



**FOOD STANDARDS**  
Australia New Zealand  
Te Mana Kounga Kai - Ahitereiria me Aotearoa

7-06

4 October 2006

## **DRAFT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

### **APPLICATION A512**

### **DEFINITION OF MEAT PIES**

**DEADLINE FOR PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS: 6pm (Canberra time) 15 November 2006**  
**SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AFTER THIS DEADLINE**  
**WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED**

*(See 'Invitation for Public Submissions' for details)*

For Information on matters relating to this Assessment Report or the assessment process generally, please refer to <http://www.foodstandards.gov.au/standardsdevelopment/>

## **Executive Summary**

Bakewell Foods Pty Ltd, now trading as Mrs Mac's Pty Ltd, lodged an Application with Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ) on 3 September 2003 to vary the requirements of Standard 2.2.1 - Meat and Meat Products, in the *Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code* (the Code).

The Applicant requested changes to the definition of a meat pie to ensure that meat pies only contain 'meat flesh' as defined in Division 1 of the Standard and not just 'meat' and to allow for other foods in meat pies.

The current definition of a meat pie in Division 1 – Interpretation, of Standard 2.2.1 is:

**'meat pie** means a pie containing no less than 250 g/kg of meat'.

The Applicant also requested that Division 2 – Compositional requirements of Standard 2.2.1 be varied for meat pies by establishing a 25% minimum level of meat flesh, identifying the species of animal used for meat pies and limiting the types of meat generally used by meat pie manufacturers to beef or mutton.

The Applicant considered that the proposed variations would enhance the reputation of the meat pie manufacturing industry in the eyes of the consumer and believed this to be consistent with the objectives of the *Food Standards Australia New Zealand Act 1991* (FSANZ Act).

The Applicant contended that there would not be any negative impact as a result of the proposed changes nor any negative dietary impact. The Applicant stated that their own internal research demonstrated a concern by consumers with the content of meat pies and that there would be little consequence to margins, competition and employment from this Application.

FSANZ wrote to the Applicant on several occasions requesting further information about the nature of the regulatory problem and the costs and benefits associated with the proposed changes to food regulations.

The Applicant withdrew the request for species identification and simplified the request to amend the Code to change the definition of meat pie and to add to the proposed editorial note to clarify that the proposed definition would not apply to meat pies containing significant quantities of other foods. The simplified Application is to amend the definition of meat pies to:

**'meat pie** means a pie containing no less than 250 g/kg of meat flesh'.

There are no public health and safety issues arising from the request to change the definition of meat pies. It is recommended that the simplified Application now proceed to Draft Assessment for further consideration, to allow for further submissions to inform the Final Assessment.

## **Purpose**

This Application should proceed to Final Assessment to allow for further consultation on the simplified request to require that meat pies contain a minimum level of 25% meat flesh. Varying the Standard will ensure that meat pies contain meat flesh only and will help to prevent reported fraud and deception in the industry. The proposed change will promote fair trading in meat pies and should help to reduce claims about poor practices in this product category.

## **Preferred Approach**

FSANZ proposes to amend the definition of meat pies in Standard 2.2.1 – Meat and Meat Products to replace the minimum level for meat at 25% with a minimum level for meat flesh at 25%.

## **Reasons for Preferred Approach**

There is strong support for changing the definition of meat pies from the meat pie industry, consumer representatives and some jurisdictions.

Some aspects of the original Application were however, opposed by many submissions. The Applicant made a number of initial requests to amend the requirements for meat pies in the Code, to:

- change ‘meat’ to ‘meat flesh’ in the definition;
- provide a compositional requirement for a minimum 25% meat flesh content;
- to exclude pies with meat and other ingredients from the definition;
- to identify the species from which meat is derived; and
- to include an editorial note clarifying that the meats generally used for meat pie manufacture are beef or mutton unless otherwise specified.

FSANZ therefore proposes to proceed to Final Assessment with a simplified Application and with simplified drafting to allow for further consultation on the key request to require a minimum meat flesh content of 25% in meat pies.

## **Consultation**

A total of 17 submissions were received in response to the Initial Assessment Report. Four submissions supported option 1 to maintain the status quo. Twelve submissions supported option 2, to consider amending Standard 2.2.1 – Meat and Meat Products. One submitter stated that they had not reached a position in considering the Application.

The Australian Food and Grocery Council did not support the original Application as it was not consistent with FSANZ’s objectives for the review of food regulations.

The Applicant, however, has since provided evidence of support for the simplified Application from a number of meat pie manufacturers, including a major producer of generic brands.

The jurisdictional responses to the original Application were mixed with; one opposing; another opposing the Application, but suggesting other changes; one opposing the change from meat to meat flesh; and two opposing the requests for species identification. Some jurisdictions requested reintroduction of the former compositional requirements, including a minimum fat requirement and some questioned the enforceability of the definition.

The Applicant undertook a survey of meat pie manufacturers which provided considerable support for the change in the definition of meat pies, with only one negative response to the proposed change from meat to meat flesh. The Applicant's survey asked industry members:

- Do they use anything other than meat flesh in the manufacture of a meat pie?
- Would our application result in a price increase?
- Are there any labelling costs associated with our Application?
- Would they anticipate any impacts on margins?
- Is there any impact on export markets?
- Are there any supply issues associated with the Application?

The Applicant received 9 replies, 7 stated their support for the Application, one would not have been affected by it, but did not express an opinion one way or the other in terms of support, and one did not support it. The replies to the questions above were mainly in the negative although one response raised a supply issue related to costs if a shortage of beef occurred.

The Applicant also gained support for the original Application from the Australian Consumers' Association (ACA). The ACA does not believe the proposal will negatively impact on the industry and can only benefit consumers.

Further consultation on the simplified Application will be required to reassess the basis for the reported opposition from both industry and jurisdictions.

FSANZ proposes to commence the establishment of a Primary Production and Processing (PPP) Standard for meat products in Australia in October 2006. As part of this process, FSANZ will also consult widely on the safety of various meat products that are produced by meat processing plants from slaughtered animals. This process will also include reconsideration of the terms 'meat', 'meat flesh' and 'offal'. Some aspects of the original Application will therefore be pertinent to consultation on the PPP Standard and will be addressed in a more considered way by the whole Australian meat industry. New Zealand regulatory agencies will also need to consider the issues raised, as with all the PPP standards.

