

## submissions

---

**From:** Deborah Miles [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 7 June 2012 2:31 PM  
**To:** submissions  
**Subject:** Re: P1018

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

### Re: Proposal P1018 Removal of the Restriction of Companion Dogs in Outdoor Dining Areas

I have studied your mission statement, philosophies and the above Proposal on the FSANZ website.

I write as a dog owner in support of the above amendment. My grounds for this submission are as follows:

- 1. More Appropriate Level of Risk Management:** best available scientific evidence confirms that restriction of companion dogs in outdoor dining areas is an inappropriately protective and an overly conservative risk management strategy.
- 2. Better Channeling of Resources:** In the hierarchy of areas of concern to human health and safety the policy of restricting dogs in outdoor dining places falls at the lower end of the scale. There are significantly more important areas that require regulation, policing and resources including monitoring of imported foodstuffs, adherence to domestic standards and assessments of producers and protocols.
- 3. Cohesion of Policy:** The current policy is inconsistent across the region. This draws into question the effectiveness of the FSANZ to obtain consensus based on scientific knowledge and to manage a cohesive strategy across all areas concerning food health and safety.
- 4. Less Impost On Food Premises:** The current policy removes the rights of owners to decide who can dine at their business thereby diminishing their control and independence and removing potential business opportunities.
- 5. Acknowledgment of Wider Sociological Needs:** Dogs can be the only companion for many people. Dogs can be better behaved than some children (and some adults). Dogs provide an opportunity for people to meet, share, and make friends. For dog owners the current policy removes their rights to a pleasurable activity in a relaxing environment. Removal of the restrictions on companion dogs will confer more benefits than risks to all stakeholders in terms of economic, health and well being impacts.
- 6. Ease and Cost Effectiveness:** Proposal P1018 is effectively a relatively uncomplicated deregulation

#### Benefit to FSANZ:

- demonstrates that FSANZ does not operate in isolation from the wider needs of a healthy community.

- is easy and inexpensive to communicate and administer. Ongoing resource requirements will be minimal.
- shows commitment to risk management policies based on current scientific knowledge and commonsense as opposed to false beliefs and emotion.
- represents a faithful to cohesion of policy which can only strengthen the credibility of FSANZ and meet the stated objective of building stakeholder confidence.
- shows commitment to the philosophy of minimal interference by FSANZ into the business of individual food and hospitality operators.
- resources devoted to administering and policing the redundant restriction policy can be channeled to more appropriate areas making for a more effective and relevant organization.

The adoption of Proposal P1018 is in the interests of all stakeholders – community members, dog owners, businesses and FSANZ.

Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to confirmation that the proposal has been accepted and absorbed into the Code

Deborah Miles

