Extracted Text from Materials Submitted by Consumer Organizations to the FY2026 2nd Meeting of the Food Sanitation Standards Council's Newly Developed Foods Investigation Subcommittee (Held on 28th May, 2026)

Disclaimer

Agenda Document 1-1 | May 28, 2026

On Cell-Cultured Foods

SHUFUREN (Association of Consumer Organizations) — Hisako Wakatsuki (Auditor)

About SHUFUREN — "Bringing the Voice of the Kitchen into Politics"

- Founded: October 1948
- Formed by homemakers who rose up during the post-war period of upheaval under the motto "Bring the voice of the kitchen into politics"
- Gave social visibility to everyday consumer complaints and raised them as public issues; this work has resulted in the establishment of systems, laws, and standards that protect consumers
  - ▷ Examples: the Act Against Unjustifiable Premiums and Misleading Representations; the Textile Products Quality Labeling Act (now the Household Goods Quality Labeling Act), etc.
- Now in its 78th year, the association continues to place the establishment of consumer rights at the core of its agenda, working to protect life and livelihoods.

Past Activities of SHUFUREN on Genome-Edited Foods

- [Written Statement] Calling for Mandatory Safety Reviews and Labeling of All Genome-Edited Technology-Applied Foods (2019)
- Featured and discussed genome-edited technology-applied foods in the association's newsletter, Shufuren Tayori
- Participated in the "Public Exchange Meeting on Foods Derived from Genome-Editing Technology," jointly organized with the Consumer Affairs Agency, the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW), and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)
- Participated in an exchange meeting held in response to the acceptance of the high-GABA tomato notification (attended by MHLW and MAFF)

- [Study Session] What Is Food Tech? — Thinking About Meat Alternatives, Cultured Meat, Insect Foods, and More (2023)
  - ▷ "Soy meat" products modeled after real meat; confectionery using cricket powder as an ingredient
  - ▷ Genome-edited foods already on the market, such as tomatoes and red sea bream
  - ▷ Cultured meat produced by artificially culturing cells
  - ▷ How should we as consumers approach "Food Tech," which the government is strongly backing as a means of contributing to solutions for food and environmental problems and to Japan's economic development? Learning about the current state and the challenges involved.

Main Consumer Concerns about Cell-Cultured Foods

① An Unknown Food with No Track Record of Consumption

- Growth factors used in the cell proliferation process
- Components of the culture medium
- Impurities and mutated cells
- Additives used in the processing stage
- Effects of long-term consumption

② Concerns about "Ultra-Processed Food"

- Cultured meat is produced through an industrial process
  - ▷ Is it really a natural food?
  - ▷ The impression of being "lab-grown meat"
- Cost and pricing issues
  - ▷ Cultured meat is currently high-cost — will it ultimately reach a price comparable to conventional meat?

③ Transparency in Information Disclosure and Labeling

- As consumers, we want clear information on the following:
  - ▷ How was it produced?
  - ▷ What additives are used? Are they safe?
  - ▷ Are genome-edited components used?
  - ▷ Comparison of nutritional composition with conventional meat

What Consumers Want

Maximum Transparency from Businesses

<Commonly cited benefits>

- No waste — only as much as needed is produced
- Can be produced anywhere in a short time, as long as a facility exists
- Environmentally and animal-friendly (no farms needed; no large amounts of water or feed required; no waste generated; no slaughter necessary)
- No risk of animal-borne infection — hygienic

→ Rather than emphasizing only the benefits, we ask that unresolved challenges also be made clear, and above all, that food safety be treated as the top priority.

<Other Key Points>

- Mandatory safety review → strict monitoring by the government
- Establishment of traceability → ability to trace the source in the event of a problem
- Clear labeling → are ingredient labels easy to understand?
- Corporate information disclosure → maximum transparency
- We do not want to eat cell-cultured food without knowing it!
  - ▷ The importance of the "right to choose"
  - ▷ Without clear labeling, consumers cannot make purchasing decisions based on their own values
  - ▷ A clear and easy-to-understand labeling system is needed — one that is not left entirely to businesses
- Inspection of manufacturing processes and assurance of safety
- Establishment of rules regarding product labeling
  - ▷ We call for the creation of a system in which the government sets clear standards and communicates safety in a way that is easy for everyone to understand.