# CONTENTS

<b>INVITATION FOR PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
1. BACKGROUND.....	3
1.1 HISTORICAL SITUATION .....	4
1.2 <i>Objectives for the Review of Food Standards</i> .....	5
1.3 <i>Current Standard</i> .....	6
1.4 <i>Overseas Regulatory Status</i> .....	6
2. THE PROBLEM.....	7
3. OBJECTIVES .....	7
<b>RISK MANAGEMENT.....</b>	<b>8</b>
4. OPTIONS.....	8
5. IMPACT ANALYSIS .....	8
5.1 <i>Affected Parties</i> .....	8
5.2 BENEFIT COST ANALYSIS .....	9
5.3 COMPARISON OF OPTIONS.....	9
<b>COMMUNICATION.....</b>	<b>9</b>
6. COMMUNICATION AND CONSULTATION STRATEGY .....	9
6.1 <i>Public Consultation</i> .....	9
6.2 <i>World Trade Organization (WTO) Notification</i> .....	10
7. KEY ISSUES RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS .....	11
7.1 <i>Meat or Meat Flesh</i> .....	11
7.2 <i>Compositional Requirements</i> .....	12
7.3 <i>Other Ingredients</i> .....	13
7.4 <i>Species Identification</i> .....	14
7.5 <i>Types of Meat</i> .....	14
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>15</b>
8. CONCLUSION AND PREFERRED OPTION.....	15
ATTACHMENT 1 - DRAFT VARIATIONS TO THE <i>AUSTRALIA NEW ZEALAND FOOD STANDARDS</i> <i>CODE</i> .....	17
ATTACHMENT 2 - SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS.....	18

## **INVITATION FOR PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS**

FSANZ invites public comment on this Draft Assessment Report based on regulation impact principles and the draft variations to the Code for the purpose of preparing an amendment to the Code for approval by the FSANZ Board.

Written submissions are invited from interested individuals and organisations to assist FSANZ in preparing the Final Assessment of this Application. Submissions should, where possible, address the objectives of FSANZ as set out in section 10 of the FSANZ Act. Information providing details of potential costs and benefits of the proposed change to the Code from stakeholders is highly desirable. Claims made in submissions should be supported wherever possible by referencing or including relevant studies, research findings, trials, surveys etc. Technical information should be in sufficient detail to allow independent scientific assessment.

The processes of FSANZ are open to public scrutiny, and any submissions received will ordinarily be placed on the public register of FSANZ and made available for inspection. If you wish any information contained in a submission to remain confidential to FSANZ, you should clearly identify the sensitive information and provide justification for treating it as commercial-in-confidence. Section 39 of the FSANZ Act requires FSANZ to treat in-confidence, trade secrets relating to food and any other information relating to food, the commercial value of which would be, or could reasonably be expected to be, destroyed or diminished by disclosure.

Submissions must be made in writing and should clearly be marked with the word 'Submission' and quote the correct project number and name. Submissions may be sent to one of the following addresses:

**Food Standards Australia New Zealand**  
**PO Box 7186**  
**Canberra BC ACT 2610**  
**AUSTRALIA**  
**Tel (02) 6271 2222**  
**[www.foodstandards.gov.au](http://www.foodstandards.gov.au)**

**Food Standards Australia New Zealand**  
**PO Box 10559**  
**The Terrace WELLINGTON 6036**  
**NEW ZEALAND**  
**Tel (04) 473 9942**  
**[www.foodstandards.govt.nz](http://www.foodstandards.govt.nz)**

**Submissions need to be received by FSANZ by 6pm (Canberra time) 15 November 2006.**

Submissions received after this date will not be considered, unless agreement for an extension has been given prior to this closing date. Agreement to an extension of time will only be given if extraordinary circumstances warrant an extension to the submission period. Any agreed extension will be notified on the FSANZ website and will apply to all submitters.

While FSANZ accepts submissions in hard copy to our offices, it is more convenient and quicker to receive submissions electronically through the FSANZ website using the Standards Development tab and then through Documents for Public Comment. Questions relating to making submissions or the application process can be directed to the Standards Management Officer at the above address or by emailing [slo@foodstandards.gov.au](mailto:slo@foodstandards.gov.au).

Assessment reports are available for viewing and downloading from the FSANZ website. Alternatively, requests for paper copies of reports or other general inquiries can be directed to FSANZ's Information Officer at either of the above addresses or by emailing [info@foodstandards.gov.au](mailto:info@foodstandards.gov.au).

## **INTRODUCTION**

Bakewell Foods Pty Ltd, now trading as Mrs Mac's Pty Ltd, lodged an Application with FSANZ on 3 September 2003 to vary the requirements to Division 1 - Interpretation of Standard 2.2.1 – Meat and Meat Products, in the Code.

The Applicant proposed the following definition:

‘Meat pies means a pie containing meat flesh. A pie may also contain a significant quantity of other foods, for example – vegetables, cheese etc. in which case it is not covered under this definition.’

The current definition of a meat pie in Division 1 – Interpretation, of Standard 2.2.1 is:

‘**meat pie** means a pie containing no less than 250 g/kg of meat’.

The Applicant also requested that Division 2 – Compositional requirements of Standard 2.2.1 be varied by adding the following:

‘A meat pie must contain –

- (a) no less than 250g/kg of meat flesh; and
- (b) the species of animal from which the meat is derived must be identified in the ingredients list. ‘

The Applicant further requested that an editorial note be included as follows:

### **Editorial Note:**

Industry practice generally limits meat to beef or mutton unless otherwise specified. Species clarification will make the information clear to consumers and instil confidence in the product and the industry generally.

The Applicant simplified the request to amend the Code to change the definition of meat pie and to modify the proposed editorial note to clarify that the proposed definition would not apply to meat pies containing significant quantities of other foods. The Applicant withdrew the request for species identification. The simplified Application is to amend the definition of meat pies to:

‘**meat pie** means a pie containing no less than 250 g/kg of meat flesh’.

## **1. Background**

The Applicant contends that varying the Standard would ensure meat pies only contain meat flesh and would enhance the quality of the product by preventing manufacturers from including ingredients in a fraudulent or deceptive way. The Applicant stated that this would promote fair trading in meat pies.

The Applicant contends that the proposed variations would enhance the reputation of the meat pie manufacturing industry in the eyes of the consumer and believed this to be consistent with the objectives of the *Food Standards Australia New Zealand Act 1991* (FSANZ Act). The Applicant contended that there would not be any negative impact as a result of the proposed changes nor any negative dietary impact. The Applicant stated that their own internal research demonstrated a concern by consumers with the content of meat pies and that there would be little consequence to margins, competition and employment from this Application.

## **1.1 Historical Situation**

Standard C4 – Meat Pie and Meat and Vegetable Pie in the former Australian *Food Standards Code* contained requirements relating to meat pie composition. Relevant compositional requirements in the former Standard are listed below.

