

---

**Report of the  
2009 Food Regulation Stakeholder Consultation Forum**

**Melbourne  
19 June 2009**

---

## **A. Introduction**

The 2009 Food Regulation Stakeholder Consultation Forum was held in Melbourne on Friday 19 June 2009.

Invitations to the forum were sent to all stakeholders on the Food Regulation Secretariat database (760 contacts). These contacts were then invited to forward the invitation to others they thought might be interested in attending. 150 people attended the forum from a diverse range of industry, consumer, public health and government bodies. A full list of attendees is at Attachment A.

By contrast to the 2008 forum, which focussed on the policy work of the Food Regulation Standing Committee (FRSC), the 2009 forum focussed on the work of the Implementation Sub-Committee (ISC). The ISC strives to achieve nationally consistent implementation, compliance and enforcement of food regulation.

The forum was divided into four main parts:

- an optional early bird session attended by the majority of participants provided a background briefing on the food regulatory system in Australia. This session focussed on the role and objectives of the ISC and the role of individual State and Territory food regulators;
- a feedback session whereby progress was reported against the issues raised by stakeholders at the FRSC 2008 forum;
- presentations and questions on three major areas of ISC's work – implementation, compliance and enforcement;
- a break-out session which involved participants working in small groups to identify any major issues or barriers to consistent implementation, compliance and enforcement. These groups also identified solutions for addressing the issues and reported back to all forum participants who provided further, valuable feedback. A panel of ISC members also provided their initial impressions on the issues raised.

A copy of the agenda is included at Attachment B.

Discussion was wide ranging and no attempt was made to reach consensus on particular issues. Rather, the focus of the day was to receive as much feedback as possible. This report does not therefore represent stakeholder consensus but rather a summary of key issues and views expressed. Further, some issues raised at the forum (and reflected in this report) may be based on individual's perceptions which may not necessarily reflect the current situation.

## **B. Early Bird Session**

### **(i) Presentation**

A presentation was provided by Mr Gary Smith, Program Manager - Systems & Capacity Building, Food Safety Unit, Victorian Department of Human Services.

The purpose of the Early Bird Session was to:

- describe how the food regulatory system works; and
- focus specifically on the role and objectives of the Implementation Steering Committee (ISC) and of individual State and Territory food regulators.

To this end, Mr Smith detailed:

- the terms of reference and membership of ISC;
- ISC's strategy for consistent implementation of food regulation;
- the eight components of ISC's strategy including the aim, sponsor and key activities of each component;
- ISC's six key priorities for 2009;
- the role of State and Territory regulators; and
- the role of stakeholders.

A copy of the Early Bird Presentation is available on the Food Regulation Secretariat website at [www.foodsecretariat.health.gov.au](http://www.foodsecretariat.health.gov.au)

### **(ii) Discussion**

Mr Smith's presentation gave rise to wide ranging comments from participants, but most were seeking clarification regarding particular issues he raised. Some of the questions raised included:

- whether consultation had been undertaken on the 8 components;
- how therapeutic claims for food would be monitored;
- how issues are resolved where different jurisdictions have different interpretations;
- whether there is, or can be, a one-stop shop for advice on the food regulatory system;
- how often ISC meets and whether ISC reports on its meetings;
- how ISC prioritises; and
- how to ensure that jurisdictions provide sufficient resources to support the ambitious work program of ISC.

Following this session, additional participants joined the Forum and were all welcomed by the Chair of ISC – Dr Anne Astin (CEO Dairy Safe Victoria).

## **C. Feedback Session**

### **(i) Presentation**

Ms Kylie Jonasson, Assistant Secretary, Research, Regulation and Food Branch, Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing provided a summary of actions as a result of feedback from the 2008 Forum.

Ms Jonasson highlighted:

- work done in relation to improving communication. Initiatives have included: the Food Regulation Secretariat Newsletter; and amendments to the Principles and Protocols for the development of policy guidelines which have an increased focus on improved coordination and consultation, earlier consultation on implementation issues and greater rigour in reporting requirements;
- changes to increase the transparency of decision making. Ms Jonasson noted the work COAG has undertaken to improve transparency of Ministerial Council decisions and also the FRSC Strategic Planning Working Groups' actions to establish a process for prioritising policy and standards development; and
- work in relation to improving consistency. In particular the alignment of FSANZ and APVMA MRLs and the COAG initiative for consistent interpretation and enforcement.