[Reference] Written Statement (Agenda Documents 1-1, 1-2)

Calling for Mandatory Safety Reviews and Labeling of All Genome-Edited Technology-Applied Foods

October 23, 2019

Addressed to: Minister of Health, Labour and Welfare / Minister in Charge of Consumer Affairs and Food Safety / Commissioner of the Consumer Affairs Agency / Chair of the Consumer Commission (消費者委員会委員長)

The notification system for the distribution and sale of genome-edited technology-applied foods came into effect on October 1. The Consumer Affairs Agency announced that it would not make it mandatory for businesses to label products as having been genome-edited, and the obligation was dropped. The reason given was that it is difficult to distinguish from conventional plant breeding, and that even if labeling were made mandatory, it would be impossible to inspect products and identify violators. We feel a strong sense of incongruity and deep disappointment that foods in which genes have been artificially manipulated are excluded from mandatory safety reviews and labeling requirements. Based on the above, we request the following:

Requests

- Please make safety reviews mandatory for all genome-edited technology-applied foods. Genome-editing technology is still a young technology. Concerns about changes in allergenic components cannot be fully dismissed. Given that the risk of unforeseen mutations cannot be said to be zero, we believe mandatory safety reviews are necessary.
- Please begin deliberations to bring genome-edited technology-applied foods under the scope of the Food Labeling Standards (食品表示基準) as soon as possible. The inability to test for genome-editing is not a reason to forgo labeling. Rather, we ask that the voices of consumers who are anxious about what cannot be determined through testing be listened to sincerely, and that genome-edited foods be made subject to the Food Labeling Standards, which exist to enable consumers to safely ingest food and make independent, rational choices.
- Please introduce a traceability system for genome-edited technology-applied foods, using documentary information-transmission mechanisms such as transaction records. We believe that labeling through social verification — such as transaction records — is

feasible. Labeling at the raw material stage would make ingredient management easier for food manufacturers and would also help prevent contamination incidents. As the EU example demonstrates, both providing and verifying such labeling is not a difficult undertaking.

- For consumers to exercise their right to choose, information disclosure is indispensable. It is vital that consumers are able to select food based on their own judgment. Labeling should be considered from this perspective, and consumers should be entrusted with the judgment to make their own choices. The current measures are incompatible with the objectives of consumer administration — namely, to respect consumers' rights and enable them to exercise those rights appropriately. The provision of information is indispensable for consumers to select the foods they themselves desire.

— End —

Agenda Document 1-2 | May 28, 2026

On Cell-Cultured Foods: Opinions and Proposals

Food Communication Compass — Mitsuki Morita, Representative

About Food Communication Compass

- Established in March 2011 as a consumer organization that "disseminates evidence-based food information." Operates the website "FOOCOM.net," providing information on food safety and food labeling by specialists. Also a member organization of the National Liaison Committee of Consumer Organizations (全国消費者団体連絡会) (a non-profit organization involved in consumer affairs).
- Conducts lectures on food safety and food labeling for general consumers at consumer affairs centers, public health centers, and consumer organization study sessions.

Section 1. Background on Cell-Cultured Foods — Consumer Interest

Cell-cultured foods have been a growing topic in recent years, and consumer interest has increased further through exhibitions at the Osaka-Kansai World Expo, among other occasions.

(Positive voices heard from consumers)

- Growing interest in near-future foods — will they be close to the real thing? Will they taste good?
- Expectations for alternatives to future protein shortages, stabilization of food supply, reduction of environmental burden, contribution to animal welfare, and sustainable technologies

(Anxious voices heard from consumers)

- Anxiety about "unknown technology" — the idea of culturing cells from living organisms and eating them
- Anxiety about something "alien" or "unnatural" — made in a laboratory or factory, unlike conventional food
- Anxiety about "safety" — eating something with no prior consumption track record feels like becoming a lab animal oneself
- Anxiety about the "manufacturing process" — concern that "unintended toxic components" might be generated during the culturing process

(Other) Background on Regulatory Deliberations

- December 2022: Cell-cultured foods were first discussed at the New Foods Investigation Subcommittee of the Food Sanitation Division of the Pharmaceutical Affairs and Food Sanitation Council (薬事・食品衛生審議会食品衛生分科会新開発食品調査部会), MHLW.
- Five sessions were held at MHLW's New Foods Investigation Subcommittee from March 2023 to February 2024; after transfer to the Consumer Affairs Agency, eight further sessions were held at the Food Sanitation Standards Council's New Foods Investigation Subcommittee through March 2026 — 13 meetings in total to date.
- Issues for safety confirmation have been organized, and a draft guideline and confirmation points have been published. Concerns and hazards have been examined in detail, and the checklist items are comprehensive in their coverage.
- The deliberations on genome-edited technology-applied foods gave an impression of haste at the time, but this has not been the case with cell-cultured foods; from the consumer side, we feel the discussions have been conducted carefully and thoughtfully.

