GM organisms “in the wild”. It is not acceptable to use the general public as a testing ground for GM foods. The basic science is not sufficiently advanced (eg epigenetics) to predict and assess the risks and impact of GM foods on human health.

At the very least, GM foods must be prominently labelled to allow members of the public to choose whether or not they subject themselves to such risks.

Yours sincerely, Lois Nethery

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Lois Nethery 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 Lois provided an email address (lois@netherymail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lois Nethery at lois@netherymail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Robin Trouchet <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 18 April 2018 7:17 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 believe Australia should take heed of the cautious approach of the Norwegian and Austrian governments on this issue. The very nature of such changes is over the long term not overnight. There is not enough evidence of the safety of techniques used and of potential non target injurious side effects to subject our people and our environment to such risk.

Yours sincerely, Robin Trouchet Margaret River, Western Australia, 6285, Australia

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Robin Trouchet 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 Robin provided an email address (robsnest@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Robin Trouchet at robsnest@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Elvira Dommissie <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 18 April 2018 7:32 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'

1. Foods derived from all GM techniques currently in use potentially or actually pose unique and unknown risks to the health of humans and/or animals eating them. For this reason they should be comprehensively assessed, and data from such assessments should be made freely available to members of the public who are interested in these results. The GM techniques referred to include gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis, RNA interference and null segregants.
2. The technique CRISPR has only been in use for 5 years. Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about non-target effects likely to result from such a procedure. Non-target effects have been a problem with a number of GM crops/foods to date. Therefore one cannot assume that the newer techniques are free from them. Known risks can be useful in safety assessments, but unknown risks that arise from such foods could involve toxicity and/or allergenicity. This could potentially result in fatalities following ingestion of such foods. Unless complete monitoring of these new GM foods' consumption is carried out, it would be very difficult to trace the source of the problem. For this reason, products derived from these techniques require comprehensive case-by-case assessments.
3. 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. Such mutations can result in the production of toxins and/or allergens in the plant cell. Past experience with GM crops has shown this on a number of occasions. The risks associated with these techniques warrant pre-market safety assessment and approval. This needs to be carried out by independent scientists, who have no connections to the GM industry.
4. RNA interference is a GM technique that can result in heritable genetic changes and so must therefore be assessed for safety like all other GM foods before being used in our food.
5. All GM plants, animals and microbes pose unique risks, because of the disruption to the DNA/RNA that results from any DNA/RNA insertion or substitution. Predictions and assumptions are not always accurate, as the site of insertion can result in DNA rearrangements. In addition, the production by a plant cell of new proteins or over-production of existing proteins, can alter the metabolic pathways, so that harmful compounds are produced by the cell.

Yours sincerely, Dr Elvira Dommissie

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Elvira Dommissie 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 Elvira provided an email address (elvira.dommissie@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Elvira Dommissie at elvira.dommissie@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Mick Alexander <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 18 April 2018 9:36 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'

Dear Sir/ Madam, It is extremely important that all new breeding techniques are assessed individually as the safety of our food supply can be at risk with poorly managed and implemented genetic engineering techniques. All of the discussed new breeding techniques are genetic engineering even if the spin tries to say it is not. Any techniques except for conventional breeding methods should be assessed individually. 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 and can decide if we want to accept the risk. These techniques to be labelled includes gene editing, GM rootstock grafting, cisgenesis, intragenesis RNA interference and null segregants. CRISPR was only invented 5 years ago and is a very risky and technique using all the same tools and methodologies as used in GM or GE. 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 before any food should be allowed in the human or animal food chain. 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. I realise the precautionary principal is not considered today by FSANZ, but hope it can become a cornerstone of food integrity into the future. Regulators should always adhere to the "Precautionary Principle".

Yours sincerely, Mick Alexander

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Mick Alexander 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 Mick provided an email address (mick@grazingbestprac.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Mick Alexander at mick@grazingbestprac.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Jack Austin <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 19 April 2018 10:35 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'

No man made or modified product should ever enter the food market without intense testing. GM plants, animals and microbes all pose unique risks so assessing the GM production process is appropriate. There is a strict process you have to go through to be certified 'organic' and more stringent rules should apply to GMO's. They could turn out to be disastrously poisonous and you want to use the general population as guinea pigs. This should be highly illegal. I would never buy a food product that is GM so if they are not labelled that is technically deceiving the public. In advertising that would be against the law so the same should apply with something as important as the food we eat. 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.

Mother nature produces the best and anything other than that should be banned full stop.

Yours sincerely, Jack Austin

---

This email was sent by Jack Austin 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 Jack provided an email address (crustinj@gmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jack Austin at crustinj@gmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Diana Palmer <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 19 April 2018 3:07 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'

My family and I oppose all research into genetically engineered organisms, plant and animal and the production of GM food. The effects of consumption of GM food is not known and the cruelty involved in producing GM animals is beyond belief. Please stop this now. It is insane to deregulate genetic modification in Australia. Why on earth would you want to do this? Australia's Non-GMO products are so sought after in Europe and Japan; they are too valuable to contaminate, too pure to adulterate. It's like you are acting for evil in even suggesting an action which will harm people and producers in known ways and have terrible consequences beyond prediction. Yours sincerely, Diana Palmer Malvern, South Australia, 5061, Australia

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Diana Palmer 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 Diana provided an email address (palmer@jetmedia.com.au) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Diana Palmer at palmer@jetmedia.com.au.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Joanna Koniuszewski <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 19 April 2018 10:58 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'

Reviews commissioned by the Austrian and Norwegian governments concluded that not enough is known about the risks posed by new GM techniques such as CRISPR. They recommended that products derived from them require comprehensive case-by-case risk assessments. Because of these risks, over 60 international scientists have signed a statement calling for these techniques to be strictly regulated as GMOs.

I along with many others hold grave concerns and am deeply worried that if you deregulate this technique there will be no monitoring or surveillance. Anyone from amateur biohackers, to industry, to terror groups would be free to use it to genetically modify plants, animals and microbes. Entirely new diseases and poisons could be made. And they could enter our food chain and our environment with no safety testing and no labelling. The risks are enormous and the results could be catastrophic. We can't afford such a huge risk.

These techniques are quite clearly genetic modification and need to be regulated. The fact that the OGTR is even considering not regulating them demonstrates how captured the agency has become by industry interests.

The OGTR recommended that these techniques be deregulated following advice from scientists in its Gene Technology Technical Advisory Committee (GTTAC) with serious conflicts of interest.

I urge you to step in and ensure that regulators stop letting industry write the rules for them and put public health and our environment before private profit.

Yours sincerely, Joanna Koniuszewski Heatherton, Victoria, 3202, Australia

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Joanna Koniuszewski 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 Joanna provided an email address (jo89\_roxy@hotmail.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Joanna Koniuszewski at jo89\_roxy@hotmail.com.

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co) To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://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:** Kim K <campaigns@good.do>  
**Sent:** Friday, 20 April 2018 1:49 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'

Please don't unleash these inadequately tested food alteration processes (GMOs, CRISPR, etc.) on our only home/earth. There are enough studies to suggest it could be harmful and irreversible. Don't let greed prevail over safety and protection of our health and our environment.

Yours sincerely, Kim K

\_\_\_\_\_ This email was sent by Kim K 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 Kim provided an email address (kimrene63@aol.com) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kim K at kimrene63@aol.com.

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