- (1) A meat pie that weighs more than 70 g shall contain not less than 250 g/kg of meat.
- (2) A meat and vegetable pie shall contain:
  - (a) not less than 125 g/kg of meat; and
  - (b) not less than 250 g/kg of total meat and vegetables.
- (3) Meat in a meat pie shall not contain more than 333 g/kg of fat.

Regulation 71 – Meat pies in the former *New Zealand Food Regulations 1984* (NZFR), provided compositional regulations for meat pies in New Zealand. The former requirements in NZFR were that the weight of the filling shall not be less than 35% of the weight of the pie, and the ingoing meat content of the filling shall be at least 70% of the weight of the filling.

The Review Proposal P191 – Meat And Meat Products (including Poultry & Game) established Standard 2.2.1. This Proposal reviewed Standard C4 of the former Australian *Food Standards Code* as well as Regulation 71 within the NZFR. The Proposal established the definitions of meat, meat flesh and meat pies within Standard 2.2.1, amongst many other matters, and sought and received submissions on the proposed new Standard. Standard 2.2.1 was gazetted in December 2000.

The Inquiry Report for Proposal P191 stated that submissions clearly demanded a requirement to ensure minimum meat content in meat pies.

Submissions from stakeholders that included consumers, enforcement agencies and industry were considered in P191. Proposal P191 stated that manufacturers of meat pies may be negatively affected if the minimum requirement for meat in a meat pie was removed.

Standard 2.2.1 retains the former requirement for 25% meat content in meat pies (in the total pie including the pastry), to maintain the standard of identity for meat pies manufactured and sold in Australia and New Zealand.



Standard 1.2.10 requires the proportions of the characterising ingredients to be declared on the label. Thus the proportion of apple in apple pie, and vegetables in curried vegetable pie are required to be declared. In the case of a chicken and vegetable pie the percentage of chicken and vegetable are required to be declared if they are characterising ingredients.

Meat was listed as a class name in the Australian *Food Standards Code* and this provision is retained in Standard 1.2.4 of the Code. Therefore, when included as an ingredient in food, the presence of meat can be declared by the class name 'meat', in an ingredient list. However, it is not mandatory to use the class name meat. An appropriate designation such as beef, lamb, pork or chicken could also be used. This was further outlined in Proposal P143 - Ingredient Labelling; Proposal P156 - The Naming of Foods and also in Proposal P163 - Representational Issues: Specific Compositional Declarations, which requires that food be suitably named and that the origin, source or species of a food are required to be declared if such omissions would be false, misleading or deceptive.

## **1.2 Objectives for the Review of Food Standards**

FSANZ (formerly ANZFA) considered the former regulations relevant to meat pies in the Australian *Food Standards Code* and the NZFR as well as the section 10 objectives of the FSANZ Act to establish the provisions of Standard 2.2.1 – Meat and Meat Products. FSANZ also developed policy principles in its review of food standards.

The general policy principles behind the review of food standards were to:

- reduce the level of prescriptiveness of standards to provide wider permissions on the use of a range of ingredients and additives to facilitate innovation, where possible, but with attention paid to a possible consequential increase in consumers' informational needs;
- replace standards which regulate individual foods with standards which apply across all foods or a range of foods, where appropriate;
- develop definitional standards in appropriate cases for foods, describing their main definitional qualities to provide a benchmark for industry and consumers;
- retain standards regulating requirements for individual foods only if consistent with the objectives, and where such standards are retained, redrafting them in a tabular format (rather than the current list format) to provide greater ease in reading and understanding and facilitate simpler amendment as required; and
- redraft standards to facilitate greater ease in reading and understanding, and to make amendments more straightforward.

In addition to these broader principles, some specific objectives applied to the review of the food commodity standards. The first of these was to take account of the changes in our food supply over the last twenty years and develop regulatory requirements that reduce the regulatory burden on the food industry. This is intended to encourage greater innovation within the marketplace.

A second objective of the review was to reflect the considerable advances in scientific knowledge in areas such as nutrition, toxicology and allergenicity, and the link between diet and long-term health that is now better understood. Incorporation into the new standards of these advances in scientific knowledge should make our food supply safer and healthier.

The final objective was to ensure greater protection for consumers, especially in relation to public health and safety. This was to be achieved through the removal of standards that applied idiosyncratic rules to a limited number of highly controlled foods in favour of standards that applied generic principles to all foods in a diverse and changing market.

### 1.3 Current Standard

Standard 2.2.1 – Meat and Meat Products of the Code includes definitions, compositional and labelling requirements for meat and meat products.

The following definitions are provided by Standard 2.2.1 – Division 1 - Interpretation.

*meat means the whole or part of the carcass of any buffalo, camel, cattle, deer, goat, hare, pig, poultry, rabbit or sheep, slaughtered other than in a wild state, but does not include –*

- (a) *the whole or part of the carcass of any other animal unless permitted for human consumption under a law of a State, Territory or New Zealand; or*
- (b) *avian eggs, or foetuses or part of foetuses.*

*meat flesh means the skeletal muscle of any slaughtered animal, and any attached -*

- (a) *animal rind; and*
- (b) *fat; and*
- (c) *connective tissue; and*
- (d) *nerve; and*
- (e) *blood; and*
- (f) *blood vessels; and*
- (g) *skin, in the case of poultry.*

*meat pie means a pie containing no less than 250 g/kg of meat.*

There are currently no compositional requirements for ‘Meat Pies’ in Division 2 of Standard 2.2.1.

### 1.4 Overseas Regulatory Status

There are no apparent definitions in Codex Alimentarius, the United States Code of Federal Regulations or European Directives for meat pies.

## **2. The Problem**

The Applicant contends that the present standard relating to the definition of meat pies does not ensure that pies of a sufficient quality are reaching the consumer and that insufficient labelling of the composition of the meat pie leads to misinformation and subsequently lowers the reputation of the baking industry.

The Applicant made a number of requests to amend the requirements for meat pies in the Code, to:

- change ‘meat’ to ‘meat flesh’ in the definition;
- provide a compositional requirement for a minimum 25% meat flesh content;
- to exclude pies with meat and other ingredients from the definition;
- to identify the species from which meat is derived; and
- to include an editorial note clarifying that the meats generally used for meat pie manufacture are beef or mutton unless otherwise specified.

The Application has now been simplified to a request to require a minimum of 25% meat flesh in the definition of a meat pie and to include an editorial note, clarifying the labelling requirements regarding meat pies with other ingredients.

The Applicant requested that under the definition of meat pie the word ‘meat’ should be substituted with the term ‘meat flesh’ to overcome any doubt as to the content of meat pies under the existing standards.