(Going forward)

- Four framework type candidates have been presented for the regulatory framework, but the categories feel difficult to understand. Rather than simply fitting cell-cultured foods into one of the existing categories, perhaps a more careful discussion is needed on how to regulate them in a way that matches their specific characteristics.

Section 2. How Should Novel Foods Be Regulated?

For novel foods produced through new scientific technologies — foods that humans have not previously consumed — there is a system in which risk assessments are conducted from the perspective of health and environmental impact before market entry, and only those for which safety has been confirmed are allowed to circulate.

(Genetically Modified Foods)

- Safety assessment guidelines were established in 1991; GM foods confirmed safe under those guidelines were imported in 1996. Safety assessment was made mandatory under the Food Sanitation Act (食品衛生法) in April 2001, and risk assessment by the Food Safety Commission (食品安全委員会) began in 2003. A labeling system also started in 2001.
- After imports began in 1996, consumer anxiety grew, and mandatory safety reviews were not required until 2001. This time lag was later described as a "misalignment" (ボタンの掛違え) and cited as one reason it took considerable time to dispel consumer anxiety.

→ For novel foods to be accepted by consumers, it is essential that the government conducts appropriate safety assessments in advance and that labeling is properly carried out. Such transparency is also the quickest path to earning consumer confidence.

Reference. Regulatory Framework — The Case of Genome-Edited Foods

(Genome-Edited Technology-Applied Foods)

- MHLW councils began examining the regulatory framework for safety in 2018.
- Policy was finalized in March 2019: products with no remaining foreign genes were treated the same as conventional breeding (mutation breeding), leading to the establishment of a pre-consultation and notification system.
- The notification system was launched in October 2019. It is a framework in which safety reviews are required as needed following pre-consultation. (This is fundamentally different from the notification system for foods with functional claims (機能性表示食品の届出制度).)

Section 3. Overseas Regulatory Frameworks for Cell-Cultured Foods

(Trends in Other Countries)

- Singapore and the EU handle cell-cultured foods under the Novel Food framework (foods with no prior track record of consumption).
- Singapore specifically introduced a Novel Food framework in order to approve cell-cultured foods.
- The US operates under a shared system between the FDA and FSIS; FDA pre-market consultation materials are publicly available, and management involves FSIS inspection.

(International Trends)

- In 2023, FAO/WHO published a report providing a comprehensive review of potential hazard factors.
- At the Codex Alimentarius Commission (コーデックス委員会), discussions on cell-cultured foods are still in their early stages, covering definitions, principles of risk assessment, and hygiene management practices.
- In 2026, FAO published a report (legal paper) titled "Regulatory Frameworks for Cell-Based Foods and Precision Fermentation-Derived Products: An Overview of Legal Issues and Solutions."

Reference. FAO "Regulatory Frameworks for Cell-Based Foods and Precision Fermentation-Derived Products: An Overview of Legal Issues and Solutions"

Existing regulatory frameworks in many countries and regions already cover many of the issues related to cell-based foods and precision fermentation-derived foods through laws on novel food production systems and genetically modified foods, and in many cases a completely new regulatory regime is not needed. However, food safety authorities need to clarify how current rules apply to these new products in order to ensure legal certainty, protect consumers, and enable market access, innovation, and international trade.

(Cited from "Food Safety Information (Chemical Substances)" by the Division of Safety Information, National Institute of Health Sciences (国立医薬品食品衛生研究所安全情報部), May 13, 2026)

Five Priority Measures

1) 2) Omitted

3) Development of new regulatory elements and/or guidelines: In some cases, it may be necessary to develop or update specific elements of the food regulatory framework (rules on food labeling and nomenclature, updates to lists of permitted additives, enzymes, and processing aids to reflect the needs of new food technologies, etc.). It may also be necessary to develop clear supporting guidelines on the production, labeling, and marketing authorization of cell-based foods and precision fermentation-derived foods, as well as Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP), Good Cell Culture Practices (GCCP), and Good Hygiene Practices (GHP).

4) 5) Omitted

Section 4. Opinions on Cell-Cultured Foods — Regulatory Framework

The appropriate regulatory framework is Type 1: "Individual product confirmation/review by government authorities."