A copy of the Feedback Presentation, as well as a table that captures activities underway (as at 29 April 2009) that align with the issues identified during the forums, is available on the FRSC website at [www.foodsecretariat.health.gov.au](http://www.foodsecretariat.health.gov.au)

### **(ii) Discussion**

Generally participants were pleased to receive feedback on progress since the last Forum.

The few comments made focussed on concerns regarding transparency of Ministerial Council decision making and also a concern that one jurisdiction could request a review of a standard. Ms Jonasson was able to advise that COAG has now agreed that any requests for review must be by majority and that once the Food Treaty with New Zealand is amended there will be only one opportunity for review. Ms Jonasson also highlighted that, once these changes are implemented, the evidence provided by the Ministerial Council to support the review decision will be made public.

## **D. Consistent Interpretation, Compliance and Enforcement**

### **(i) Presentations**

Three presentations were given about the work that ISC is currently undertaking.

- Integrated model for standards development and consistent interpretation
  - Mr Stan Goodchild, Manager of the Food Unit for the Department of Health (Western Australia) spoke on the work that has been done on an integrated model for standards development and consistent interpretation. Specifically he described:
    - the integrated model whereby national food standards and their implementation strategies are developed as a package for consideration by the Ministerial Council; and
    - the piloting of this new model in relation to eggs.
- Implementation of the National Food Safety and Audit Policy
  - Dr Fay Jenkins, Director Food Policy and Programs, South Australia Health described the new National Regulatory Food Safety Auditor Guideline (the Guideline) which implements the National Food Safety and Audit Policy which is designed to promote national consistency in the management of food safety auditors and auditing. She described the rationale for the Guideline, the process of development and the intent of the Guideline. She also described each of the three sections of the Guideline – namely, criteria and approval processes for regulatory food safety auditors; advice on managing audit process; and advice on managing regulatory food safety auditors.
- Draft Australia New Zealand Enforcement Policy
  - Mr Peter Day, Executive Director, Compliance Investigation and Enforcement Branch with the NSW Food Authority discussed the draft Australia New Zealand Enforcement Policy. Specifically;
    - the rationale for the policy;
    - the purpose of the policy - advocating a graduated, proportionate approach to enforcement that is risk based and does not result in the automatic adoption of stronger measures in the first instance;
    - the draft enforcement toolbox which is appended to the policy and provides advice on possible enforcement tools that may be used by regulators; and

- the trial of the policy which was undertaken by 14 regulatory bodies and concluded on 31 May 2009. Mr Day noted that feedback from trial participants was being examined and that the policy would be presented to ISC for final endorsement before being presented to FRSC.

A copy of each of these presentations is available on the Food Regulation Secretariat website at [www.foodsecretariat.health.gov.au](http://www.foodsecretariat.health.gov.au).

## (ii) Discussion

Some of the issues raised by forum participants (and responses from ISC members) included the following:

- in relation to the ***integrated model for standards development and consistent interpretation***, queries included:
  - how stakeholders get input into the review after it concludes in 2 years (it was noted that the review will be driven by stakeholders and will focus on content and process);
  - the resource implications for the integrated model (it was noted that this is being evaluated);
  - how stakeholders will be consulted on the integrated package for eggs (through the FSANZ process);
  - the implications if States/Territories do not interpret and implement consistently (this would be reported to the Ministerial Council);
  - whether there would be benchmarks (it was noted that another project is focussing on Key Performance Indicators and evaluation for ISC);
  - how long the integrated model for eggs would take to be developed (this would be the usual timeframe for standards development - eg 12 months to 2 years depending on FSANZ processes and whether the Ministerial Council requests a review);
  - whether the model would apply to new standards or also major amendments to existing standards (noted that the integrated model was currently only being trialled in relation to eggs); and
  - whether the SDC would be involved (the SDC would feed into the process).
- in relation to implementation of the ***National Food Safety and Audit Policy*** through the new Guideline:

- it was noted that this would be a great opportunity for industry to partner with regulators; and
- it was queried whether the Guideline allows for consistent messaging to auditors, opportunities to check auditor understanding and also whether there will be equivalence across jurisdictions (the intent is that this improves consistency).
- in relation to the ***Draft Australia New Zealand Enforcement Policy***, participants queried:
  - whether stakeholders would be able to review feedback (ISC noted that the feedback would be considered by ISC);
  - who industry should listen to when there is a difference between FSANZ policy and state enforcement (it was noted that with outcomes based standards there will necessarily be more room for disagreement but that outcomes based standards also have advantages over more prescriptive standards);
  - whether 'naming and shaming' will be part of the policy (it was noted that this was up to individual jurisdictions and a general discussion was had about some of the disadvantages of 'naming and shaming'); and
  - the breadth of the trial and whether there was industry consultation (it was noted that the trial involved 14 regulatory bodies and that if, and when, issues are raised by industry and other stakeholders, including through forums such as this one, ISC considers the issues).

