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The Biosecurity Act 1993 may be used by various people or agencies to manage harmful organisms, but the powers available or the functions they can carry out vary. This article describes some of these statutory roles.

**Chief technical officers**

Chief technical officers (CTOs) have been appointed in each of the biosecurity departments (three in Agriculture and Forestry, and one in each of Conservation, Fisheries and Health). These people are able to appoint inspectors, authorised persons and accredited persons who may access various powers or perform certain functions under the act or its subordinate legislation.

CTOs may also exercise certain powers or undertake certain functions themselves. For example they are able to determine organisms to be unwanted, which enables inspectors or authorised persons to take action to manage or eradicate the organism. They may also impose regulatory measures such as declaring controlled areas to regulate the movement of organisms or other goods into, within, or from those areas, and specifying treatments and procedures relating to those organisms or goods.

The chief executive of any of the four biosecurity departments may appoint one or more CTOs. The Director-General of Agriculture and Forestry may appoint CTOs to carry out all of the functions and duties of a CTO under the act, whereas there are restrictions on the functions and duties of CTOs appointed by the chief executives of the other three departments. In general, these latter CTOs are able to deal with harmful organisms that affect their responsibilities, but their role does not extend to activities relating to border control or transitional and containment facilities. CTOs have been appointed only in government departments.

**Deputy chief technical officers**

Chief executives of the four biosecurity departments may appoint deputy chief technical officers who are able to exercise all the powers, functions and duties of a CTO under the act, whereas there are restrictions on the functions and duties of CTOs appointed by the chief executives of the other three departments. In general, these latter CTOs are able to deal with harmful organisms that affect their responsibilities, but their role does not extend to activities relating to border control or transitional and containment facilities. CTOs have been appointed only in government departments.

**Principal officers**

Principal officers, who are the chief executives of regional councils, may also appoint authorised persons or accredited persons for pest management activities within their region. Regional councils may impose statutory controls to deal with harmful organisms either under a pest management strategy or small-scale management programme (as described in Biosecurity 3: 2), and may also carry out other pest management activities such as surveillance and monitoring.

**Inspectors**

Inspectors can be appointed to exercise a broad range of powers and functions including all those of an authorised person. But they may be appointed with access to additional powers and functions such as the ability to give biosecurity clearance to risk goods, to detain people in certain situations for up to four hours to enable them to be searched by the police, or to audit transitional and containment facilities and their operators for compliance with approved standards.

**Authorised persons**

The powers and functions available to an authorised person enable them to control or eradicate harmful organisms. Authorised persons may be appointed to carry out activities under a pest management strategy or, in the case of regional councils, a small-scale management programme. They may also be appointed by a CTO to have direct access to the powers and functions of an authorised person (so they need not be operating under a strategy or small-scale management programme in that case).

**Accredited persons**

Accredited persons do not exercise any statutory powers, but may be accredited to carry out certain functions. As an example, accredited persons have been appointed under the national bovine tuberculosis pest management strategy to test cattle and deer for TB. The strategy restricts TB testing to inspectors, authorised persons and accredited persons to ensure that those testing have reached a minimum level of competence.

**Management agency**

A management agency is the body specified in a pest management strategy as responsible for implementing that strategy. This body is able to impose certain regulatory controls (such as movement restrictions) relating to the pests under their strategy.

---

Sue Cotton, National Manager (Policy Coordination), phone 04 474 4283, cottons@maf.govt.nz
Ruminant feed ban regulations

Animal proteins in compound stock feeds will be regulated under the Biosecurity Act in mid-1999. The new regulations will consolidate the exclusion and labelling measures already taken by the members of the New Zealand Feed Manufacturers Association to mitigate the risk of transmitting and amplifying spongiform encephalopathy agents via stock feeds.

The feeding of ruminant protein (other than milk protein) to ruminant animals will be prohibited by law. In particular, animal feeds containing meat and bone meals (MBM) such as pig and poultry rations must be stored and fed so that sheep, cattle and deer are denied access. Specialist feed supplements formulated for ruminants must be processed under conditions which minimise any carryover of MBM protein or mixing of feed types.

Labels

Label warnings will be prescribed for MBM, compound feeds and feed supplements, dry pet foods and blood and bone fertiliser.

Risk management

The regulations will rely on risk management programmes to ensure that manufactured animal feeds offered for sale are pure, and fit for purpose as labelled. Risk management programmes operate within businesses to continuously control risks to the quality and safety of products. Programme compliance is monitored by the manufacturer as well as being certified from time to time by an independent verification agency.

Feed manufacturers will be responsible for the cost of developing, operating and verifying a risk management programme which is suitable to their range of manufacturing plants, clientele, and products. The single biggest impact of the regulations is likely to be the operational cost of producing compliant feed for ruminants, by feed mills whose core business is compounding feeds for non-ruminants. A MAF/industry working group is being formed to determine practical restrictions on feed mill operations which will assist the development of risk management programmes.

