

**Senate Community Affairs Committee**

**ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**HEALTH PORTFOLIO**

**Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018, 29 & 30 May 2017**

**Ref No:** SQ17-000828

**OUTCOME:** 5 - Regulation, Safety and Protection

**Topic:** GM Modifications

**Type of Question:** Written Question on Notice

**Senator:** Rice, Janet

**Question:**

A review by the Austrian Environmental Agency concluded that “A thorough characterisation of the final products of RB [reverse breeding] and AB [accelerated breeding] is needed to exclude the unexpected presence of GM modifications.” \*

- a) Does the OGTR disagree with this analysis?
- b) If yes, on what basis?
- c) If no, does the OGTR think it is appropriate that organisms produced using these techniques not be regulated as GMOs given the potential presence of unexpected GM modifications?

\* Ibid., p. 49

**Answer:**

The Gene Technology Regulator has not expressed a view in relation to the conclusions of the report by the Austrian Environmental Agency and the material on which these conclusions are based.

It is the Gene Technology Regulator’s view that subject to paragraphs (d) and (e) of the definition of ‘genetically modified organism’ in section 10 of the *Gene Technology Act 2000*, organisms that inherit traits that occurred because of gene technology, including unexpected modifications, are Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) and dealings with these GMOs are subject to regulation under the *Gene Technology Act 2000*.