The Applicant conducted a survey of meat pie manufacturers and obtained general support for the requested change from meat to meat flesh. The Australian Consumers’ Association also submitted a letter supporting the Application.

## **3. Objectives**

The objective of this assessment is to determine whether it is appropriate to amend the definition of meat pies.

The Applicant contends that making the proposed amendment is consistent with the section 10 objectives of the FSANZ Act, specifically the provision of adequate information relating to food to enable consumers to make informed choices, and the prevention of misleading or deceptive conduct.

FSANZ’s objectives in establishing and maintaining standards do not include quality assurance or market protection. FSANZ’s primary objective is the protection of public health and safety. FSANZ’s second main objective is to ensure that consumers are provided with adequate information to facilitate choice. FSANZ also provides a labelling regime to prevent fraud and deception.

In developing or varying a food standard, FSANZ is required by its legislation to meet three primary objectives which are set out in section 10 of the FSANZ Act. These are:

- the protection of public health and safety;
- the provision of adequate information relating to food to enable consumers to make informed choices; and
- the prevention of misleading or deceptive conduct.

In developing and varying standards, FSANZ must also have regard to:

- the need for standards to be based on risk analysis using the best available scientific evidence;
- the promotion of consistency between domestic and international food standards;
- the desirability of an efficient and internationally competitive food industry;
- the promotion of fair trading in food; and
- any written policy guidelines formulated by the Ministerial Council.

## **RISK MANAGEMENT**

### **4. Options**

**Options available are:**

- Option 1 Not approve - Maintain the status quo and not amend Standard 2.2.1 - Meat and Meat Products by providing a new definition of meat pies.
- Option 2 Approve - Accept the Application to amend Standard 2.2.1 - Meat and Meat Products by providing a new definition of meat pies.

### **5. Impact Analysis**

#### **5.1 Affected Parties**

Parties affected by the options outlined above include:

1. Meat pie manufacturers and retailers.
2. Importers and exporters of meat pies.
3. Consumers of meat pies.
4. Australian, State, Territory and New Zealand Government agencies that enforce food regulations.

## **5.2 Benefit Cost Analysis**

### *5.2.1 Option 1 – Status quo*

This option permits the continuation of the current definition of the meat in meat pies to include a variety of animal parts in addition to meat flesh. While manufacturers inform FSANZ that they only use meat flesh, the current definition of meat has been perceived by some consumers as meaning that meat pies do contain other animal parts. The consequence has been some dissatisfaction by some consumers, particularly when prompted by a media article articulating this issue. Occasionally the sales of meat pies have fallen, for a period, following the publication of such articles.

### *5.2.2 Option 2 – Amend Standard 2.2.1*

This option would specify that meat pies contain only meat flesh and would correct the perception of some consumers about the meat content of meat pies. Consumers would be reassured of the content of meat pies and would have no grounds to be dissatisfied on this issue. Under this option media articles would be quite different and it is unlikely that the meat pie manufacturers would lose sales revenues from this source. The meat pie manufacturers assure FSANZ that the change in definition will have no impact on their industry. They would continue to use meat flesh; no costs would be incurred and prices of meat pies would not increase.

## **5.3 Comparison of Options**

It is expected that there would be no negative impacts as a result of the changes proposed in Option 2 of this Application. The concerns of consumers about the content of their meat pies will be addressed. In addition this Application is not believed to impact on business margins, competition or employment.

There is therefore, no basis for considering, that the costs that would arise from amending the definition for meat pies to require meat flesh in place of meat as a result of the Application outweigh the direct and indirect benefits to the community, Government or industry.

## **COMMUNICATION**

## **6. Communication and Consultation Strategy**

### **6.1 Public Consultation**

A total of 17 submissions were received in response to the Initial Assessment Report. Four submissions supported option 1 to maintain the status quo.

Twelve submissions supported option 2, to consider amending Standard 2.2.1 – Meat and Meat Products. One submitter stated that they had not reached a position in considering the Application.

The Australian Food and Grocery Council did not support the original Application as it was not consistent with FSANZ's objectives for the review of food regulations. The Applicant, however, has since provided evidence of support for the simplified Application from a number of meat pie manufacturers, including a major producer of generic brands.

The Australian Consumers' Association (ACA) wrote to FSANZ in support of this Application on 27 March 2006. The ACA supported further work on this Application and believed that consumers expect meat in a meat pie to be skeletal muscle, not offal or carcass parts such as snouts, ears, tongue roots, tendons and blood vessels. The ACA supported amending the definition of meat pies to bring it more into line with consumer expectations and prevent deception. The ACA also supported species identification in ingredient lists for meat in meat pies.

The ACA believes this change is consistent with the requirements for sausages that must contain 500 g/kg of fat free 'meat flesh' in Standard 2.2.1. ACA does not believe this Application will negatively impact on industry and can only benefit consumers. In the ACA's experience, the current system of characterising ingredient labelling often fails to provide consumers with adequate information and protection.

The jurisdictional responses to the original Application were mixed with one opposing, another opposing the Application but suggesting other changes, one opposing the change from meat to meat flesh and two opposing the requests for species identification. Some jurisdictions requested reintroduction of the former compositional requirements, including a minimum fat requirement and some questioned the enforceability of the definition.

Further consultation on the simplified Application will be required to reassess the basis for the previously reported opposition from both industry and jurisdictions.

FSANZ proposes to commence the establishment of a Primary Production and Processing (PPP) Standard for meat products in October 2006. As part of this process, FSANZ will also consult widely on the safety of various meat products that are produced by meat processing plants from slaughtered animals. This process will also include reconsideration of the terms 'meat', 'meat flesh' and 'offal'. Some aspects of the original Application will therefore be pertinent to consultation on the PPP Standard and will be addressed in a more considered way by the whole Australian meat industry.

## **6.2 World Trade Organization (WTO) Notification**

As members of the World Trade Organization (WTO), Australia and New Zealand are obligated to notify WTO member nations where proposed mandatory regulatory measures are inconsistent with any existing or imminent international standards and the proposed measure may have a significant effect on trade.

There are no apparent definitions in Codex Alimentarius, the United States Code of Federal Regulations or European Directives for meat pies.

Amending the Code to change the definition for 'meat pie' is unlikely to have a significant effect on trade. Notification will not be recommended to the agencies responsible in accordance with Australia's and New Zealand's obligations under the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) or Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) Agreements.

## **7. Key Issues raised in Submissions**

The original Application requested a number of amendments to Standard 2.2.1. Therefore, while twelve submissions supported amending the Standard, it should be noted that not all of these submitters agreed to all amendments as requested by the Applicant, with some offering support for specific aspects of the Application.