## **E. Breakout Group Discussion**

The purpose of the break out groups (8 groups of between 10 and 18) was to:

- identify issues/examples where consistency has been an issue;
- identify possible solutions; and
- in relation to each possible solution, identify:
  - pros and cons;
  - any cost implications;
  - possible timeframes for implementation (eg short, medium or long term)
  - roles and responsibilities (noting that it will be important for solutions to involve all partners not just government); and
  - any other implementation issues.

Each group worked for 35 minutes on the above objectives and then reported back to the full forum.

The issues and solutions collectively identified by the groups are included in the following tables. As many of the groups identified similar issues and solutions, these have been grouped together and summarised. Please note that no attempt was made to achieve consensus on solutions – the aim was to identify as many options as possible.

Issue	Possible Solutions	Implications/other comments
<p>Inconsistent interpretation by regulators.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the differences between the policy intent and the drafting of Standards</li> <li>• inconsistent communication of interpretation</li> <li>• problems created as the result of separate streams for standards development and implementation</li> <li>• outcomes based standards leading to inconsistency</li> <li>• sections 1 and 2 of the Code being the main areas of inconsistency for larger companies and section 3 for smaller companies</li> </ul>	<p>More and clearer user/interpretive guides especially for more complex standards (noted that CoOL guidelines are a good example)</p> <p>Pull all guides together including any industry guidelines</p> <p>Create an independent referee</p> <p>Create a single statutory body</p> <p>Improve communication of decisions</p> <p>Training for local government and industry together</p> <p>Establish a central information library (common website) across all jurisdictions</p> <p>Address impressions and expectations re inconsistency with respect to outcomes based standards (the purpose of which is to enable flexibility in achieving outcomes)</p> <p>Recognise the role of industry codes and standards, not just black letter law</p> <p>Improve communication between industry and ISC</p>	<p>Some of the challenges are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• diversity of local government;</li> <li>• the reality that different Councils will have different views;</li> <li>• prioritisation of resources;</li> <li>• very little case law on new standards to guide interpretation;</li> <li>• little sharing of interpretive information across jurisdictions</li> </ul> <p>If the performance based outcomes are clear, people can have different approaches to arriving at the same outcome – this is not inconsistency – this is the intent of outcomes based standards</p> <p>An advantage of outcomes based standards is that different auditors will see different things and this enables more solutions to emerge</p>

Issue	Possible Solutions	Implications/other comments
<p>Enforcement of the labelling standard</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clear labelling contraventions and the absence of regulatory action in response to contraventions</li> <li>• difficulties for small business to understand the requirements</li> <li>• poor labelling of imported product and high compliance cost for local manufacturers</li> </ul>	<p>Enforcement notices could be issued with fines attached - this could resource better enforcement</p> <p>Big companies could also contribute to enforcement costs</p> <p>Could establish a panel to review complaints (as occurs re review of TV ads)</p> <p>Bring local government into the discussion</p> <p>Better communicate labelling surveys</p> <p>Need guidance on labelling specifically for small companies</p> <p>Guides should also be in other languages</p>	<p>Some of the challenges are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• as for challenges re inconsistency of interpretation generally</li> <li>• the focus of regulatory bodies on safety rather than suitability</li> <li>• the fact that regulators are driven by complaints and by public health impact and this necessarily means that labelling is sometimes a lower priority</li> </ul>
<p>Lack of clarity re health claims</p>	<p>Look at egg trial and potentially apply it to health claims</p>	<p><sup>1</sup></p>
<p>Standards that can't be enforced by local government</p>	<p>Apply more pilots of the integrated model</p>	
<p>Hurdles related to export inconsistency</p>	<p>Recognise AQIS as an important partner</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Please note that while forum discussion did not focus on the implications of these specific issues and proposals, there was general discussion about all issues and solutions having resource implications and requiring consideration in the context of other priorities.

