Agricultural inputs, consumer disclosure and enduring liability

Submission to the Treasury

Mandatory disclosure of agricultural treatments and technologies in consumer food and fibre

15 October 2026

Voice of Australia's organic industry

Organic Operators Australia

Organic Operators Australia is the unified voice for Australia's organic industry to negotiate policy reforms with Governments and that helps the industry to capitalise on the growing global demand for organic products.

The objectives of OOA are to:

- facilitate an organic industry which has an authoritative voice that enhances the fortunes of all Australian certified organic operators, through advocacy, education and transparent representation
- improve the competitiveness of certified organic operators through effective advocacy to governments, with industry stakeholders, and in respect of research and development
- promote the integrity of certified organic productions systems
- promote industry development and educate producers and consumers in respect of certified organic production
- facilitate collaboration across supply chains and improve domestic and export market access for certified organic operators
- promote widespread uptake of sustainable farming systems and markets based on organic principles and imbued with a culture of innovation, of progressive improvement towards best practice, of transparent integrity, of inclusive collaboration, of holistic systems, and of true value pricing

More information about Organic Operators Australia (ABN 31 458 679 398) is available at https://organicoperators.au

Table of contents

Executive summary 1

- Agricultural inputs should remain visible in the food and fibre they help produce 1
- Recommendations 1

The ACL connection 3

- Follow the input into food and fibre 3
- Use an enforceable information standard 3
- A broader next step in OOA advocacy 3

Wholesale disclosure and the OGTR connection 5

- Information that must accompany supply 5
- Make the information travel with the goods 5
- Match the duty to the regulator 6

Consumer disclosure and the APVMA connection 7

- Ingredient-equivalent disclosure 7
- What the consumer should see 7
- Keep declarations accurate and usable 8

Responsibilities and legal changes 9

- Duties must be enforceable at each stage 9
- Environmental protection needs express coverage 10

Assessment that makes disclosure meaningful 11

- Assess the whole relevant pathway 11
- Publish an intelligible risk statement 11
- Keep the evidence current 12

Enduring liability for attributable harm 13

- Responsibility beyond withdrawal 13
- Match the remedy to the harm 13
- Address delayed harm explicitly 14

Financial capacity to deliver remediation 15

- Insurance and supplementary security 15

A proponent-funded remediation fund 15
Keep commercial responsibility with proponents 15
Response to Treasury's post-market options 17
Use information to target protective action 17
Implementation and measures of success 19
A defined delivery program 19
Practical design questions to resolve 19
Evaluate benefits and costs honestly 20
References 21

Executive summary

Agricultural inputs should remain visible in the food and fibre they help produce

Organic Operators Australia (OOA) asks Treasury to use the Australian Consumer Law (ACL) to connect wholesale input disclosure with mandatory information on consumer products.

OOA seeks OGTR-mandated disclosure of relevant technologies and associated inputs to wholesale buyers, including notice of downstream disclosure duties, and consumer declarations of APVMA-approved treatments used in production. Treasury should coordinate the powers needed to deliver both.

Treatments should be treated as ingredients **for disclosure purposes**, with the clarity expected of sugar in a cake mix. Disclosure should follow documented use, even where no residue is detected; residue findings and exposure risks should be reported accurately.

Alongside the RIS post-market reforms, OOA seeks a mandatory information standard, thorough supporting assessment and enduring liability for attributable human health and environmental harm. [1]

Recommendations

1. Make disclosure mandatory

Develop an ACL information standard requiring agricultural treatment and technology-use disclosure on consumer food and fibre, supported by records that follow the product through wholesale supply.

2. Connect OGTR approvals to downstream warnings

Require relevant technology suppliers and licence holders to identify the technology, associated chemical and biological inputs, material risks and the obligation to pass disclosure to buyers and consumers.

3. Connect APVMA approvals to consumer labels

Require approved AgVet treatments used in production to be declared with ingredient-equivalent prominence, coordinated with food and consumer product labelling rules.

4. Require adequate evidence and updates

Fund independent scrutiny of credible exposure pathways, publish intelligible risk statements, and update assessments, labels and supply-chain notices when evidence changes.

5. Strengthen post-market action

Prioritise Options 5 and 6, supported by effective recalls, information sharing and proportionate enforcement. Trace affected inputs into the resulting food and fibre.