The comments raised by submitters have been summarised under the following key issues:

### **7.1 Meat or Meat Flesh**

George Weston Foods, the NSW Food Authority, SA Department of Health, the Australian Food and Grocery Council and the New Zealand Food Safety Authority all opposed the proposed amendment to the definition of meat pie from ‘meat’ to ‘meat flesh’.

The NSW Food Authority considered that the proposed definition is contrary to the principles and objectives in the review of the Code to permit innovation and enable consumer choice. The Australian Food and Grocery Council also commented that the suggested amendment would result in more prescriptive regulation and reduced flexibility. These submitters suggested that the issues raised by the Applicant are best addressed by labelling or advertising to indicate superior quality and content.

The Australian Food and Grocery Council stated that the current definition allows for broad permission for manufacturers in sourcing meat. Also, the current Standard permits qualified statements that can be used to differentiate between different cuts and types of meat.

The SA Department of Health commented that the proposed amended definition does not provide additional information to the consumer and that clause 4 of Standard 2.2.1 contains relevant provisions for the declaration of offal. They also suggested that changing the definition to ‘meat flesh’ would mean that traditional products could no longer be considered a ‘meat pie’.

The Victorian Department of Human Services, the Baking Industry Association of Victoria, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry WA, Mr Anthony Dean, the National Council of Women, Mr Desmond Sibraa, Coles Myer Ltd and the Dietitians Association of Australia all supported the proposed amendment to the definition of meat pie, to enhance product quality, increase consumer confidence and promote fairer trading in the meat pie sector. The Food Technology Association of Victoria suggested that the current definition should be changed, as by accepted convention, a definition of a term cannot contain that same term as part of the description.

While supporting an amendment to Standard 2.2.1, Queensland Health suggested an alternate definition of meat pie, namely: ‘a pie which included the word ‘meat’ or a term having a similar effect anywhere in its appropriate designation is a product consisting of a filling based on cooked meat encased wholly or substantially in pastry’. The Victorian Department of Human Services also suggested that a meat pie is better defined as a pastry casing (as opposed to a pie) containing meat.

### 7.1.1 *Evaluation*

Since the Initial Assessment Report was prepared, the Applicant simplified their original definition of meat pie to:

‘**meat pie** means a pie containing no less than 250 g/kg of meat flesh’.

While acknowledging that the current regulation does not prevent meat pies from containing meat flesh, FSANZ considers that the proposed definition will ensure that meat pies contain meat flesh only and that this will help to prevent reported fraud and deception in the industry.

The proposed change will promote fair trading in meat pies and should help to reduce claims about poor practices in this product category.

## 7.2 **Compositional Requirements**

The Baking Industry Association of Victoria opposed the proposal to establish compositional requirements more generally for meat pies on the basis that this would be overly restrictive and current labelling requirements are sufficient and allow flexibility.

The Chamber of Commerce and Industry WA commented that consumers can currently be exposed to misinformation through labelling and therefore supported the proposal to include compositional requirements.

Queensland Health and The Environmental Health Association (Australia) supported the proposed compositional requirements on the basis that compositional labelling information is often not effectively available in relation to unpackaged meat pies, and therefore product quality needs to be regulated. The Australian Food and Grocery Council commented that the potential issue relating to misinformation relates to unpackaged products. In this regard, the Environmental Health Association (Australia) and the Australian Food and Grocery Council both suggested that, for unpackaged meat pies, consideration should be given to requiring the display of characterising ingredients at the point of sale.

Queensland Health stated that minimum meat and maximum fat content should be regulated for nutritional reasons, recommending a maximum of one part in three of fat. They suggested a compositional requirement that ‘such a pie shall not contain less than 250 g/kg of meat unless non-meat foods are also named in the appropriate designation and that the meat shall be in the form of meat flesh unless another meat product is specified’. Mr Desmond Sibraa also agreed that compositional requirements should be specified to prevent deceptive practices such as the addition of other food or food additives to meat pies and to limit the fat content.

Queensland Health and the Victorian Department of Human Services also supported specific compositional requirements for meat pies on the basis that definitional standards are not enforceable. The New Zealand Food Safety Authority suggested that it should be made clear that the current requirement should be clarified to mean 25% ingoing meat, as was the case in the NZFR. However, the NSW Food Authority noted its preference for the current Code structure and suggested that the enforceability issue could be addressed by way of further clarification in the Standard.



However, it supported the reinstatement of a maximum fat content in the definition of meat, as was included in the former Australian *Food Standards Code*.

Further support for compositional requirements came from the Dietitians Association of Australia and the Food Technology Association of Victoria.

#### *7.2.1 Evaluation*

Since the Initial Assessment Report was prepared, the Applicant has agreed to a simplified definition of meat pies to incorporate a compositional requirement for 25% meat flesh, rather than the establishment of a separate clause to address compositional requirements for meat pies. This approach is consistent with the policy principles and objectives for the review of food standards, specifically, to reduce prescriptiveness, to foster innovation in the food industry and to develop definitional standards where appropriate. Many of the comments relate to the previous regulations.

In terms of the issue of consumer information, FSANZ considers that the ingredient labelling, nutrition labelling and characterising ingredient labelling provisions in the Code provide consumers with adequate and appropriate information to assess the nutritional and quality aspects of the product.

However, it is also acknowledged that there is a potential information gap in relation to all unpackaged products. This issue is outside the scope of this Application and would need to be considered as part of a separate application or proposal regarding labelling of unpackaged foods.

The issue involving enforcement of compositional requirements within definitional standards is being addressed within Proposal P302 – Minor Amendments Omnibus VI. P302, now at Final Assessment, proposes to provide a deeming provision that will afford definitions which contain compositional components, a substantive status within Standard 1.1.1 – Preliminary Provisions – Application, Interpretation and General Provisions. This amendment will mean that compositional aspects within definitions in the Code will be enforceable.

### **7.3 Other Ingredients**

The NSW Food Authority considered that the exclusion of considerable amounts of other foods from the definition of meat pie conflicts with the Applicant's proposed definition that includes any pie containing meat flesh. The Food Technology Association of Victoria questioned the definition of the term 'significant quantity' and suggested that an actual figure be included in the Standard.

The Australian Food and Grocery Council commented that the proposed definition would mean that meat and vegetable pies would be classified as a meat pie and subsequently require a minimum of 25% meat content.

#### *7.3.1 Evaluation*

After the Initial Assessment Report was released for comment, the Applicant agreed to simplify the request regarding regulation of the addition of other ingredients to meat pies.