Issue	Possible Solutions	Implications/other comments
<p>Need for better consultation and collaboration</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>concern regarding no or limited consultation on key documents such as the audit guidelines</li> </ul>	<p>Need a clear process so people know when they will be consulted</p> <p>Consultation and collaboration needs to commence earlier (at the draft stage)</p> <p>Need to address feedback before policy is finalised</p> <p>Need feedback re how feedback has been incorporated – “We want to know we’re being heard”</p> <p>Possibly AFGC as a member on ISC</p> <p>Direct contact between stakeholders and MinCo</p>	
<p>Role of EHOs/auditors. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>different approaches</li> <li>ability to address risk</li> <li>confusion re role</li> <li>lack of consistency particularly re time between checking, high risk offenders not being checked more frequency</li> </ul>	<p>EHOs should be audited</p> <p>EHOs should be more accountable</p> <p>Hold more forums re what people think of EHOs and how to improve their work</p> <p>Better use of risk guidelines by local government</p>	
<p>Absence of a review mechanism for ISC</p>	<p>A review mechanism which enables ISC to assess its effectiveness</p> <p>Competencies for regulators/government bodies not just auditors</p>	

## **F. ISC Feedback and Conclusions**

Following general discussion of the issues and possible solutions, a panel of five ISC members were asked to provide forum participants with any initial thoughts or reflections on the issues that had been raised and the value of the forum in general. Panel members noted:

- there would appear to be general support for the direction ISC is taking (particularly support for the integrated model, increased auditor consistency and actions being taken to improve consistency and communications with stakeholders);
- there have been a number of very consistent messages emerging including the importance of more targeted user guides;
- key issues for ISC to work through include how ISC:
  - partners with stakeholders to ensure not just consultation but collaboration;
  - better engages consumers, particularly noting the small number of consumer representatives at the forum; and
  - better engages local government;
- the value of focussing specifically on implementation issues through a forum such as this;
- the importance of FSANZ ensuring that standards are enforceable and an acknowledgment of the challenges that outcomes based standards present. Also recognition of the need to ensure that any cost/benefit analysis undertaken by FSANZ reflects the right information; and
- that ISC had agreed that other jurisdictions could hold their own forums. A forum was recently held in Queensland and similar issues emerged including confusion regarding roles, auditing issues, challenges with labelling compliance and enforcement.

## G. Suggestions for 2010 Forum

Forum participants were invited to make suggestions for the 2010 forum and were also asked to include any suggestions on evaluation forms that were provided to all participants.

Suggestions included:

- more involvement of stakeholders in presentations. For example, industry, local government or a consumer body could make a presentation.
- dedicated time for questions and answers relating to the previous forum;
- a summary of actions taken to address issues raised at the 2009 forum; and
- presentations and discussion focusing on:
  - the relationship between food laws and laws of general application (eg ACCC);
  - labelling;
  - emerging policy issues;
  - service providers' role in food safety;
  - challenges faced by EHOs;
  - how the food regulatory system impacts on food businesses operating in multiple jurisdictions;
  - advertising of health claims for food; and
  - detailed models for industry involvement in standard setting.

A number of participants also noted that the next forum should address both FRSC and ISC, rather than holding FRSC and ISC forums in alternate years (a gap of two years in relation to discussion of topical issues is too long).

ISC would like to thank all participants for their involvement in the forum.

The forum provided very valuable feedback to ISC regarding its progress and also areas for further attention. In particular ISC acknowledges the positive approach of participants and the commitment demonstrated to work together to improve the system.

This Report will be provided to ISC and FRSC for consideration in the context of identifying areas for improvement of the regulatory system and also priorities for the coming years.

**Attachment A: Attendees of the  
2009 Food Regulation Stakeholder Consultation Forum**

<b>INDUSTRY (TOTAL = 63)</b>		
1	Jodi Dixon	Coles
2	Neil McSkimming	Coles
3	Angie Low	Nutricia
4	Kim Leighton	Australian Food and Grocery Council
5	Kate Carnell	Australian Food and Grocery Council
6	Tom Heyhoe	Independent Food Industry Consultant
7	Conrad Blaney	Australian Meat Industry Council
8	Lucy Pearson	Australian Beverages Council Ltd
9	Carol Bate	Fonterra
10	David Harrison	QLD Meals on Wheels
11	Natalie Cook	Woolworths
12	Damier Bakin	Woolworths
13	Chris Bentley	Woolworths
14	Stephanie Rajczyk	Nestle
15	Kirsten Grinter	Nestle
16	Maureen Wilson	Spotless
17	Neil Smith	Cadbury
18	Elesha Kelly	Cadbury
19	Allan Poynton	Kraft Foods Ltd
20	John Linforth	Kraft Foods Ltd
21	Vijaya Rajendram	Wyeth Nutrition
22	Lira Yoon	Wyeth Nutrition
23	Fred Griffiths	Patties Foods Ltd
24	John Hart	Restaurant and Catering Australia
25	Jim Xaiz	Heinz
26	Dimitra Kostaras	Heinz
27	Andreas Dubs	Australian Chicken Meat Federation
28	Jo Jeffery	General Mills Australia
29	Newton Fernando	Fibrisol
30	Catherine Nguyen	Fibrisol
31	David Henning	Campbell Arnott's
32	Richard Murray	Smith's Snack Foods
33	Tony Coope	Parmalat
34	Siva Sivapalasundram	Parmalat
35	Amber Drake	Dairy Australia