Declarations

While risk management programmes are increasingly being implemented within the feed industry and on farms they will not be required in small feed companies with a limited clientele, or by end-users generally. But the regulations will have monitored safe feeding practices.

Feed Records

MAF will have the discretionary power to require ruminant owners who use compound feeds or feed supplements to keep and provide inventory records.

Offences under the regulations will include:

- feeding prohibited material;
- making false declarations;
- failing to label, or tampering with feed labels;
- adulterating compliant ruminant feed;
- failing to make every endeavour to comply with a risk management programme;
- failing to keep or present records where required.

Communication

The feed manufacturing industry will be responsible for communicating to feed merchants, carriers, farmers and other end-users their obligations to ensure prepared feeds are stored properly and fed in accordance with the label.

MAF will be responsible for:

- “auditing the auditors” of risk management programmes;
- auditing compliance where risk management programmes are not in use;
- investigating breaches of the regulations and taking prosecutions.

The proposed content of the feed ban regulations was outlined in the predecessor to Biosecurity, (Sentinel 66: 4) on 15 December 1997, and 17 public submissions were received. An analysis is being sent to those who made submissions and additional copies are available from MAF.

Ashley Edge,
Policy Advisory Officer,
phone 04 474 4213,
edgea@maf.govt.nz

New rules will regulate the use of ruminant protein in animal feeds.
Background

The current conditions applied by MAF for the importation of animal fibre into New Zealand result from a review carried out in 1991. Under the terms of the veterinary agreement between New Zealand and the European Union, New Zealand is obliged to re-assess the disease risks posed by trade in animal fibre. Rather than consider fibre from the EU in isolation, MAF opted to carry out a generic risk analysis on fibre of sheep and goats regardless of country of origin.

It is important to note that the scientific literature contains no reports of imported fibre having been shown to be responsible for the introduction of disease agents into animal populations.

The risk analysis considered three forms of fibre: greasy fibre for scouring and further processing, fleeces for home spinning and fibre for laboratory testing.

Disease risk analysis

The analysis considered risks to animal health, and any disease risks to people handling imported fibre. The diseases considered were predominantly those of sheep and goats which are listed in OIE lists A and B. Exotic mites and ticks were also considered. The risk of introduction of weed seeds in imported fibre was not considered.

The hazard identification consisted of a consideration of the epidemiology of each disease, particularly the survival of the agent in the environment and route of transmission. It concluded that 11 exotic diseases might conceivably be carried in fibre of sheep and goats. Any disease which is likely to survive on fibre for less than a week was not considered to be a potential hazard.

The risk assessment considered in turn each of the diseases identified. This was done in several steps:

- The release assessment examined the treatments involved in scouring and further processing of fibre, to assess which of the identified disease agents would be able to survive through processing. The assessment concluded that scouring could not be relied on to inactivate all diseases of potential concern, and that waste products from scouring might also contain disease agents.

Disease risk analysis

- The exposure assessment considered possible routes by which disease agents in imported fibre might result in disease establishment in New Zealand livestock. It concluded that the likelihood of imported fibre coming into contact with livestock is extremely small.

- The consequence assessment considered the effects of the introduction and establishment in New Zealand for each disease.

- The risk estimation summarised the overall risk, and came to a conclusion as to whether or not safeguards are warranted.

Safeguards

Risk management measures were recommended for each of the three forms of the commodity under consideration, and regarding standards for transitional facilities handling imported wool and goat fibre.

Safeguards are recommended for the following diseases:

- Foot and mouth disease
- Sheep pox and goat pox
- Anthrax
- Q fever
- Caprine and ovine brucellosis (Brucella melitensis)
- Contagious agalactia
- Contagious caprine pleuropneumonia
- Enzootic abortion of ewes
- Salmonellosis (Salmonella abortus ovis)
- Sheep scab
- Exotic ticks within the family Ixodidae

Consultation

During the risk analysis process MAF consulted widely with recognised international experts to ensure that the conclusions were technically sound and the safeguards appropriate. Public submissions on the risk analysis are now invited.

Jean-Marie Derouet, Technical Advisory Officer (International Animal Trade), phone 04 498 9818, derouetj@maf.govt.nz

The deadline for submissions is 1 February 1999
New arrangements between MAF and ERMA New Zealand for containment facilities

MAF and ERMA New Zealand are developing arrangements for co-operating in the area of new organisms.

An umbrella memorandum of understanding (MoU) has been signed between the Chief Executive of the Environmental Risk Management Authority (ERM A New Zealand) and the Chief of MAF’s Regulatory Authority. The MoU covers both new organisms and hazardous substances. Its purpose is to clarify the responsibilities, powers, functions and duties of the two agencies, and to provide a framework for cooperation.