6. Preserve enduring responsibility

Establish enforceable remediation and compensation obligations, backed by insurance, financial security and a proponent-funded remediation fund. Approval, disclosure or withdrawal must not purchase immunity.

7. Close gaps between regulators

Give Treasury, ACCC, APVMA, OGTR, FSANZ and relevant state and territory authorities a defined program to implement these duties and address environmental harm.

The ACL connection

OOA represents organic operators whose businesses depend on reliable input identification, traceability, soil and water quality, and informed consumer choice. Our proposal seeks consistent disclosure and accountability across agricultural production. [9]

Follow the input into food and fibre

The consumer product is the food purchased for consumption or the fibre product purchased for personal or household use. A treatment applied earlier in production can be relevant to its composition, exposure profile, production history and environmental consequences. Product safety and truthful information should be assessed across that chain.

The consumer-goods definition in ACL Part 3-3 can encompass these finished products, even where a particular commercial agricultural input is outside it. The application of each provision still depends on the goods and circumstances. The stronger legal connection is therefore the finished food or fibre and the information needed to understand it. [7]

Consumers should not have to discover agricultural treatments through an incident, a laboratory investigation or an optional marketing claim. Wholesale buyers likewise need reliable records to assess supply, protect segregation and certification, and prepare accurate consumer information.

Use an enforceable information standard

ACL section 134 allows the Commonwealth Minister to make information standards dealing with specified information, its form, records and provision to other persons. OOA asks Treasury to develop a standard for agricultural treatment and technology use, with express amendments where the required coverage exceeds existing powers. [7]

There is an established food-labelling precedent: country-of-origin information is regulated through an ACL information standard. OOA draws on that mechanism, without suggesting that an origin standard already requires treatment disclosure. Food composition, safety and labelling requirements must also be coordinated with FSANZ and food enforcement authorities. [10]

The standard should impose an affirmative duty. Enforcement against misleading claims remains useful, but should not be the only route to obtaining information about production inputs.

A broader next step in OOA advocacy

OOA's APVMA correspondence develops a standard Risk Disclosure Statement within existing assessment arrangements. Our OGTR paper develops a pathway-based approach to evidence and uncertainty. This submission carries those principles into a broader proposal for mandatory wholesale and consumer disclosure, supported by the legal changes required. [2, 3]

The information standard and enduring-remediation scheme are additional OOA proposals. They are not presented as provisions already contained in Treasury's post-market options. Treasury should progress useful immediate reforms while developing these complementary measures.

Wholesale disclosure and the OGTR connection

OOA asks for a mandatory obligation to disclose relevant synthetic chemical and biological use to wholesale buyers and users, and to notify them of the resulting consumer disclosure duty.

The requirement should attach at the point where a technology or input is supplied and continue when the agricultural commodity changes hands.

Information that must accompany supply

For relevant agricultural gene technologies and biological products, the supplier should provide a standard statement identifying:

- The product, organism or technology, its function, approval or licence identifier, and responsible Australian entity.
- The chemical and biological inputs supplied, required or specified as part of its use, with linked APVMA or other approvals where applicable.
- Assessed human health and environmental risks, affected exposure pathways, use conditions, material uncertainties and relevant handling or containment requirements.
- The obligation to record actual use and transfer that record when resulting crops, animal products, ingredients or fibre are supplied.
- The obligation to disclose that use on resulting consumer products, together with prescribed risk information and any necessary warnings.
- The current statement version, reporting contact and process for notifying buyers of revised evidence or restrictions.

The notice should plainly tell the buyer:

> *Record use of this input and pass the required information to subsequent buyers. Products made using it must carry the prescribed consumer disclosure and relevant risk warnings.*

Make the information travel with the goods

Licence holders and input suppliers should provide authoritative input information. Growers and livestock operators should record actual applications or uses. Aggregators, processors and manufacturers should retain the link between those records and the goods supplied. Wholesalers and retailers should obtain the information needed to fulfil their own disclosure obligations.

Records should identify the relevant crop, animal group or commodity batch; treatment or technology; date or production period; and source. Approved aggregation rules should preserve the

disclosed input history when batches are blended or ingredients are transformed. The standard should state how incomplete histories and inadvertent contamination are handled; absence of disclosure means nil use of declarable inputs, and producers / manufacturers should be held accountable for both disclosure and non-disclosure.