The definition proposed in the Initial Assessment Report was unclear and caused confusion. An editorial note will be used to clarify that other provisions in the Code already mean that the proposed definition of meat pie does not apply to meat pies that contain significant quantities of other foods. In this regard, it will be clearer that the 25% meat flesh requirement will apply only to pies that do not contain significant quantities of other ingredients.

#### **7.4 Species Identification**

Queensland Health, the NSW Food Authority, the SA Department of Health, the Victorian Department of Human Services and the Australian Food and Grocery Council all opposed the proposal to identify the animal species in the ingredient list. The NSW Food Authority and SA Department of Health noted that manufacturers currently have the option of advertising/promoting the animal species of meat used in a product. The SA Department of Health and the Victorian Department of Human Services considered that the current labelling requirements are sufficient to enable informed consumer choice. The NSW Food Authority also commented that species identification is not a requirement for any other product containing meat and considered that the claims of industry protection are unjustified.

The Australian Food and Grocery Council commented that the Standard would become unnecessarily complicated, expensive testing would be required by enforcement agencies and there may be contamination issues when different types of meat are processed on the same equipment.

The Western Australian Food Advisory Committee considered that the mandating of meat species will provide certainty and enhance consumer confidence, however, it could create additional costs for industry due to label changes and also prevent the use of other recognised meats in manufacture. They also commented that the Code permits voluntary label declarations which can benefit consumers.

The New Zealand Food Safety Authority, Coles Myer Ltd, the Dietitians Association of Australia and the Food Technology Association of Victoria all supported the proposal to identify meat species in the ingredient list to promote consumer choice and help prevent misleading or deceptive conduct in industry.

##### *7.4.1 Evaluation*

The Applicant withdrew the original request that the animal species be identified in the ingredient list. This aspect of the Application is therefore no longer relevant. As discussed under section 1.1, the ingredient labelling provisions in clause 4 of Standard 1.2.4 in the Code provide manufacturers with the option of declaring the presence of meat by its class name 'meat', or alternatively by using its common name, or a name that describes the true nature of the ingredient, for example, beef, lamb, pork or chicken.

#### **7.5 Types of Meat**

The Chamber of Commerce and Industry WA supported the inclusion of the proposed editorial note to clarify that meats used are beef or mutton unless otherwise specified. The Environmental Health Association (Australia), also agreed with the Applicant's concerns regarding the possible use of meat from animals other than cattle or sheep and that consumers have an expectation that meat in a meat pie is from either cattle or sheep unless otherwise stated.

The NSW Food Authority and the New Zealand Food Safety Authority noted that the proposed amendment to the definition to require 25% meat flesh does not exclude the addition of offal to pie filling, as suggested by the Applicant.

The NSW Food Authority also commented that provisions would need to be made in the Code for meat pies containing offal - for example, in the case of a steak and kidney pie, clarification is required regarding the 25% meat flesh requirement and whether it applies to the 'steak' component only or the combined 'steak and kidney' components.

The NSW Food Authority stated that clarification is required in the Standard in relation to those parts of the carcass that could possibly be used in products that are not defined as 'offal' but would fit under the definition of 'meat'.

It also noted a contradiction between clause 4 of Standard 1.2.4, which permits the use of the generic name 'meat' and clause 4 of Standard 2.2.1, which requires that the specific type of offal or the class name 'offal' must be declared on the label. The NSW Food Authority recommended that Standard 1.2.4 be amended in line with Standard 2.2.1.

#### *7.5.1 Evaluation*

FSANZ acknowledges that there are aspects of Standard 2.2.1 which require further clarification, they cannot all however, be addressed within the scope of this Application. A limitation of the review of food standards for meat and meat products was that it could not address the slaughter of animals or the operation of abattoirs.

FSANZ proposes to commence work on the Primary Production and Processing (PPP) Standard for meat and meat products in Australia in October 2006. As part of this process, the definitions of 'meat' 'meat flesh' and 'offal' will be reconsidered, as well as the handling and treatment of products as food, offal, pet food and by-products from various meat processing plants. This process will provide a mechanism, which will involve the whole meat industry in Australia, to further discuss some of the concerns raised by submitters in relation to the possible content of meat pies. As with the other PPP standards, New Zealand regulatory agencies will also need to consider the issues raised.

## **CONCLUSION**

### **8. Conclusion and Preferred Option**

#### **Preferred Approach**

FSANZ proposes to amend the definition of meat pies in Standard 2.2.1 – Meat and Meat Products to replace the minimum level for meat at 25% with a minimum level for meat flesh at 25%.

#### **Reasons for Preferred Approach**

There is strong support for changing the definition of meat pies from the meat pie industry, consumer representatives and some jurisdictions.

Some aspects of the original Application were however, opposed by many submissions. The Applicant made a number of initial requests to amend the requirements for meat pies in the Code, to:

- change ‘meat’ to ‘meat flesh’ in the definition;
- provide a compositional requirement for a minimum 25% meat flesh content;
- to exclude pies with meat and other ingredients from the definition;
- to identify the species from which meat is derived; and
- to include an editorial note clarifying that the meats generally used for meat pie manufacture are beef or mutton unless otherwise specified.

FSANZ therefore proposes to proceed to Final Assessment with a simplified Application and with simplified drafting to allow for further consultation on the key request to require a minimum meat flesh content of 25% in meat pies.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Draft variations to the *Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code*
2. Summary of Submissions

**Draft variations to the *Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code***

**To commence: on gazettal**

[1] **Standard 2.2.1** of the *Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code* is varied by –

[1.1] *omitting from clause 1, the Editorial note*

[1.2] *omitting from clause 1 the definition of meat pie, substituting –*

**meat pie** means a pie containing no less than 250 g/kg of meat flesh.

[1.3] *inserting in clause 1 an Editorial note immediately following the definition of sausage –*

**Editorial note:**

The definition of ‘meat’ does not include eggs or fish, as such foods are regulated in Standards 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 respectively.

The definition of a ‘meat pie’ does not apply to pies which contain significant quantities of other foods for example, a steak and vegetable pie.

The generic Standards in Chapter 1 of this Code apply to foods in Chapter 2, Food Product Standards. In particular, it should be noted that clause 3 of Standard 1.2.4 applies to meat and meat products.

## Summary of Submissions

Following the first round of public comment on A512:

A total of 17 submissions were received in response to the Initial Assessment Report. Four submissions supported option 1 to maintain the status quo. Twelve submissions supported option 2, to consider amending Standard 2.2.1 – Meat and Meat Products. One submitter stated that they had not reached a position in considering the Application.