(Reasons)

- Japan has no Novel Food regulations for foods with no prior consumption track record, but has a long history of conducting individual safety reviews for genetically modified foods through government authorities.
- In light of international trends, a novel food framework is appropriate.
- A notification-only system lowers barriers to entry, and there is concern that it may be impossible to exclude free-rider-type businesses. Even if operators from other industries can enter the food business simply by preparing documents under a notification system, there is concern that in the difficult manufacturing process of culturing, companies that

do not implement proper hygiene management could generate "unintended components."
- There is also concern about whether HACCP alone is sufficient to ensure appropriate control of manufacturing processes. The FAO report mentions the development of Good Cell Culture Practices (GCCP) and Good Hygiene Practices (GHP). We ask that these be examined as issues unique to cell-cultured foods.
- From the perspective of consumer acceptance, Type 1 offers the highest credibility. Even under Type 3, safety reviews should be required on a case-by-case basis. Government confirmation of safety is a prerequisite for appropriate risk communication.

Opinions on Cell-Cultured Foods — Labeling

The food labeling system should be examined with a view to making labeling mandatory.

(Reasons)

- For both genetically modified foods and genome-edited technology-applied foods, labeling systems (including information provision) were considered on the premise of safety, and regulations started simultaneously. Deliberations on a labeling system should begin so that neither consumers nor businesses are left confused.
- Information disclosure through labeling is also required from the perspective of international trade.
- Terminology is important in food labeling, and words can influence consumer acceptance. What term is best — "cell-based food" (細胞性食品), "cell-cultured food" (細胞培養食品), etc.? How should product names and ingredient names be handled? Sufficient discussion is needed in the deliberation of the labeling system to avoid misleading consumers.
- If a system is established in which only products whose safety has been confirmed by the government are allowed to circulate, there may be room for further discussion on terminology that could cause anxiety for consumers.

Other Proposals — A Framework for Novel Foods

Japan also needs a safety assessment system for novel foods.

(Reasons)

1. Japan has no framework for safety assessment of foods with no prior consumption track record. In the area of health foods, the EU has the Novel Food framework and the US has systems such as GRAS, yet Japan has no such regulations — something that has been raised as a problem by the Consumer Commission (消費者委員会) and others.
2. The lack of a pre-market evaluation system for novel foods in Japan is also a barrier to advancing the development of new technologies. It is undesirable for both businesses and consumers if serious companies that cautiously weigh business risks hesitate to proceed, while less scrupulous companies distribute novel foods on the market.
3. From the perspective of consumer protection, we ask that consideration be given to establishing a safety assessment system for novel foods in Japan as well.

Agenda Document 1-3 | May 28, 2026

Comments on the Deliberation of Cell-Cultured Foods (Provisional Name)

Japanese Consumers' Co-operative Union (日本生活協同組合連合会, abbreviated: 日本生協連)

About the Consumer Co-operative

An organization where investors become members and run and use it together to realize everyone's "wishes" (共通の経済的・社会的・文化的ニーズと願い — shared economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations).

- Number of members: approximately 30 million
- Capital investment: approximately 940 billion yen
- Total business revenue: 3.8 trillion yen

Relationship between JCCU and Regional Co-ops

(Membership structure)

- Consumers → pay investment and become members → join regional co-ops and business federations (JCCU member co-ops)
- Regional co-ops and business federations → join the Japanese Consumers' Co-operative Union (JCCU)

(Product supply flow)

- JCCU develops private brand products (CO-OP products) → supplies CO-OP products to regional co-ops and business federations
- Regional co-ops and business federations sell food to consumers through home delivery and store operations, including the CO-OP products they have sourced (national brand products are also handled)

※ JCCU and member co-ops are not in a headquarters-branch relationship.

Previously Submitted Comments

(※ Excerpted from "Comments on the Deliberation of Cell-Cultured Foods," submitted to the New Foods Investigation Subcommittee, Food Sanitation Division, Pharmaceutical Affairs and Food Sanitation Council (薬事・食品衛生審議会食品衛生分科会新開発食品調査部会), December 15, 2023: https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/12401000/001178618.pdf)

Preamble

- Labeling rules should also be examined appropriately from the perspective of ensuring consumer choice
- Information provision is also necessary regarding the background and purpose of cell-cultured food development and research, and its relationship to consumers' lives. On that basis, it is important to create an environment in which consumers can choose.