Match the duty to the regulator

OGTR regulates dealings with gene technologies. OOA seeks mandatory disclosure through OGTR for matters within that scope.

APVMA holds regulatory responsibility for assessment of gene technologies specifically in regard to AGVET treatments, and for assessment of synthetic chemicals in AGVET treatments.

Treasury should sponsor express legislative changes for uncovered technologies and downstream obligations. [6, 11]

"Synthetic biology" or a similar term should be defined in the implementing rules to cover all synthetic biological entities (not just the now redefined narrow definition of "GMO"). Labels, records and approvals should identify the actual technology or input, rather than rely on an undefined category. Changes to a product's regulatory classification should not silently remove an otherwise applicable disclosure duty.

Consumer disclosure and the APVMA connection

OOA asks that approved AgVet treatments used to produce food and fibre be disclosed on the resulting consumer products. An approval label on the agricultural input does not, by itself, tell the consumer how their food or fibre was produced.

Ingredient-equivalent disclosure

The principle is straightforward: just as sugar is declared in a cake mix, an agricultural treatment used to produce food & fibre should be visible to the buyer/consumer. OOA proposes an expressly defined disclosure category covering production treatments, positioned with comparable clarity to the ingredient declaration or, for fibre, the composition information.

This would be a new obligation. Treatment use, chemical residue and a food ingredient under existing law are distinct concepts. The proposed duty should record **use**, whether or not testing detects a residue. Where residue information is reported, it should identify what was measured and avoid equating non-detection with non-use.

APVMA sets maximum residue limits and evaluates dietary exposure based on FSANZ published consumption limits. That assessment answers a safety and compliance question, it does not itself provide consumers with risk disclosure. OOA seeks disclosure alongside applicable residue controls. [12]

What the consumer should see

- A clear treatment or technology-use statement identifying the relevant active constituent, biological input or technology and, for composite foods, the affected ingredient where practicable.
- Prescribed, evidence-based information about relevant health and environmental risks of that use, with any necessary precautions stated prominently.
- A distinction between production-stage hazards and risks from consuming, wearing, using or disposing of the finished product. Wording must identify the relevant exposure.
- A reference enabling access to the authoritative assessment, approval conditions, material uncertainties and updated information. Digital access should supplement the essential declaration and warnings.

The same core disclosure should appear before purchase online and, for unpackaged goods, at the point of sale. The standard should cover imported and domestically produced goods on an equivalent basis, with verifiable supplier records.

Keep declarations accurate and usable

Illustrative wording could read:

> *Production treatments: wheat grown using [active constituent].*

A fibre label could state:

> *Agricultural treatments used in producing this cotton: [identified treatments].*

Additional risk warnings must reflect the evidence and exposure pathway.

The default should cover approved treatments used in producing the goods, with clear rules for livestock treatments and upstream feed inputs. Administrative simplification may govern presentation and record transfer; it should not create a blanket exemption merely because use was approved or no residue was detected.

Existing GM-food labelling has defined triggers and exemptions. OOA's proposal deliberately seeks broader production-use disclosure and would require coordinated changes where existing rules are narrower. [13]

Responsibilities and legal changes

Treasury should establish a coordinated program that assigns each obligation to a responsible body. The objective is one coherent disclosure chain, supported by specialist assessment and effective enforcement.

Responsible body	Requested role and legal implementation
Treasury and ACL authorities	Develop the mandatory information standard, supporting amendments and enforcement design. Coordinate consumer disclosure on food and fibre, supply-chain records and remedies. [7]
OGTR	Require the proposed wholesale statements and downstream-disclosure notices for relevant Gene technology dealings. Use adequate existing powers and seek amendments where needed; coordinate associated inputs with competent regulators. [5, 6, 11]
APVMA	Assess AgVet risks and specify authoritative treatment, residue and warning information. Establish the proposed approval-linked disclosure duties, with complementary downstream labelling law where required. [4, 12]
FSANZ and food authorities	Develop and implement aligned food-labelling requirements and resolve interactions with existing ingredient, warning and GM-food provisions. State and territory food authorities would enforce applicable food laws. [11, 13]
Environmental and other relevant authorities	Provide the complementary monitoring, investigation, containment and restoration duties needed for agricultural and environmental pathways outside consumer-product powers. Agree accepted referrals and responsible agencies. This should align with existing sustainability disclosures where the use of environmentally harmful treatments should be disclosed by Agricultural organisations.