36	Robin Condron	Dairy Australia
37	Tony Beaver	Food and Beverage Importers Association
38	Diana Withnall	ClubsNSW
39	Catherine Wallace	Unilever
40	Julie Newlands	Unilever
41	Sacha King	Simplot
42	Julius Edmundson	Simplot
43	Alana Moylan	Simplot
44	Alison Scandrett-Maeir	Simplot
45	Jennifer Thompson	Confectionery Manufacturers of Australasia
46	Christa Lingham	Food Technology Association of Australia Inc.
47	Jenny Robertson	Food Safety Council of Victoria
48	Felicity McGrath	SPC Ardmona
49	Julie Woods	Monash University
50	Ian Gamble	Amway
51	Sharon Van Dyk	Jaymak
52	James Van Dyk	Jaymak
53	Ken Hocking	Jaymak
54	Bandula Welungoda	Jaymak
55	Rachael Wright	Jaymak
56	Cameron Colville	Jaymak
57	Charles Fisher	FoodLegal
58	Peter Jeffery	PharmaCare Laboratories
59	Ilias Hossain	Herbalife Australasia
60	Kay Khoo	Bayer CropScience
61	Felicity Keiper	Bayer CropScience
62	Ruth Kendon	Australian Self-Medication Industry
63	Michael Leader	Monsanto

<b>CONSUMER GROUPS (TOTAL = 3)</b>		
------------------------------------	--	--

64	Victoria Smith	Novartis
65	Shaun Holmgreen	Novartis
66	Clare Hughes	Choice

<b>GOVERNMENT (LOCAL) (TOTAL = 35)</b>		
67	Tracy McAlpine	City of Stonnington, VIC
68	Pam Walters	City of Stonnington, VIC
69	Peter Wright	Yarra Ranges Shire Council, VIC
70	Ingrid Makowski	Yarra Ranges Shire Council, VIC
71	Brooke Hutcheon	Wyndham City Council, VIC
72	Meryem Osman	Wyndham City Council, VIC
73	John Kelly	Central Goldfields Shire Council, VIC
74	Bruce Boxer	Mitchell Shire, VIC
75	Susannah Milne	Bendigo Shire Council, VIC
76	Jessica Ivory	Bendigo Shire Council, VIC
77	Lisa Lagozzino	Bendigo Shire Council, VIC
78	Quoc Vo	Macedon Ranges Shire Council, VIC
79	Malcolm Ramsay	Hobsons Bay City Council
80	Lily Goneva	Hobsons Bay City Council
81	John Mullaney	Bayside City Council, VIC
82	Tony Gullone	Hume City Council
83	John Minchinton	Banyule City Council
84	Tullio Persi	Bayside City Council
85	Con Tsekouras	Bayside City Council
86	Peter Curtis	Brimbank City Council
87	Melissa Leerson	Mildura City Council
88	Travis Finch	Manningham City Council
89	Ross Cairns	Wangaratta Rural Council
90	Ralph Mertins	City of Whittlesea
91	Sean La Fontaine	Casey City Council
92	Terry Old	Casey City Council
93	Robert Rosa	Casey City Council
94	Luke Mitton	Horsham City Council
95	Rachel Juras	Horsham City Council
96	Robert Beattie	City of Kingston
97	Antony Knight	Hume City Council
98	David Esmore	Cardinia City Council
99	Robert Beattie	City of Kingston
100	Andrew Mackintosh	La Trobe City Council
101	Elizabeth Garlick	La Trobe City Council

