



**Australian Government**  
**Department of Agriculture  
and Water Resources**

**SECRETARY**

Ref: EC19-00264

Senator Barry O'Sullivan  
Chair  
Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Chair

Having reviewed the transcripts of Additional Estimates hearings conducted by the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee on Tuesday 19 February 2019, the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources would like to identify two factual mistakes made in providing evidence to the Committee.

The first correction relates to a response I provided to a question asked by Senator Rice. The relevant dialogue is on page 15:

**Mr Quinlivan:** I can describe it. I'd have to get some advice on tabling it because we provided it effectively to Commonwealth and state ministerial council for their decision-making—it wasn't really a public process; it was for a decision-making process. As to the content of the advice, we, from memory, noted that there had been different approaches to this. So, I think the US, China and some others have decided not to regulate this gene editing technique as a GMO, whereas the EU and some others—

**Senator RICE:** I think Japan as well.

**Mr Quinlivan:** had made a different decision. The question we were being asked was: what were the market access implications of a decision to follow the practice that the US and China have adopted?

I wish to highlight to the committee that on page 15, I listed China as one of the countries that had decided not to regulate this gene editing technique. I would like to correct the record that China is still considering whether to regulate the gene editing technique.

The second correction relates to the correction of terminology Mr Andrew Patterson used in his response to a question asked by Senator Smith. The relevant dialogue is on page 31:

**Mr Patterson:** Of the material that has been provided to inform the investigation to date, that includes statements, affidavits and financial transactions. On the basis of what the secretary and Ms Lane mentioned, I would prefer to take further advice as to going into further detail.

I wish to advise the committee that the correct terminology for identifying material that has been provided to inform the investigation to date includes statutory declarations and not affidavits as originally cited.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the transcript of the Additional Estimates hearings and to provide clarification on the above points.

Yours sincerely

Daryl Quinlivan

21 March 2019