Submitter	Comments
George Weston Foods Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 1 – maintenance of <i>status quo</i>;</li> <li>• does not support Option 2 to accept Application;</li> <li>• change to definition unnecessary;</li> <li>• change considered probably cost neutral as species is already identified on current packaging, as long as additional testing is not required e.g. DNA testing.</li> </ul>
NSW Food Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 1 - maintenance of status quo;</li> <li>• issues are best addressed by ensuring provision of adequate information to consumer;</li> <li>• considers proposed definition to be in contrast to the principles of the Code to permit innovation and enable consumer choice;</li> <li>• suggestion by applicant that pies that include considerable amounts of other foods would not be included in the standard is seen to conflict with proposed definition that would seem to include any pie containing meat flesh;</li> <li>• prefers existing structure of Code with an amendment to clarify that definitional standards are enforceable;</li> <li>• considers the possible inclusion of fat under current definition of meat to be a valid issue, and would support reinstatement of a maximum fat content as was included in the previous standard;</li> <li>• rejects proposal to identify animal species in ingredient list, as is not a requirement for any other product containing meat and claims of industry protection are unjustified. Notes that manufacturers are free to promote animal species if so desired;</li> <li>• calls for clarification of the declaration of parts of carcass other than meat flesh (included in the current definition of meat) that may possibly be used in products that are not covered under Clause 4, and therefore not declared;</li> <li>• notes a contradiction between Standard 1.2.4 clause 4 and Standard 2.2.1 clause 4, and is of the view that Standard 2.2.1 clause 4 is preferred and Standard 1.2.4 should be amended;</li> <li>• suggests provisions in the Code for meat pies containing offal (e.g. steak and kidney pie) would be required if definition is amended to ‘meat flesh’;</li> <li>• notes requirement of pie to contain 25% meat flesh does not exclude addition of offal to pie filling as suggested by applicant.</li> </ul>

Submitter	Comments
SA Department of Health, Food Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 1 - maintenance of status quo;</li> <li>• Proposal to amend definition adds nothing for the consumer, declaration of offal on the label or to customer at time of purchase is included under Standard 2.2.1 clause 4;</li> <li>• suggests changing definition to ‘meat flesh’ would remove traditional products out of the standard as would not be considered a ‘meat pie’;</li> <li>• considers declaration of animal species unnecessarily restrictive;</li> <li>• current labelling requirements, along with use of the term ‘meat’ as currently defined in Code is sufficient to enable informed consumer choice. Notes manufacturer is currently free to advertise/promote animal species of meat used in a product;</li> <li>• considers promotional activity and statements a better way to increase consumer awareness of product quality as additional regulation will restrict varieties of the same product sold by other manufacturers.</li> </ul>
Australian Food and Grocery Council (AFGC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 1 - maintenance of status quo;</li> <li>• the suggested amendment would result in more proscriptive regulation with reduced flexibility in meeting product requirements;</li> <li>• the proposal redefines meat pies in a way that provides less information to consumers where the pie consists of other food;</li> <li>• the suggested amendment would result in significantly increased costs for enforcement agencies with no consumer benefit in health or safety of the product;</li> <li>• notes that current labelling requirements apply to packaged product, with unpackaged meat pies being exempt from declaring the characterising ingredient, and suggests the issue of greater concern is this lack of information provided with unpackaged product affecting consumer perception and expectation. Suggests consideration be given to display of percentage characterising ingredients at point of retail sale;</li> <li>• notes the concerns of the applicant regarding the possible use of meat other than beef or mutton under the current definition, and that consumers have an expectation that meat in a meat pie is from either cattle or sheep unless otherwise stated;</li> <li>• rejects the proposal that the animal species from which the meat is derived be listed on the ingredients, noting that this would unnecessarily complicate the standard and require expensive testing by enforcement agencies, as well as contamination issues when different types of meat are processed through the same equipment.</li> <li>• rejects the proposed change to the definition of a meat pie as such a definition would cause meat and vegetable pies to be classified as a meat pie and subsequently require a minimum of 25% meat content. Furthermore, there is potential for consumer misinformation if the class name ‘meat pie’ were to apply to pies that contain a mixture of foods unless there is a mandatory declaration of characterising ingredients;</li> <li>• rejects that there is a need to redefine the meat pie to limit the meat used to meat flesh, the current standard permits qualified statements that can be used to differentiate between different cuts and types. The current definition allows for broad permission for manufacturers in sourcing meat and there is no significant concern regarding mixing or blending meat from different species;</li> <li>• suggests an alternative to amending regulation is to indicate superior quality and content by amending labelling and advertising.</li> </ul>

Submitter	Comments
Victoria Dept of Human Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 – consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• no objection to proposed requirement for meat pie to contain ‘meat flesh’ instead of ‘meat’;</li> <li>• second sentence of definition confusing and unnecessary;</li> <li>• no justification for requiring species be identified, characterising ingredient requirements are sufficient;</li> <li>• Editorial note considered unnecessary;</li> <li>• suggests meat pie better defined as a pastry casing (not pie) containing meat;</li> <li>• supports compositional requirements being placed in Div. 2 of Std. 2.2.1. Current placement in a definition is not enforceable.</li> </ul>
Baking Industry Assoc. of Victoria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 – consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• supports change to definition and proposes to include species ‘beef or mutton’ in definition as well as percentage meat;</li> <li>• does not consider there to be a need to establish compositional requirements for meat pies - considers current labelling/nutritional requirements to be sufficient while still allowing flexibility and efficiency;</li> <li>• suggests that the meat industry should be consulted;</li> <li>• changes to compositional requirements would be overly restrictive and may result in duplicating current arrangements</li> <li>• would be cost effective to include beef or mutton flesh in the definition.</li> </ul>
Chamber of Commerce and Industry Western Australia (CCI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 - consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• agrees that amendment of the Standard will enhance product quality as will ensure product contains only meat flesh;</li> <li>• will prevent manufacturers from including ingredients in a fraudulent or deceptive way;</li> <li>• supports change to Division 2 to include compositional requirements, as currently consumers can be exposed to misinformation in relation to quality through labelling;</li> <li>• suggests poor product quality can lead to loss of consumer confidence in the baking industry;</li> <li>• supports inclusion of the suggested Clause 4 as well as the suggested linked Editorial note.</li> </ul>
Desmond N Sibraa (Solicitor-Barrister-Food Safety Consultant)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 – consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• considers the former Standard C4 of the Food Standards Code to have been easily accessible and understandable, and properly enforceable;</li> <li>• considers current standard to be ‘a description at best’, not ‘user-friendly’ and completely unenforceable and suggests that all law must be ‘clear, unambiguous and easily enforceable’;</li> <li>• current standard does not specifically permit, but allows for addition of other food or food additives to meat pies such as soy protein added to deceptively increase results for meat content on analysis;</li> <li>• party pies would not meet requirement of 250g/kg meat content due to increased ratio of pastry to meat, with this being overcome in old standard as did not apply to pies under 70g;</li> <li>• suggests that no consideration is currently given to limit fat content and that fat could be defined as meat under the current definition of meat;</li> <li>• supports change to definition to read ‘meat flesh’ as current situation allows for use of other components other than skeletal muscle and suggests consumers expectation is that a meat pie contains skeletal muscle;</li> <li>• suggests absence of limits on minimum meat and vegetable content means that meat and vegetable pies are not regulated;</li> </ul>