Duties must be enforceable at each stage

The framework should specify who must create, retain, transmit, check and publish the information. Input proponents should supply the authoritative risk statement (Including the APVMA – which has already completed the risk assessment material to this statement); downstream businesses should be responsible for accurate records and declarations within their control. A small processor cannot reconstruct undisclosed upstream information without access rights and enforceable supplier duties.

Disclosure failures should attract proportionate correction, information-production and enforcement powers. Deliberate concealment, fabricated treatment histories and repeated suppression of material risk information should attract stronger sanctions than promptly corrected administrative errors.

Commercial confidentiality should protect genuinely sensitive material without obscuring input identity, material safety findings, consumer warnings or the basis of regulatory decisions. Records should be retained for periods matched to traceability, exposure and potential delayed harm. Individual health information requires separate privacy protection.

Environmental protection needs express coverage

Information about production-stage effects on soil, water, biodiversity and neighbouring land is relevant to the purchasing decision. Where supported by evidence, the disclosure should identify those effects and the conditions intended to manage them.

Environmental investigation, containment and restoration also need enforceable powers under the relevant specialist or environmental legislation. OOA asks Treasury to coordinate that extension expressly; consumer injury reporting and recalls alone cannot deliver it. A referral between agencies should identify who has purchased the treatments and accepted responsibility for their use. This should inform potential audit targets and environmental harm assessment criteria.

Assessment that makes disclosure meaningful

Mandatory disclosure depends on adequate evidence. OOA seeks assessment that follows credible pathways from agricultural use through human exposure and environmental release, with proponent funding and independent regulatory control. Our existing APVMA and OGTR proposals provide the foundation. [2, 3]

Assess the whole relevant pathway

For AgVet products, assessment should identify the formulation, active constituents, relevant metabolites and degradation products, approved application ("on-label use") patterns, and affected food or fibre. It should examine dietary, dermal, inhalation, occupational and bystander exposure where relevant, including changes during processing, repeated use, environmental accumulation and disposal.

For gene technologies, assessment should identify the organism or product, intended function, persistence, retained activity, delivery and plausible ecological interactions, and transmutations. OOA's OGTR paper supports escalating evidence where function and exposure create a credible pathway to harm. A molecular change, novel protein or gene-transfer event alone does not establish an adverse outcome. [3]

Relevant chronic, developmental, reproductive, endocrine, neurological and other endpoints should be investigated where mechanism, exposure or evidence warrants. The assessment should address susceptible populations and plausible cumulative or mixture effects, with methods and uncertainty stated. Environmental assessment should address relevant drift, runoff, persistence, non-target effects, soil and water functions, and recovery potential.

The regulator should first screen pathways, then require targeted studies to resolve decisive gaps, escalating to realistic systems or field evidence where justified. The questions and acceptance criteria should be set independently of the proponent. Existing evidence should be reused where sufficiently comparable.

A current example of the short-coming is evident in the current senate inquiry into Paraquat and Parkinsons disease.

Publish an intelligible risk statement

The statement should identify what was assessed, the evidence and benchmarks used, authorised exposure conditions, material uncertainties, residual risks, required controls and review triggers. It should support both the wholesale statement and the consumer declaration. Its version and date should make later changes traceable.

Warnings must distinguish a substance's hazards from risks under particular exposure conditions. A label should neither imply that every treated product is unsafe nor suggest that approval guarantees absence of every possible harm. If a use presents an unacceptable risk, disclosure cannot make it acceptable.

Keep the evidence current

Require relevant post-market monitoring, prompt reporting of significant new findings and targeted reassessment. Updated conclusions must reach input users, downstream buyers and affected consumers. Treatment records should support exposure reconstruction and investigation, including after the original input is withdrawn.

OGTR's expert review and retrospective pilot can test the added value of proposed assessment questions. APVMA's Risk Disclosure Statement can be developed alongside the wider disclosure framework. Treasury should set milestones so these processes inform implementation without indefinitely postponing the legal design. [2, 3]

Enduring liability for attributable harm

The duty to disclose must be accompanied by a duty to remedy harm.