The two agencies will establish six operational agreements to implement the umbrella agreement. These will cover the following areas:

- determination of new organisms;
- assessment and approval of agricultural compound/hazardous substances;
- clearance of organisms at the border;
- clearance of agricultural compounds at the border;
- compliance with containment standards, and;
- agricultural compound compliance.

As far as new organisms are concerned, ERM A New Zealand is responsible for considering applications and approving standards for containment facilities. Containment facilities are for holding organisms that should not become established in New Zealand, either for the time being or ever. MAF is responsible for approving containment facilities (against the standards set by ERM A New Zealand) and will ensure that facilities and operators are appropriately supervised.

Containment standards

New organisms in containment must be held in approved containment facilities. Examples include invertebrates held for host-specificity trials as potential biological control agents, genetically modified micro-organisms, transgenic rats and mice, hamsters and zoo animals.

These facilities and their operators are approved by the Director-General of Agriculture and Forestry under sections 39 and 40 of the Biosecurity Act 1993, according to the standards approved by ERM A New Zealand. The standards specify the structural and operating requirements for holding new organisms in containment facilities. They also specify how these facilities and their operators may be approved.

These standards are based on the requirements of the third schedule in the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 and will be complemented by the containment controls set by ERM A New Zealand. Each standard will outline the generic containment requirements for a particular class of organisms, while containment controls will identify species- or project-specific constraints for a new organism. Central to these containment standards is the requirement that the operator documents and uses procedures to show how the requirements of the standards and the controls will be met.

MAF Quarantine Service will provide supervisors for inspecting and auditing containment operations. It will work to requirements set out in ERM A New Zealand’s containment standards.

Approving animal ID systems

Under the Biosecurity Act MAF may officially approve systems which are capable of identifying animals (or other organisms) for biosecurity purposes.

Once an animal identification system is approved by MAF, no one may use an identification (e.g. tag, mark, radio frequency device) that forms part of that system if they are not entitled to use it in relation to that organism. For example, if the Animal Health Board system for cattle is approved no one else will be able to use an identification code on cattle and deer that could be mistaken for that system. But it is not compulsory to use an approved system unless a regulation has been made that requires specified people to use it on certain organisms.

Before an ID system can be approved under the Biosecurity Act it must provide unique, clear and lasting identification in a form that will not be confused with any other generally used ID system. In giving approval, MAF will also have regard to animal welfare and user-services criteria such as:

- efficient and hygienic application of proven ID devices;
- adherence to principles of personal information privacy;
- security controls on the production and distribution of ID devices;
- data maintenance arrangements by the system administrator;
- the structure of fees charged to the ID system members;
- industry support for gaining statutory approval, and associated controls.

It is important that MAF uses a transparent approval process. There is room for only a small number of systems to be in general use for any one kind of animal before compromises are inevitable in terms of efficiency (through loss of clarity and uniqueness) and animal welfare (through re-tagging and multiple tagging, for example). Therefore, if identification does become compulsory as will be the case for cattle and deer, there must be a balance between offering a choice of approved systems and achieving efficient, whole-of-life identification.

MAF intends to notify approved identification systems in the New Zealand Gazette and in Biosecurity. Significant amendments, suspensions and revocations to approved systems will be notified in the same way. Administrative procedures for suspensions and revocations of approved status are being finalised for regulation. These include a right of appeal, and measures to preserve identifications currently in use on animals and the associated records.

Applications have been received from two animal ID system administrators and are notified on page 11 of this issue of Biosecurity.

The integrity of approved ID systems, whether voluntary or compulsory, is protected by the Biosecurity Act. The maximum penalty for removing, altering or defacing an approved identification without written authority or reasonable excuse is a $50,000 fine and/or 12 months imprisonment in the case of an individual, or a $100,000 fine in the case of a corporation. The same maximum penalty applies to the offences of knowingly using an approved identification issued to another animal owner, or imitating an approved identification.

Ashley Edge, Policy Advisory Officer, phone 04 474 4213, edgea@maf.govt.nz

Kevin Corrin, National Manager (Animal Quarantine), phone 04 474 4136, corrink@maf.govt.nz
Pest management strategies are to be developed for exotic animal diseases of concern. Comments are sought on the next stage of this process, and nominations for membership invited.

The previous issue of Biosecurity (7: 6-7) outlined a draft process for the development of a pest management strategy or strategies for exotic diseases of animals. Key components of this process are the technical focus groups and a steering group.

**Technical focus groups**

It is suggested that six separate groups be established to consider diseases of concern to the ruminant, porcine, equine, avian, aquaculture and apiculture sectors. The proposed terms of reference for the technical focus groups (to be confirmed by each group) are to:

- develop technical plans for the control/eradication of exotic animal diseases, for use in preparing pest management strategies pursuant to the Biosecurity Act 1993;
- aim to have the technical plans ready for cost-benefit analysis by mid-1999;
- provide advice on issues relating to exotic animal disease control or eradication that will be used when developing pest management strategies.