Section 1. On the approach to deliberations

(1) Ensuring transparency (2) Coordination and division of roles among relevant ministries

Section 2. On terminology and definitions

On Discussions at the New Foods Investigation Subcommittee

- Sessions are held in public and have been conducted carefully and thoughtfully.
- Confirmation points and a draft guideline have been published; concerns and hazards have been comprehensively organized.
- On the other hand, the "manufacturing management and quality control" section in the draft guideline is important for stable product manufacturing. The actual methods of verification in this area and the degree of government involvement will need further consideration going forward. (For example, when manufacturing genetically modified foods, the manufacturing facility must undergo a conformity check against manufacturing standards.)

On the Regulatory Framework

- The following four framework types have been presented as candidates (※ Agenda Document 1-2, 2nd Meeting of the Food Sanitation Standards Council New Foods Investigation Subcommittee, FY2025, September 29, 2025):

  Type 1: Individual product confirmation/review by government authorities
  Type 2: Third-party certification Type 3: Notification Type 4: Self-management
- Our organization considers Type 1 to be appropriate, for the following three reasons:

  ▷ 1. Consumer acceptance

  ◇ The form of government authorities individually confirming and reviewing each product is likely to be most readily accepted by consumers.

  ▷ 2. Scientific validity

  ◇ Genome-edited technology-applied foods (especially SDN-1) are subject to notification based on the rationale that they involve "genetic changes within the range that occur in nature or through conventional breeding techniques." If an approach other than confirmation/review were to be adopted, some rationale would be needed (e.g., equivalence to existing foods with a prior consumption track record). On the other hand, since the diversity of manufacturing methods and products — including imported products — is expected to continue expanding, it is probably difficult to provide a firm rationale at this point in time.

  ▷ 3. International consistency

  ◇ Our understanding is that in many countries, novel foods (foods with no prior consumption track record) undergo risk assessment followed by confirmation by government authorities. In the US, while it is not treated as formal approval, the process involves FDA consultation and FSIS inspection.

  (※ Agenda Document 1-2, 2nd Meeting of the Food Sanitation Standards Council New Foods Investigation Subcommittee, FY2025, September 29, 2025)

On Information Provision, Labeling, and Advertising

Essentially, our views have not changed from the 2023 comments.

- Information provision is also necessary regarding the background and purpose of cell-cultured food development and research, and its relationship to consumers' lives.
- On that basis, it is important to create an environment in which consumers can choose.

Section 1. Information provision

It may be appropriate for relevant government authorities to first collaborate and advance information provision efforts (e.g., organizing what the government needs to deliberate on and communicating progress on its website; having easy-to-understand, trustworthy, up-to-date information sources for consumers to access accurate information and think things through).

Section 2. Creating an environment for choice

- Rules on labeling and advertising are necessary — in particular, so that consumers do not end up having "eaten it without knowing"
- In relation to existing meat and seafood products, it is also necessary to prevent labeling and advertising that "misleads" or "claims superiority without basis"
- Going forward, discussions on labeling rules should proceed on the premise that background information will be provided (in particular, what the label name should be needs to be decided early). While the development of guidelines is proceeding, names used in laws and administrative documents and names used in product labeling should be consistent.

On Nomenclature

- Either "cell-based food" (細胞性食品) or "cell-cultured food" (細胞培養食品) is considered appropriate, but each has advantages and disadvantages.
- In any case, since consumers are unlikely to understand from the name alone, supplementary explanation will be necessary.

Cell-based food (細胞性食品)

Aligns with the term "cell-based food" used in the FAO/WHO report (※ FAO & WHO, Food safety aspects of cell-based food (2023)), which is desirable from the perspective of international coordination. The neutral nuance does not include the word "culture" (培養), which is unfamiliar to consumers; however, it may be difficult for consumers to imagine the difference from existing foods (the subcommittee's point that "many foods are made of cells" is valid).

Cell-cultured food (細胞培養食品)

Because the word "culture" (培養) is included, it is easier to imagine that the manufacturing process differs from conventional foods. However, for those unfamiliar with the term "culture," it remains a food that is difficult to understand. Therefore, even if this term is adopted, supplementary explanation is still necessary.

Agenda Document 1-4 | May 28, 2026

May 21, 2026

National Liaison Committee of Consumer Organizations (一社）全国消費者団体連絡会)

Secretary-General: Chisako Gono

Comments on the Safety of Cell-Cultured Foods (Provisional Name)

Regarding the Consumer Affairs Agency's ongoing deliberations on "foods manufactured through cell culture (cell-cultured foods, provisional name)," we offer the following comments from the consumer perspective.