A consumer's receipt of information should not be treated as a waiver. Regulatory approval, compliant use, a warning or participation in a recall should not create blanket immunity from the proposed remediation duties.

Responsibility beyond withdrawal

OOA seeks a prospective statutory framework for designated products and activities capable of serious, persistent or delayed harm. It should impose duties to fund reasonable investigation, containment and remediation of attributable harm, with appropriate compensation rights. Responsibility should not depend solely on proving breach of an approval condition.

The framework should identify manufacturers, importers, registration or licence holders and other parties whose conduct or control materially contributed to the harm. Affected farmers, workers, consumers, neighbouring producers and communities should have deliberately defined rights, including where they did not purchase or choose the input.

This cannot be limited to "causal" link – the current get out of jail free card used by organisations causing harm. Instead, "correlation" should trigger the disclosure, and remedy triggered at the establishment of causal.

Withdrawal, cancellation, licence surrender, market exit or corporate restructuring should not extinguish obligations arising from earlier supply or release. Transfers should preserve records, an accountable entity and financial security. Targeted anti-avoidance provisions should address asset stripping and sham transfers, with fair procedures and review.

Match the remedy to the harm

Eligible remedies should include medically justified assessment, treatment, rehabilitation and continuing support; reasonable containment and clean-up; restoration of affected soil, water and ecological functions; and monitoring against recovery criteria. Where full restoration is impossible, the law should specify appropriate alternative restoration or compensation.

The design should separately address proven contamination-related production loss, testing, segregation, recertification and lost markets. Commercial or certification loss can occur without demonstrating biological injury. Eligibility should follow clear statutory tests and evidence.

Precautionary investigation, interim assistance, remediation orders and final compensation require distinct thresholds. A credible signal can justify investigation before individual causation is established. Final liability should follow stated rules for causation, multiple contributors and evidentiary uncertainty, with access to relevant proponent records.

Address delayed harm explicitly

ACL safety-defect actions include specified defences and limitation periods: section 143 provides a three-year knowledge-based commencement period and a ten-year outer period from manufacturer supply. These rules do not describe every available legal claim. Treasury should examine whether they leave gaps for designated latent harm. [7]

OOA seeks a discoverability-based avenue and remediation duties that last for the scientifically justified period of potential exposure and harm. Commencement and transition rules should be express, preserve existing rights and avoid leaving retrospective effects implicit.

Environmental duties require their own clear statutory basis and responsible authority. OOA's requested extension is from consumer-product accountability to the attributable environmental consequences of producing and using those products.

Financial capacity to deliver remediation

An enduring duty has practical value only if the responsible business can meet it. OOA seeks financial assurance for designated higher-risk proponents, proportionate to credible exposure and consequences.

Insurance and supplementary security

Require adequate insurance and examine the actual cover, including exclusions, limits, deductibles, territorial scope, gradual pollution, latent illness and biological risks. Supplement uncovered material exposures with approved bonds, trusts, guarantees or other security.

Independent technical and actuarial assessment should consider authorised scale, exposed people and ecosystems, persistence, reversibility and severe but credible scenarios. Run-off arrangements should respond after withdrawal and market exit for a period aligned with the hazard and claims framework.

Require notice of cancellation or impairment, replacement security before further relevant supply or release, and reasoned approval before security is released. Where adequate assurance cannot be provided, reconsider authorised scale or conditions. Financial cover should never substitute for reducing an unacceptable risk.

A proponent-funded remediation fund

Establish an independently administered statutory fund for urgent protective measures and eligible harm where the responsible party is insolvent, unavailable or still being identified. Contributions should reflect risk and exposure, with separately accounted sector pools where appropriate, independent reserve reviews and audited reporting.

Interim assistance should not depend on completing lengthy litigation. Final payments should follow published eligibility and causation rules, with reasons, review and protection against duplicate recovery. The fund should retain recovery rights against responsible entities and available security.

Insurance limits, fund contributions and fund payments must not cap underlying liability or require affected people to waive remaining rights. Governance should include independent health, environmental, financial and technical expertise and affected-community representation, without proponent control over claim decisions.

Keep commercial responsibility with proponents

OOA opposes government indemnities that relieve AgVet or gene technology manufacturers, importers or distributors of responsibility for attributable human health or environmental harm. Necessary public emergency action should preserve recovery rights and should not imply a taxpayer guarantee of commercial liabilities.