The groups are to prepare control/eradication plans for each disease of concern assigned to them. The draft technical plans will be reviewed by recognised experts, and then subjected to cost-benefit analysis. Technical plans with a negative cost-benefit will be reconsidered by the group to determine whether an acceptable alternative can be developed. Plans with a positive cost-benefit will be submitted for development into a pest management strategy by a separate steering group.

Each technical focus group will include nominees from industries and interested government departments, and may include nominees from other interested organisations and members of the public.

MAF expects technical focus groups to start work early in 1999, so the proposed control measures can undergo a cost benefit-analysis by the middle of the year. Each technical focus group is expected to meet at least twice. Written material may also be distributed for consideration out of session.

There will be a continuing advisory role for the groups after the main task has been completed. In the case of an exotic disease response, members of the technical focus group may be asked to act as advisers to MAF. The future status of each technical focus group and its relationship to the equivalent technical subcommittee of the Agricultural Security Consultative Committee will be considered after its tasks relating to the pest management strategy have been completed.

**Steering group**

It is expected that there will be a single group to take the proposed disease control measures and build a proposal for a pest management strategy which meets the requirements of the Biosecurity Act. These include deciding on a management structure, specifying rules, negotiating financial arrangements, and ensuring that the costs of the strategy are outweighed by the benefits of having it. The terms of reference for the steering group have yet to be finalised.

The steering group begins work after the cost-benefit analysis for each disease has been completed, possibly late in 1999, and is expected to take a minimum of a year to work through the drafting and consultation processes.

**Invitation**

Industry organisations, other interested organisations and members of the public are invited to register their interest in participating in the development of pest management strategies for specified exotic diseases of animals. (Exactly which exotic diseases are to be covered will be finalised as part of the process and will depend to some extent on whether the benefits of having a strategy outweigh the costs for each disease.)

At this stage, MAF expects that there will be three distinct roles. They are not exclusive of each other but do call for different knowledge and expertise:

- As part of a technical focus group, joining MAF’s exotic disease specialists.
- As a member of the steering group to develop a pest management strategy.
- As an interested party, to go on MAF’s consultation list for this project.

Participants in the process, whatever their role, will be expected to bear their own costs of participation such as time and travel.

Elizabeth Stoddart, Technical Advisory Officer (Animal Quarantine), phone 04 498 9634, stoddarte@maf.govt.nz

Nominations for the technical focus groups close on 1 February 1999.
Two new state-owned enterprises formed from the now-defunct MAF Quality Management, Asure New Zealand and AgriQuality New Zealand, swung into business on 1 November.

Earlier this year the government decided to establish two new SOEs to deliver services provided by MAF Quality Management (MQM). AgriQuality New Zealand will focus on the agri-food industry, and Asure New Zealand will focus on meat inspection services.

The purpose of establishing the SOEs is to separate service delivery from the core government tasks of policy and regulatory standards, and to improve the efficiency and performance of both businesses to ensure their viability. The move to establish the SOEs follows three strategic reviews (1996, 1997 and 1998) of the Crown's involvement in MQM, which concluded that operations within MQM were capable of being commercially viable.

AgriQuality New Zealand will provide services covering farm quality and animal health, quality assurance services for a wide range of food products, and biosecurity and food safety services. While its services will become contestable and more cost-effective for the primary sector, MAF will retain control of regulatory functions and the certification process.

Health surveillance and emergency disease and pest response (EDPR) will continue to be controlled through MAF, with services contracted from both SOEs and other service providers within tight specifications. Reference diagnostic laboratories for plant and animal pests and diseases will remain in government ownership.

Biosecurity control at the border will be retained within MAF. Post-quarantine services not considered a core regulatory function are already being supplied by the private sector. Government regulations will not change, nor will the standards which need to be met. Key certification processes will be controlled by the government.

AgriQuality New Zealand

This business will provide specialist advice to customers, as well as monitoring and controlling standards and quality. The SOE's client base includes producers, processors, manufacturers, retailers and exporters in the agri-food business.

The four strategic business units within AgriQuality New Zealand are:

**Farm Network** provides advisory and technical services to assist with the identification and control of disease and other production-limiting factors on farms. These services aim to enhance production volumes and production quality.

**Assurance Services** works in partnership with customers, providing advice about achieving standards, enhancing quality and adding value through supply-chain management.

**Lab Network** provides technical analysis for producers, processors and retailers dealing with food products, to ensure quality standards, food safety and market access.

**Emergency Response** provides a national operational management ability able to respond quickly to emergency situations, including issues of biosecurity and food health, in the public and private sectors. This business also advises customers on risk-management strategies and emergency response, and provides field and laboratory surveillance services for plant and seed pests and diseases.

Asure New Zealand

Asure New Zealand Ltd will provide front-line meat inspection services and other services to the meat processing industry. It is targeting the country's four largest meat processing companies as well as some of the 40 smaller processors operating around the country. More than 60% of its business is expected to come from the 'big four'.

