


## submissions

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 29 March 2016 3:47 PM  
**To:** submissions  
**Subject:** FSANZ Submission Form Received (Internet) - CQC Ltd  
**Attachments:** LR34. Appendix D Submission.doc

	
<b>Code Submission</b>	
Application/Proposal Number:	LR34
Organisation Name:	CQC Ltd
Organisation Type:	Individual
Representing:	Consumers
Street Address:	426C Masterton-Castlepoint Road, RD 6, Masterton, 5886 New Zealand
Postal Address:	426C Masterton-Castlepoint Road, RD 6, Masterton, 5886 New Zealand
Contact Person:	Ian Cardno
Contact Number:	[REDACTED]
Email Address:	[REDACTED]
Submission Text:	

## LR 34 Consultation Paper – Labelling Review Recommendation 34: Review of mandatory labelling of irradiated food

---

### Attachment D – Questions for Stakeholders

1. What information (for example, studies, data or consumer feedback) can you provide on consumer awareness, understanding and behaviour, in response to labelling about food irradiation?

*No comment to offer.*

2. Do you purchase, or would you consider purchasing, irradiated food?

if yes, then why?

if no, then why not?

*Yes. My knowledge of how the irradiation process works is that harmful pathogens and pests are killed, and the shelf life of the treated product is prolonged in the same (if not enhanced state), more so than if the product was not treated to kill those pathogens and pests.*

3. Does the current labelling requirement for irradiated food (see box below) provide enough information for you to make an informed choice about the food you buy?

**Labelling requirement:** If the food, ingredient or component of a food has been irradiated, a statement to the effect that the food, ingredient or component has been treated with ionising radiation is required.

*Yes. Consumers make choices based on information on labels or signs, or beliefs and cultures, or simply select based on other factors e.g. brand knowledge, price, and appearance.*

4. What are your views about the wording of the statement not being prescribed?

*I am comfortable with the current label requirements not being displayed for irradiated foods. Having no labelling with statements about irradiation is consistent for labelling with other treatments that may have been applied.*

5. What are your views about the voluntary use of the Radura symbol?

*The voluntary use of the symbol is acceptable.*

6. Do you think the current labelling requirement for all foods permitted to be irradiated should be removed?

- if yes, then why?

- if no, then why not?

*Yes – I consider that irradiation is a beneficial treatment and that there is no harm to consumers for consuming irradiated food i.e. irradiation in the doses used discussed in this document.*

7. If labelling was to continue for irradiated whole foods, do you think restaurant meals containing irradiated ingredients should still be labelled?

*No. Not necessary. I do not consider that irradiated food is harmful.*

8. If labelling was to continue for irradiated whole foods, do you think irradiated ingredients used in packaged food should still be labelled?

*No. Not necessary. I do not consider that irradiated food is harmful.*

22. What are your views about information on the safety and benefits of food irradiation being on food labels?

*Information on the safety and benefits of food irradiation on food labels should be the same as all other food treatment applications.*

23. What other practical approaches other than labelling can be used to communicate the safety and benefits of food irradiation? (Please describe).

*Producers, exporters, marketers and retailers could communicate food safety and benefits of food irradiation in consumer publications – e.g. magazines, promotional material.*

24. Do you have any information on the effectiveness of any of these approaches? (If so, please provide).

*No information on effectiveness.*

**Other general comments:**

*There doesn't appear to be any definitive reason to continue/discontinue with labelling for irradiated foods, other than providing consumer's a degree of choice, following the introduction of a food product that has been subject to a treatment by a new technology.*

*Questions may arise about the detrimental effects of food that has been treated by irradiation. There is no scientific evidence that consumption of irradiated food produces any immediate or potential future harm to humans.*

*Codex and FSANZ should review the principles behind why Codex recommended mandatory labelling of irradiated foods. If Codex's recommendation for mandatory labelling of irradiated food followed a principle that consumers be informed of a new treatment's details for a period of a generation and that principle has been similarly applied for all new major food treatments, what is Codex's recommendation following a generation of application of food irradiation?*

*Are the principles applicable now following introduction of irradiation as a major new food treatment?*

Ian Cardno

Director  
CQC Ltd

426C Masterton-Castlepoint Road  
RD 6  
Masterton 5886

██████████  
████████████████████