

Seamons, Colleen

From: Mal Pace [malpace@pacetrainingandhealth.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 24 December 2009 11:52 AM
To: submissions
Subject: Proposal P1007-Primary Production & Processing Requirements For Raw Milk Products

Dear Sir/Madam,

I refer to the above Proposal. You have me on your distribution list as I was one of the original submitters. Thanks you for sending through the update.

Unfortunately I don't have a lot of time to prepare an in depth reply, however I felt it pertinent to make comment; particularly on the **Microbiological Risk Assessment of Raw Cow Milk** document. Although I readily admit I have not read all 119 pages of this document, I have read the important parts.

I noted with disappointment that the word "organic" only comes up once in the whole document – and that is in the References section (I also note that the word "biodynamic" doesn't come up at all).

I feel this represents a flaw in this paper. Any study that compares pathogenic microbes in any animal food product (in this case, Raw Milk) MUST compare the difference between the organically produced product and the non-organically produced product. It is my understanding that studies looking at pathogenic susceptibility do show a difference between truly organically produced milk (which most Raw Milk advocates will be seeking), and non-organically produced milk. Milk production standards, what the cows eat and drink etc are all different, DO make a difference to the quality of the milk produced.

Papers such as <http://realmilk.com/documents/ResponsetoMarlerListofStudies.pdf>, and the studies it refers too, should be thoroughly read and assessed.

Thank you and regards

Mal Pace
Managing Director



Pace Training and Health

ABN: 30299560543

Ph: (61) (2) 9929 8054

Mob: 0408 644 401

Email: malpace@pacetrainingandhealth.com.au

Website: www.pacetrainingandhealth.com.au