Submitter	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• suggests that ‘unscrupulous traders’ will take advantage of the current situation where the standard is unenforceable to make ‘illicit profits to the detriment of honest traders’;</li> </ul>
New Zealand Food Safety Authority (NZFSA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 - consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• supports change to identify meat species by common name in the ingredients list, creating consumer awareness, and suggests should relate to meat in all products;</li> <li>• see no benefit in change to wording as ‘meat flesh’ over meat;</li> <li>• suggest that inclusion of other components included under definition of meat flesh would not prevent manufacture of poor quality fillings;</li> <li>• problems with suggested definition as does not include offal, leading to problems with compositional requirements in relation to products such as steak and kidney pie;</li> <li>• does not support change to 250g/kg (25%) meat content as this is accepted in industry, but it should be made clear that this applies to the ingoing weight of meat, not the cooked weight. This point should also be in the User Guide.</li> <li>• the Nutrition Information Panel provides nutrition and quality information for consumers.</li> <li>• consider the implications, including costs and benefits of requested changes.</li> </ul>
Queensland Health, Environmental Health Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 - consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• suggests that meat pies are an important food item in Australia and NZ and their composition should be controlled;</li> <li>• as compositional information is often not effectively available to consumers in relation to unpackaged meat pies, minimum product quality needs to be regulated;</li> <li>• advises that regulation by definition presents a problem with enforcement and that a compositional standard is required;</li> <li>• in consideration of good nutrition, minimum meat and maximum fat content should be controlled as is required for sausages;</li> <li>• in initial assessment report the old code was quoted incorrectly, C4 of old code said that ‘a meat pie that weighs more (not less as quoted) than 70g ....’</li> <li>• considers the suggested wording of standard is not adequate as could allow for a pie containing other foods to still be called a meat pie but be exempt from compositional regulation;</li> <li>• suggested definition that ‘a pie which includes the word ‘meat’ or a term having a similar effect anywhere in its appropriate designation is a product consisting of a filling based on cooked meat encased wholly or substantially in pastry’;</li> <li>• suggested compositional requirement that ‘such a pie shall not contain less than 250g/kg of meat unless non-meat foods are also named in the appropriate designation and that the meat shall be in the form of meat flesh unless another meat product is specified’;</li> <li>• addition of requirement that meat in pies shall not consist of more than one part in three of fat;</li> <li>• rejects suggestion to identify species of animal in ingredients list.</li> </ul>
Private (Mr Anthony Dean)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 - consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• supports proposal of a different definition and inclusion of compositional requirements as will benefit consumer to have more information on food purchased;</li> <li>• will encourage a higher standard of food production.</li> </ul>
National Council of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 - consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• supports redrafting to facilitate greater ease in reading and understanding;</li> </ul>

Submitter	Comments
Women of New Zealand (NCWZNZ)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supports clearer labelling, in particular clarification of fat content by including on label;</li> <li>• considers need to change definition as a result of increase in fast foods;</li> <li>• expressed concern that amendment of standard will lead to increased cost of pies to consumer, suggested that superior products would be repaid by increased sales;</li> <li>• notes that current labelling requirements in the Code address many of previous concerns, but that labelling must be constantly under review due to advances in technology.</li> </ul>
Coles Myer Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 - consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• agrees that changing definition will promote fairer trading in meat pies and increase consumer confidence in this food sector;</li> <li>• current labelling requirements in the Code don't appear to address the issues raised by the applicant;</li> <li>• class name 'meat' doesn't indicate the true nature of the food, suggest that consumers would prefer to know the species of meat used, would allow a more informed purchase decision by consumer and help prevent misleading or deceptive conduct in industry;</li> <li>• costs associated with amending product labels are not considered unreasonable, suggesting changes could be made at the same time as other labelling/packaging amendments providing a phase in period of 2 years.</li> </ul>
Dietitians Association of Australia, Food Standards Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 - consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• change to definition of meat pies to include 'meat flesh' would be more consistent with consumer expectation and prevent use of inferior parts of animals in these products;</li> <li>• supports the inclusion of animal species in ingredients list as will support consumer choice;</li> <li>• believes changes to the definition and to include compositional requirements will allow for further information and greater choice for consumers.</li> </ul>
The Environmental Health Association (Australia)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 - consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• notes that current definition does not exclude addition of other ingredients, however these may determine the declaration of the name of the food and the percentage characterising ingredient labelling required;</li> <li>• notes that current unpackaged meat pies are exempt from declaring the percentage of the characterising ingredient and contends that the greater issue is the lack of information provided with unpackaged meat pies rather than packaged meat pies;</li> <li>• suggests that consideration be given to require display at the point of retail sale of percentage characterising ingredients;</li> <li>• agrees with concerns of the applicant regarding the possible use of meat from animals other than cattle or sheep under the current definition, and that consumers have an expectation that meat in a meat pie is from either cattle or sheep unless otherwise stated.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Food Technology Association of Victoria Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Option 2 - consider amendment of Standard 2.2.1;</li> <li>• questions as to how the term ‘significant quantity’ in the proposed definition is to be defined, suggests the Standard should contain an actual figure;</li> <li>• suggests the current definition requires a change as by accepted convention a definition of a term cannot contain that same term as part of the description;</li> <li>• agrees with the proposed clause 4 in relation to composition, except for a slight change to ‘the species of animal or animals ...’;</li> <li>• the proportion of beef and/or mutton should be left to the discretion of the meat pie manufacturer provided minimum level of 250g/kg is maintained and declarations made in ingredients list due to fluctuations in price, availability, seasonal variation etc.</li> </ul>
Western Australian Food Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has not reached a position at this stage;</li> <li>• identification of the meat species will provide certainty and enhance consumer confidence, but could create additional expense for industry in amending labels and also by preventing use of other recognised meats in manufacture;</li> <li>• the current Code enables voluntary declarations by a manufacturer should that be seen as a trade advantage, consumers will also benefit from such a declaration;</li> </ul>