The SOE's chief executive Terry Pierson said the major meat companies had been visited during the establishment phase and the industry message had been clear. "They want cost efficiency, simplicity and high levels of service. Our approach to our relationships with them will be to develop partnerships which make compliance with food safety regulations easy and efficient."

Hugh Lynch, Chief Executive Officer, AgriQuality New Zealand, Private Bag SAMC, (33 Lambie Drive), Manukau City, Auckland, phone 09 262 7350, fax 09 262 7370, www.agriquality.co.nz

Terry Pierson, Chief Executive Officer, Asure New Zealand, PO Box 1141, (Level 3, Hong Kong Bank House, 141 Cambridge Terrace), Christchurch, phone 03 353 1370, fax 03 353 1371
Draft import health standards for consultation

The following draft import health standards (IHSs) have been developed by MAF and are available for public consultation:

**Pig meat products from Chile**

MAF Regulatory Authority is responding to a market access request from Chile for pig meat products. The safeguards included in this IHS are based on The importation into New Zealand of meat and meat products; a review of the risks to animal health by Dr Stuart MacDiarmid.

**Pig semen from the United States of America**

Safeguards for porcine respiratory and reproductive syndrome (PRRS) during the importation of semen have been reviewed, based on a risk analysis prepared by a consultant to the Pork Industry Board. The risk analysis estimated the level of risks using a variety of safeguards against PRRS, and the revised IHS contains the measures considered by MAF to provide an appropriate level of protection against this disease.

**Dairy products for human consumption (manufactured from New Zealand/Australian origin dairy products) from Thailand**

MAF will approve Thai dairy processing premises for the manufacture of dairy products for human consumption made from New Zealand/Australian dairy products on a case-by-case basis. All dairy products must be pasteurised to time/temperature parameters known to inactivate the foot and mouth disease virus. These measures were discussed in the MAF dairy risk analysis reported in the predecessor to Biosecurity (Sentinel 64: 9, 15 September 1997).

**BSE safeguards for beef products**

The world organisation for animal health or Office International des Epizooties (OIE) is reviewing its recommendations against bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) for the importation of beef products. MAF has now produced a consultation document illustrating how these recommendations would be incorporated into revised import health standards.

**Live pigs and pig semen from New Caledonia**

MAF Regulatory Authority has responded to a market access request from New Caledonia for live pigs and pig semen, as the pig industry wishes to export pigs and semen for the agricultural field days. A disease risk analysis has been completed, and draft import health standards proposed. New Caledonia has supplied animal health surveillance data indicating freedom from all OIE list A diseases of pigs.

Survey data has also been provided for some OIE list B diseases. Since 1982 New Caledonia has imported live pigs only from Australia and New Zealand.

Jean-Marie Derouet, Technical Advisory Officer, International Animal Trade, phone 04 498 9818, derouetj@maf.govt.nz

The deadline for submissions is 1 February 1999

Macropod skins and fibre from Australia

An analysis of the biosecurity risks posed by the importation of macropod (kangaroo, wallabies and wallaroos) skins and fibre from Australia is available for public consultation. The analysis recommends animal source and/or processing safeguards that the products must comply with.

Accompanying the analysis is a draft import health standard based on the recommended safeguards. Small quantities of trophy skins are currently imported using an existing import health standard; importer requests for fibre and greater quantities of skins instigated the development of the new import health standard.

Sarah Peters, Technical Advisory Officer (International Animal Trade), phone 04 474 4116, peterss@maf.govt.nz

The deadline for submissions is 1 February 1999

New import health standards issued

The following new import health standards (IHSs) have been issued by the Chief Veterinary Officer and are available for use. Any previous IHSs covering these combinations of country of origin and commodity/species have been revoked.

**Deer from the United Kingdom**

**Deer embryos from the United Kingdom**

**Deer semen from the United Kingdom**

These IHSs have been altered by adding technical changes relating to safeguards for transmissible spongiform encephalopathies.

Section 8.1 (eligibility) now includes the scientific and common names of deer present in New Zealand, and importation is restricted to these species. These are the species the Department of Conservation determines have already established a feral range in New Zealand.

Commercial shipments of untanned cattle/sheep/goat hides and skins of New Zealand origin

Clause 4.1 has been reworded to bring the standard in line with the new terminology relating to transitional facilities and biosecurity direction.
Live ratites into New Zealand from Australia
This was amended to bring consistency in the testing requirements between the pre-export and post-export quarantine. This standard replaces that dated 18 March 1998.

Specific pathogen free (SPF) chicken (Gallus gallus) eggs for MAF reference laboratory use from Australia
This standard dated 1 November 1998 was implemented to enable the supply necessary for diagnostic use by the MAF reference laboratory at the National Centre for Disease Investigation at Wallaceville. The standard is in line with existing policy and was consulted on with the Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand (PIANZ).