The design must distinguish administrative regulatory cost recovery, remediation funding and compensation. Treasury's recall cost-recovery proposal does not itself establish the broader fund OOA requests. Contribution rates, coverage and transition arrangements require legal, actuarial and economic work rather than unsupported estimates. [1]

Any claim by existing proponents that this imposes unreasonable cost and constraint is quickly dispelled by the 10x growth of AgVet treatments in Australia compared to all other countries. We have in Australia a comedic adoption of novel synthetic AgVet treatments which stands as a extreme outlier internationally.

Response to Treasury's post-market options

OOA supports reforms that allow regulators to follow an input into the food and fibre produced with it, obtain evidence, warn affected buyers and act on credible harm signals. The positions below respond to the RIS; the mandatory disclosure and enduring-liability proposals accompany them. [1]

RIS option and questions	OOA position and design requirements
1 Status quo Questions 1.1–1.2	Insufficient as the sole response. Existing powers should be reinforced by reliable information, earlier intervention and effective redress.
2 Guidance Questions 2.1–2.4	Support common identifiers, record templates and coordinated guidance. Voluntary disclosure cannot substitute for the proposed enforceable standard.
3 Supplier recalls Questions 3.1–3.3	Support clearer corrective actions, recall terminology and necessary data sharing. Non-admission protection for notification must preserve substantive remedies and underlying evidence.
4 Compulsory recalls Questions 4.1–4.3	Support timely consultation, specified remedies, notice variation and reasonable regulatory cost recovery. Distinguish recall costs from health compensation and environmental remediation.
5 Intervention Questions 5.1–5.6	Priority. Require proportionate testing, assessment, records and communication, including where an existing recall is inadequate. Trace implicated inputs into food and fibre; retain statutory safeguards.
6 Reporting Questions 6.1–6.4	Priority. Include serious chronic illness and serious near misses. Retain two-day initial reporting, followed by updates, and share de-identified intelligence with specialist regulators.
7 Administration Questions 7.1–7.3	Support direct ACCC warning and specified administrative functions, with reasons, review and oversight. Preserve the proposed ministerial role in high-impact decisions.
8 Penalties Questions 8.1–8.4	Support stronger, tiered deterrence calibrated to seriousness, benefit and culpability. Target deliberate concealment and dangerous non-compliance. Penalties must not replace remediation.
9 Technical changes Questions 9.1–9.3	Support targeted coverage and coordination improvements, including relevant product-related services. Preserve useful domestic and overseas notifications and avoid unexplained jurisdictional gaps.

Use information to target protective action

Investigation and testing should remain available when a supplier has already started a recall if evidence or protective action is inadequate. Directions should identify reasonable grounds, the unresolved question, required work, a timetable and review rights. Urgent measures need proportionate thresholds and safeguards.

For serious incidents, retain a prompt initial report followed by additional evidence as it becomes available; do not require completed causal proof before notification. Link records to affected ingredients, foods and fibre lots. Corresponding environmental reporting should operate through the competent specialist or environmental regime. [8]

A disclosure breach should attract an appropriate information remedy. A finding of an unsafe product may require restrictions, withdrawal or recall under the applicable powers. Relabelling must not be treated as a sufficient response to an unacceptable safety risk.

Implementation and measures of success

A defined delivery program

Within six months of a government decision to proceed

Publish the coverage and responsibility map; consult on the ACL information standard, linked food-labelling changes and specialist amendments; agree the mandatory data fields and consumer presentation principles. Include organic and conventional operators, consumer organisations, health and environmental expertise, processors, retailers and affected communities.

Within twelve months

Publish the proposed legal instruments, impact assessment, implementation timetable and liability-design options. Pilot records and declarations across food and fibre supply chains, including imported goods, composite foods, unpackaged sales and online retail. These are OOA's proposed milestones, not announced government commitments.

Phase in compliance

Begin with new approvals and defined priority categories, then bring existing products into coverage on a published timetable. Phase-in should reflect implementation needs and risk, with a clear destination of comprehensive disclosure. Provide reusable templates and proportionate support for smaller operators.

Review after three years of operation

Assess consumer comprehension, traceability, enforcement and remediation outcomes, with earlier action where monitoring identifies material failures.

