

**Email Submission: Beth Strods**

Hi,

Thanks for the opportunity to have input into this important issue

I support Option 3: amend the GT Regulations with some but not all of the draft amendment proposals.

I support the repeal of item 1 in Schedule 1. Organisms that have been altered by gene technology should be regulated as GMOs.

The proposed deregulation of GM techniques would remove monitoring of such activities. This would pose a risk to the community as any control (or knowledge) of what has been done with the altered material would not be tracked. We just don't know what effect such material would have on people, animals or our environment. Taking such a risk is needless - have the controls in place.

With new techniques we should welcome scrutiny to ensure there are no undesirable consequences.

These changes could increase the testing undertaken on animals - any reduction in controls should be an ethical concern for animal welfare.

I oppose the deregulation of 'null segregants'. This would stay keep in step with the EU.

I oppose the proposed deregulation of RNA interference and gene silencing. The use of such applications should be regulated and have a risk assessment.

Gene drives could have potentially catastrophic environmental consequences which are unknown. There should be a moratorium on the environmental release of gene drives.

Changes in technology and research techniques have the potential to provide significant advances for society. They also have the potential to cause severe damage. Appropriate oversight and regulation is imperative. With such relative young technology there is no way to fully understand longer term impacts so strong regulation and oversight should be essential.

Thanks  
Beth Strods