Requests have subsequently been received for the importation of SPF eggs for both research and industrial uses from the USA as well as Australia. MAF has proposed an IHS developed for wider uses, including the same safeguards as those in the IHS already implemented for the importation of SPF eggs for use in the MAF reference laboratory. An important feature is the level of security required for the facilities in which these SPF eggs will be used.

Crocodile meat products from Australia
MAF has accepted that crocodile meat products certified by AQIS as derived from farmed crocodiles of Australian origin and processed in accordance with the Australian standard for hygienic production of crocodile meat for human consumption provides an equivalent assurance to MAF’s zoosanitary requirements.

Laboratory animals into New Zealand
The import health standard has been amended to bring it in line with the new terminology relating to transitional facilities and biosecurity direction introduced through the Biosecurity Amendment Act 1997.

Zoological animals into New Zealand
- African hunting dogs into New Zealand (dated 18 November 1998);
- Red pandas into New Zealand (dated 14 October 1998);
- Viverridae into New Zealand (dated 14 October 1998).

The above import health standards were developed from risk analyses which were prepared by Dr Richard Jakob-Hoff and Dr Kerrie Rose. These risk analyses were reviewed by MAF Regulatory Authority.

Dogs and cats from Fiji
Section 11 of the standard has been altered to change the term ‘biosecurity clearance’ to ‘biosecurity direction’.

Preserved animal specimens from all countries
This standard, dated 23 November 1998, replaces IHS 152.10.05.202 from the MAF 152.10 series (specimens in formalin/alcohol) that relates to animal tissues and faeces. No conditions are altered.

Non-viable invertebrates from all countries
This new standard, dated 17 November 1998, replaces the IHSs 152.10.05.202 (specimens in formalin/alcohol) and 152.10.03.210 (dead bees) from the MAF 152.10 series. It also allows for dried invertebrates other than bees to be imported.

Ornamental animal products from all countries
This IHS, dated 18 November 1998, replaces the import health standard for the importation of animal specimens for ornamental purposes into New Zealand, dated 15 January 1998. The range of eligible products has been clarified at the request of border staff to include more examples, in particular skin drums, shields and belts. Bone ornaments are also included as they are no longer covered in the MAF 152.10 series.

Draft risk analysis for consultation
The following draft risk analysis has been developed by MAF and is available for public consultation:

Import risk analysis: branded organic-based fertilisers
An analysis of the biosecurity risks posed by the importation of a specific range of organic-based fertilisers from the USA (California) is available for public consultation (the brand name is not revealed for commercial reasons). The fertilisers contain cattle blood and bone meal, and poultry and fish hydrolysates. All cattle and poultry used in the fertilisers have received ante- and post-mortem inspections in government-controlled slaughter premises. The fish used in the fertilisers is from salt-water sources. The ingredients are processed by heat or enzymes and dried to a stable acidic powder form until use.

The analysis recommends safeguards relating to the source of the animals and/or processing methods that the products must comply with. These safeguards would form the basis of any future import health standard for these products.

Jean-Marie Derouet, Technical Advisory Officer (International Animal Trade), phone 04 498 9818, derouetj@maf.govt.nz

The deadline for submissions is 1 February 1999
Keeping bees in Coromandel and eastern Bay of Plenty

MAF has revised the statutory permits which are required before bees may be kept in the Coromandel and eastern Bay of Plenty restricted beekeeping areas. The new permits will be valid for the next two honey-producing seasons. They will expire on 1 May 2000 so that renewal can be aligned with the reporting period for the American foulbrood pest management strategy.

The permits, a requirement under the Apiaries Act 1969, are being directly mailed to all beekeepers who have registered permanent or seasonal apiaries located in the restricted areas. Compliance will be administered by AgriQuality New Zealand Ltd (formerly MAF Quality Management) from their Tauranga office.

The two restricted areas were initially declared in 1977 and 1948 respectively because of the risk to humans from consuming poisonous honey. Honeydew produced by the passion vine hopper insect when it feeds on the toxic plant tutu is sometimes collected by bees and transformed into honey. During the high risk period (e.g. 11 December to 30 April in the eastern Bay of Plenty) when the passion vine hopper is most numerous and other risk factors are present, no honey may be taken for purposes of human consumption.

Ashley Edge, Policy Advisory Officer, phone 04 474 4213, edgea@maf.govt.nz

Exotic disease response standards revised

MAF has completely revised the standards for investigating and responding to a suspected case of a serious exotic disease of animals (including honey bees and fish), following the recommendations arising from a recent review of New Zealand’s emergency disease and pest response. The standards are written as a series covering requirements for:

- all service providers;
- the Chief Veterinary Officer, who initiates a response, makes the policy and strategic decisions during the response, and declares the stand-down;
- the National Control Centre, located in MAF’s head office, which provides advice to the Chief Veterinary Officer and national and international liaison;
- the National Centre for Disease Investigation (NCDI), located in Upper Hutt (see Biosecurity 2: 3), which receives initial notifications, directs operations and assesses information, in order to give technical advice to the Chief Veterinary Officer;
- the Initial Investigation Veterinarians Team, who are located around New Zealand and are required to be able to investigate suspect cases within 5, 12 or 24 hours, depending on the disease suspected;
- the Field Operations Response Team, which may be comprised of several service providers and will carry out the on-ground containment and control measures as directed by the NCDI;
- the production and processing industries which could be affected.