<b>GOVERNMENT (STATE) (TOTAL = 33)</b>		
102	Tracy Ward	ISC, Dept Health and Families, NT
103	Anne Astin	ISC Chair
104	Phillipa Robertson	Dairy Food Safety Victoria
105	Andrew Chen	Dairy Food Safety Victoria
106	Corrie Goodwin	Dairy Food Safety Victoria
107	Katrina Buxton	Dept of Innovation, Industry & Regional Development, VIC
108	Craig Sahlin	ISC, NSW Food Authority
109	Peter Day	ISC, NSW Food Authority
110	David Cusack	Implementation Sub Committee
111	Stuart Heggie	Dept Health & Human Services, TAS
112	Violette Lazanas	Dept Human Services, VIC
113	Gary Smith	ISC, Dept Human Services, VIC
114	Pauline Ireland	Dept Human Services, VIC
115	Victor Di Paola	Dept Human Services, VIC
116	Catherine Finch	Dept Human Services, VIC
117	Jen Thompson	Dept Human Services, VIC
118	Terry Oughtred	Dept Human Services, VIC
119	Houa Tia	Dept Human Services, VIC
120	Candida D'Menzie-Bunshaw	Dept Human Services, VIC
121	Max Murphy	Dept Human Services, VIC
122	John Whittam	Dept Human Services, VIC
123	Pauline Sanders	Dept Human Services, VIC
124	Ryan Carmichael	Dept Human Services, VIC
125	Katy Day	Dept Human Services, VIC
126	Zaynep Dib	Dept Human Services, VIC
127	Mark D'Agostino	Dept Human Services, VIC
128	Eileen McCormick	Dept Human Services, VIC
129	Stan Goodchild	ISC, Dept Health, WA
130	Fay Jenkins	ISC, Dept Health, SA
131	Tenille Fort	Dept Health, QLD
132	Kira Goodall	Dept Primary Industries, VIC
133	Sharyn Bayne	Dept Primary Industries, VIC
134	Sue Pepper	Biosecurity Victoria

<b>GOVERNMENT (COMMONWEALTH) (TOTAL = 14)</b>		
135	Fiona Cumming	Therapeutic Goods Administration
136	Philippa Smith	FSANZ
137	ISC, Steve McCutcheon	FSANZ
138	Melanie Fisher	FSANZ
139	Sally Johnston	NZFSA
140	Carla Hutchinson	NZFSA
141	Edwina Mulhearn	AQIS
142	Kylie Jonasson	ISC, Dept Health and Ageing
143	Jenny Spooner	Dept Health and Ageing
144	Narelle Marro	Dept Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
145	Nathan Barker	Dept of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research
146	Janis	ACCC

**TOTAL = 146**

<b>FACILITATOR</b>		
	Andrea Matthews	Matthews Pegg Consulting (mpconsulting)

**Attachment B: Agenda for  
2009 Food Regulation Stakeholder Consultation Forum**

<b>8.30</b>	<b>Registration</b>
<b>9.00 – 10.00</b>	<p><b>Induction Session</b></p> <p><b>For delegates new to the food regulation system, and those interested in a refresher:</b></p> <p>How does the food regulation system work?</p> <p>What is the role and objectives of the Implementation Sub-Committee in the food regulation system?</p> <p>What are the key projects currently being undertaken by ISC?</p> <p>What is the difference between the role of ISC and the role of individual state/territory food regulators in the food regulation system?</p> <p>What is the role of the stakeholder in the ISC process?</p>
<b>10.00</b>	<b>Morning Tea and registration</b>
<b>10.30 - 10.45</b>	<b>Official Opening &amp; Welcome</b>
<b>10:45 – 11:15</b>	<p><b>Feedback Session</b></p> <p>Short session reviewing what was talked about during the last Forum – What did we hear? What actions are being taken as a result of feedback received?</p>
<b>11.15 - 12.45</b>	<p><b>Session 1 – Consistent interpretation of regulatory standards</b></p> <p>Case studies will be presented to stakeholders on the consistent interpretation of regulatory standards.</p> <p>This part of the session will be followed by an open forum discussion on issues arising from these studies.</p>
<b>12.45 – 1.30</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
<b>1.30 – 2.45</b>	<p><b>Session 2 – Consistent interpretation of regulatory standards</b></p> <p>Stakeholders will be invited to participate in break out groups to discuss potential solutions to issues identified from the open forum discussion.</p> <p>Agreed priorities to address solutions identified by stakeholders will then be considered with a view to developing an action plan(s).</p>
<b>2.45 - 3.15</b>	<b>Summation, clarification of issues received from stakeholders and next steps for ISC</b>
<b>3.30</b>	<b>Close</b>