Section 1. Please ensure safety carefully and thoroughly

We are aware that throughout the deliberation process in the subcommittee, all possible hazards have been anticipated and the discussions have been conducted with the premise of ensuring safety from a specialist perspective. We agree with the development and implementation of guidelines, and express our gratitude to all parties involved in the deliberations.

At the same time, for consumers, even if told there is no scientific problem, this is essentially an unknown domain, and there is anxiety that "there may be risks different from conventional foods."

It is also certainly true that it is not easy to understand or accept that "if manufactured safely in accordance with guidelines, it can be eaten with the same peace of mind as ordinary foods."

Taking these points into consideration, we ask that the approach to ensuring the safety of cell-cultured foods not be rushed, and that as new findings emerge, safety assessment and management continue to be advanced while continuously reflecting them in risk management.

Regarding the procedural framework (Types 1–4), given that this is a novel food produced through new technology, we believe that in the initial stage, "review" by national and specialist bodies to individually confirm the safety and manufacturing method should be the basic approach. It is important to first build trust with consumers based on the fact that "only products whose safety has been confirmed are distributed." After that, as manufacturing track records and distribution data accumulate and safety standards become established, we consider it possible that procedures could transition to "notification," but we ask for careful consideration even in that case.

Section 2. Please clearly communicate the purpose of development and consumer benefits — accurately convey to consumers the background and usefulness of cell-cultured foods, and the purpose of their development

Specifically, in comparison with conventional livestock farming, please assess from all possible anticipated perspectives what advantages there are for consumer life and society, and provide easy-to-understand explanations: ① what contribution is there in terms of reducing environmental burden and improving sustainability; ② whether nutritional and health benefits can be expected; ③ how great is the advantage from an ethical perspective (animal welfare); ④ how significant is the role as a new protein source from the perspective of food security; ⑤ whether and how existing livestock production methods will be affected; ⑥ whether there will be a contribution to consumers in terms of price; and from any other anticipated perspectives — please assess what advantages there are for consumer life and society, and provide clear and easy-to-understand explanations.

Section 3. Please ensure the right of consumers to make their own choices, and reliably establish a system that enables them to do so

Even if there is a scientific evaluation that a product is safe, if consumers were to find themselves in a situation where they had "been eating food made with unknown technology without knowing it," this could result in undermining trust in the technology as a whole. For this reason, please establish proper rules regarding the "establishment of labeling means" and the "development of information disclosure," including the possibility of making labeling mandatory. Clearly labeling that a product is a cell-cultured food and enabling it to be distinguished from conventional meat products will lead to the "establishment of consumers' own right to choose."

Furthermore, at the stage when products begin circulating on the market, it is not yet possible to predict what names and formats they will circulate under, whether they will be handled as standalone general meat products, whether they could also become part of the ingredients in processed foods, or whether they will come to be frequently used in the restaurant industry. Please cover all of these scenarios and create an environment in which all information is disclosed and consumers are able to choose for themselves, regardless of the situation. It is no solution to consumer anxiety if situations in which consumers can exercise their own judgment and situations where they cannot due to circumstances beyond their control are allowed to coexist.

Section 4. Please continue highly transparent risk communication

Whether highly transparent explanations are provided by developers and government authorities regarding safety information and areas of concern will determine the state of consumer understanding. We believe that the most important thing is for consumers themselves to proactively acquire knowledge, deepen their understanding of the characteristics of new technologies and the safety guidelines, and use this as material for their own judgment.

Regarding names and terms, we are aware that various discussions have been held and "cell-cultured food" has been chosen as the provisional name. However, for consumers, voices have indicated that any of the terms — "cell culture" (細胞培養), "cultured meat" (培養肉), or "cell-based food" (細胞性食品) — tends to conjure a frightening image first and foremost. We believe that careful follow-up is needed regarding such candid impressions and feelings. The issue of product nomenclature is an important one that directly affects labeling as well. We ask for consideration of appropriate terminology and definitions based on the criteria of clarity and peace of mind for consumers.

Taking into account the many points raised above, we believe that even if it takes time, continuing to provide careful explanations will lead to an improvement in trust. It is important to advance careful risk communication so that the efforts made by developers in the process of development can translate into improved consumer trust.

— End —