Practical design questions to resolve

The implementing rules should define which agricultural production stages and treatments must be recorded, including veterinary treatment histories, feed-related inputs, post-harvest treatments and relevant biological technologies. They should specify how records survive processing, blending and changes in ownership, and distinguish deliberate use from unintended contamination.

Essential declarations and risk warnings should remain visible at purchase. Detailed technical material can be linked through accessible digital records. Test the wording with consumers so it conveys use, exposure and risk accurately without implying that trace detection alone demonstrates harm.

Equivalent obligations for imports require verifiable supplier documentation and workable checks. Unavailable upstream data should trigger a defined compliance response, rather than an assumption

of non-use. The design should avoid routine batch testing where records can establish use, while retaining targeted testing where it has evidentiary value.

Evaluate benefits and costs honestly

OOA does not provide quantified national cost estimates. Treasury should measure record-transfer and label-change costs, consumer understanding, detection of false claims, investigation delays, recall reach, exposure reconstruction, financial-security adequacy and time to assistance or remediation.

The assessment should include costs borne by households, health services, affected businesses and ecosystems, alongside business compliance costs. Compensation transfers should be distinguished from net resource benefits. Prevent duplicated reporting and assessment through common identifiers and accepted evidence, while retaining an accountable regulator for each obligation.

OOA asks Treasury to make agricultural input use visible to buyers and consumers, make the disclosed risks evidence-based, and keep responsibility for attributable harm enforceable for as long as that harm persists.

References

[1] The Treasury. Strengthening post-market regulation of unsafe products in the Australian Consumer Law. Consultation Regulation Impact Statement, September 2026; especially pp 18–38, 39–52 and Appendix D. Consultation and document: https://consult.treasury.gov.au/c2026-802968

[2] Organic Operators Australia. Completing APVMA's risk-based assessment model through standard risk disclosure. Letter to Scott Hansen and Ed Cram, 27 August 2026, version 2.0. OOA organisational source; supports the assessment-disclosure foundation.

[3] Organic Operators Australia. Position Paper to OGTR on Novel Proteins and Genome Dynamics. July 2026; executive summary, sections 3–8 and Appendix A. OOA organisational source; supports pathway-based assessment.

[4] APVMA. Chemical product: statutory criteria for registration, including safety and labelling. https://www.apvma.gov.au/registrations-and-permits/chemical-product-registration/what-to-include/statutory-criteria/chemical-product

[5] Office of the Gene Technology Regulator. Risk Analysis Framework 2013, version 4. https://www.ogtr.gov.au/sites/default/files/files/2021-06/risk_analysis_framework_may_2013_0.pdf

[6] Commonwealth of Australia. Gene Technology Act 2000. Federal Register of Legislation. https://www.legislation.gov.au/C2004A00762/latest/text

[7] Commonwealth of Australia. Competition and Consumer Act 2010, Schedule 2, Australian Consumer Law; s 2, Parts 3-3, 3-4 and 3-5, including ss 134, 142–143. Compilation 166, 27 August 2026, volume 4. https://www.legislation.gov.au/C2004A00109/2026-08-27/2026-08-27/text/original/pdf/4

[8] ACCC. Product Safety Mandatory Reporting Guidelines, July 2026. https://www.productsafety.gov.au/system/files/product-safety-mandatory-reporting-guidelines-july-2026.pdf

[9] Organic Operators Australia. About us. https://organicoperators.au/About

[10] ACCC. Country of origin food labelling. Explains the existing ACL information-standard mechanism. https://www.accc.gov.au/business/advertising-and-promotions/country-of-origin-food-labelling

[11] OGTR. Australia's gene technology regulatory system. Describes the respective regulator roles. https://www.ogtr.gov.au/about-ogtr/australias-gene-technology-regulatory-system

[12] APVMA. Pesticides and veterinary residues. Maximum residue limits, dietary exposure evaluation and links to the Food Standards Code. https://www.apvma.gov.au/chemicals-and-products/pesticides-and-veterinary-residues

[13] FSANZ. Genetically modified (GM) food labelling. Current approach, triggers and exemptions. https://www.foodstandards.gov.au/consumer/gmfood/labelling

Online sources accessed 21 September 2026. Mandatory wholesale and consumer treatment-use disclosure, ingredient-equivalent presentation and enduring-remediation provisions are OOA proposals in this submission; earlier OOA papers are cited for their respective supporting principles.