The revised standards outline the structure required to investigate and respond to a suspected case of exotic disease, and specify the outcomes to be achieved. Service providers are required to develop procedures to meet the outcomes required.

The revised standards will cover the period from November 1998 to 30 June 2000. During this time MAF will comprehensively assess options for contestable service provision for the next three to five years. On completion of this assessment the standards will be adjusted to incorporate any changes in service supply.

Until 1 July 2000 the main service providers will be AgriQuality New Zealand Limited, Asure New Zealand Limited (see page 7 of this issue) and Massey University. Additional service providers could include the Police, Defence Force, Meterological Service, veterinary groups and agricultural industry organisations, depending on the disease suspected.

A copy of the standards can be found on MAF’s website at http://www.maf.govt.nz/Standards/anbio/index.html

Mirzet Sabirovic, National Manager (Exotic Disease Programmes) phone 04 498 9809, sabirovicm@maf.govt.nz

Search and inspection warrants

The warrant used to enter dwellings and marae, and the search warrant used to enforce the Biosecurity Act, have been amended by regulations taking effect in December 1998. The prescribed form for the warrant to enter becomes the ‘warrant to enter and inspect’. The search warrant may now be obtained by authorised persons under the act, as well as by inspectors and police officers. As with inspectors, authorised persons must be accompanied by a member of the police when executing a search warrant.

These are the significant changes contained in the Biosecurity (Forms) Amendment Regulations 1998. The new regulations are consequential to changes enacted by the Biosecurity Amendment Act 1997.

Ashley Edge, Policy Advisory Officer, phone 04 474 4213, edgea@maf.govt.nz
Notification of ID system applications

Applications have been received from two identification system administrators for approval under section 50 of the Biosecurity Act 1993. Both systems support the national bovine tuberculosis pest management strategy.

As part of the strategy, the Animal Health Board (as the management agency) intends to introduce compulsory identification of cattle and farmed deer. Regulations will be needed to require farmers to identify animals aged over one month born after 1 July 1999, and to identify all cattle and deer after 1 July 2001. Before these regulations can be made, the systems need to be approved by MAF under section 50 of the act (see page 5 for further details).

System name: National Dairy Herd Improvement Database (MINDA)

System administrator: Livestock Improvement Corporation Ltd, (Ian Hook, MINDA Services Manager), Corner Morrinsville and Ruakura Roads, Private Bag 3016, Hamilton

Species: cattle, deer

System name: Animal Health Board

System administrator: Animal Health Board Inc., (Robert Isbister, General Manager), Level 3, Agriculture House, Johnston Street, PO Box 3412, Wellington

Species: cattle, deer

This article is intended to fulfill part of MAF’s notification requirements for approval of animal identification systems. Queries on the detail of each system should be directed to the relevant system administrator.

Ashley Edge, Policy Advisory Officer, phone 04 474 4213, edgea@maf.govt.nz

Poultry meat risk analysis

MAF’s draft risk draft analysis on the importation of poultry meat (see Biosecurity 7: 11) has been sent to 13 experts in New Zealand, Australia, the United States and the United Kingdom, for detailed technical review. The reviewers have been selected for their recognised expertise in the fields of poultry diseases or risk analysis. It is expected that the technical review process will be completed early in the new year, in which case the risk analysis would be released for public consultation in mid to late January 1999. However, if the technical reviewers find any substantial issues of concern MAF will have to revise the risk analysis. This could result in a delay of one to two months before the risk analysis can be completed and signed off as technically correct, after which public consultation can begin.

Stuart MacDiamid, National Manager (Agricultural Security), phone 04 474 4223, macdiamids@maf.govt.nz

Approval for two biocontrol agents

Two biological control agents have been approved for release into New Zealand. These decisions on the introduction of new species are the last to be made under the Animals Act 1967, and were made under the transitional provisions of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996. The applications were notified for public comment in Biosecurity 4: 7 on 15 June 1998.

Gall fly against scotch thistle

The gall fly Urophora stylata is intended as a biocontrol agent against scotch thistle. In making this approval the Chief Veterinary Officer took into account that:

- the extent of the impact of U. stylata as a biocontrol pressure on scotch thistle is unknown but any impact would be advantageous;
- there is little risk of U. stylata doing unwanted harm in New Zealand.

Gall wasp against hieracium

The gall wasp Aulacidea subterminalis is intended as a biocontrol agent against Hieracium pilosella (the most widespread species of hieracium in New Zealand). In approving the application, the Chief Veterinary Officer took in account that:

- there is evidence that A. subterminalis has the potential to reduce the rate of growth, flowering and reproduction of plants of H. pilosella in New Zealand, thus improving the ability of other plants to compete against it;
- A. subterminalis is expected to be able to establish throughout the range of H. pilosella in New Zealand;
- there is minimal risk of A. subterminalis doing unwanted harm to natural resources in New Zealand;
- members of the public, the Minister of Conservation and the Minister for the Environment have had an opportunity to express their views on the application.

Elizabeth Stoddart, Technical Advisory Officer (Animal Quarantine), phone 04 498 9634, stoddarte@maf.govt.nz

Response to exotic organism incursions

MAF has prepared draft policy statements on response to incursions by exotic organisms (Biosecurity 2: 6-7) and funding such responses (Biosecurity 5: 6-7). Submissions on the draft policy statements have been analysed and a response to the submissions is being prepared. The summary of submissions and response will be available soon, and access to these documents will be advised in the next issue of Biosecurity. The final policy statement should also be available early in 1999.

Don Crump, Analyst, MAF Policy, PO Box 2526, Wellington, phone 04 498 9849, fax 04 474 4206, crumpd@maf.govt.nz
These animal health regulations have been either proposed or implemented by members of the World Trade Organization, and have been notified under the SPS agreement (the WTO agreement on the application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures) between 30 October and 18 November 1998.

Andrew Matheson, SPS Notification Authority coordinator, phone 04 474 4219, sps@maf.govt.nz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date notified</th>
<th>Summary of content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8/10/98</td>
<td>Testing for toxoplasmosis in imported sheep destined for breeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18/11/98</td>
<td>Caprine embryos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18/11/98</td>
<td>Deer from Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18/11/98</td>
<td>Petfood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18/11/98</td>
<td>Reptiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11/11/98</td>
<td>Hares from third countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1 Add.1</td>
<td>15/10/98</td>
<td>Final date for comments extended to 15/10/98 and entry into force postponed to 1/11/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2 Add.1</td>
<td>15/10/98</td>
<td>Final date for comments extended to 15/10/98 and entry into force postponed to 1/11/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>3 Add.1</td>
<td>15/10/98</td>
<td>Final date for comments extended to 15/10/98 and entry into force postponed to 1/11/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>4 Add.1</td>
<td>15/10/98</td>
<td>Final date for comments extended to 15/10/98 and entry into force postponed to 1/11/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14/10/98</td>
<td>Processed animal proteins in animal feed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19/10/98</td>
<td>Revocation of egg product standards that did not safeguard against Newcastle disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9/11/98</td>
<td>Acceptance of USA and Canadian public health certificate of free sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6/11/98</td>
<td>Standards for establishments packaging honey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to contact us

Everyone listed at the end of an article as a contact point, unless otherwise indicated, is part of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Animal Health & Welfare Group.

All MAF staff can be contacted by e.mail, and the standard format for all addresses is surnameinitial@maf.govt.nz.

For example, Ralph Hopcroft would be hopcroft@maf.govt.nz. (There are slight exceptions for people with similar names, but these addresses are given where necessary.)

PO Box 2526, Wellington, New Zealand.

(+64) 4 474 4100 (switchboard)
most staff have direct-dial lines, which are listed where available

(+64) 4 474 4133 (Animal Health & Welfare group, except Chief Veterinary Officer)
(+64) 4 474 4240 (Chief Veterinary Officer)

ASB Bank House, 101 The Terrace, Wellington.

International animal health regulations

Unwanted organisms register

A searchable register of unwanted organisms is being developed and is expected to be publicly available on MAF’s world wide web site in the first half of 1999.

The register is a requirement under a revision to the Biosecurity Act 1993 made in late 1997, and will contain all organisms determined to be unwanted by a chief technical officer in one of the biosecurity departments (Agriculture and Forestry, Conservation, Fisheries, Health), organisms declined importation by the Environmental Risk Management Authority, and prohibited organisms specified in the second schedule of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996.

Classifying harmful organisms as an ‘unwanted organism’ enables access to powers in the Biosecurity Act to manage or eradicate those organisms.

Sue Cotton, National Manager (Policy Coordination), phone 04 474 4283, cottons@maf.govt.nz

Containment standards approved

Under the new arrangements for approving containment standards (see p 5), three containment standards have now been approved by ERMA New Zealand. These approved standards are available from MAF:

- containment facilities for vertebrate laboratory animals;
- containment facilities for micro-organisms;
- transitional and containment facilities for invertebrates (this also addresses the quarantine requirements for invertebrates).

Three other standards are under development:

- containment facilities for transgenic farm animals;
- containment facilities for zoo animals;
- containment facilities for transgenic fish.

Kevin Corrin, National Manager (Animal Quarantine), phone 04 474 4136, corrink@maf.govt.nz