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The final article in this series provides a brief description of ‘notifiable organisms’, the act’s cost recovery provisions, and offences and penalties that may be imposed under the act.

**Notifiable organisms**

Many of the act’s provisions relate to pests (the subject of a pest management strategy) or unwanted organisms (organisms determined to be unwanted by a chief technical officer). The act also recognises another type of undesirable organism: ‘notifiable organisms’. These organisms must be notified to a chief technical officer by any person who suspects their presence in a new place.

Organisms become notifiable by being declared as such by order in council. MAF’s policy on unwanted organisms outlines the ministry’s criteria for declaring organisms to be notifiable organisms. Generally speaking, they must be exotic to this country and have the potential to cause a serious adverse impact on New Zealand’s animal and plant production industries (see Biosecurity 6:4 for details of the criteria). MAF’s policy also requires all notifiable organisms to be unwanted organisms so that the provisions of the act are available immediately should a notifiable organism be found here.

A recent review of unwanted organisms affecting animals has meant that changes are needed to the current order in council for notifiable organisms. (The organisms that are to appear in a revised order in council were listed in Biosecurity 6:6.)

**Cost recovery**

The costs of carrying out a number of the act’s functions can be recovered under various provisions. The Biosecurity (Costs) Regulations 1993 outline the charges to be applied for a number of biosecurity activities, including inspecting and treating various categories of risk goods, issuing import health permits, inspecting transitional facilities and supervision of their operators. These regulations are being reviewed and an amendment is anticipated this year.

Costs may also be recovered directly for a particular function or service under other provisions. Section 135 allows the Director-General of MAF (among others) to recover the costs of administering the act if money has not been appropriated by parliament for that particular activity. Section 128 also provides a cost-recovery mechanism in the event that a person does not comply with a direction to carry out specified actions or measures. A chief technical officer, principal officer of a regional council, or management agency, may authorise the necessary actions to be taken and then recover the costs of those actions from the person to whom the direction was issued.

**Offences and penalties**

The penalties that apply under the act vary depending on the nature of the offence. The most severe penalty for an individual carries a maximum of five years’ imprisonment, a fine of up to $100,000, or both. For a corporation, the maximum penalty is a fine of up to $200,000. These penalties apply to offences such as knowingly possessing unauthorised goods, or moving organisms or other goods in breach of a movement control notice. The penalties and offences are outlined in part VIII of the act.

**Instant fines at the border**

A person who, on arrival at the border, wrongly declares that they do not possess goods that may pose a biosecurity risk (whether or not they make that declaration knowingly) may be fined up to $400. That person may elect to pay an instant fine of $200 rather than have the offence heard in court. If the person does not elect to pay an instant fine they have only 14 days within which to respond.

The existence of the instant fine provision or the payment of such a fine does not prevent a prosecution from being taken under other offence provisions, if a person is believed to have breached those provisions as well. For example, a person who knowingly tries to bring unauthorised goods into New Zealand may be subject to the more stringent penalties discussed above, whether or not the instant fine provisions have been applied to them.
MAF has initiated a new surveillance programme for bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), which will begin in February 1999.

The effect of the new programme will be to increase laboratory examination to 300 brains per year from cases of nervous disease in cattle greater than two years old.

MAF’s new BSE surveillance programme has been developed in response to a revision of the international surveillance and monitoring programme guidelines, which were adopted by the world organisation for animal health, the Office International des Epizooties or OIE, at its last general session in May 1998.

The previous OIE target (set in 1997) was 200 brains per year, but the numbers examined in New Zealand did not meet this. In 1996 76 brains were examined, and in 1997, 108. From January to October of 1998 only 58 cattle brains were examined.

Cattle in New Zealand are not infected with the BSE agent. However, any country that wants to trade as a BSE-free country must undertake an internationally-accepted continuous BSE surveillance and monitoring programme that has been designed along the OIE guidelines. As part of this programme MAF has to ensure that brains from cattle which are exhibiting clinical signs of progressive central nervous disease are screened for histopathological evidence of BSE, and found to be negative.

MAF has a programme to ensure that all brains submitted to animal health laboratories and Massey University for routine diagnostic purposes undergo the screening required by the OIE. This programme also includes monitoring at slaughterhouses to obtain brains from any cattle displaying signs of nervous disease, plus financial incentives to encourage veterinary practitioners to submit brains to laboratories.

To increase the number of brains examined so the OIE’s new guideline of 300 cattle brains might be achieved, MAF considered the incentive programme had to be redesigned. The number and type of financial incentives was increased from their previous levels.

Figure 1 depicts how the new scheme will operate. It has been developed in consultation with the Dairy Cattle Veterinarian’s Branch of the New Zealand Veterinary Association (NZVA) and participating MAF-approved animal health laboratories. The programme is focusing on dairy cattle, as this segment of the cattle population has the highest degree of contact with farmers and veterinarians. The scheme also requires the veterinarian to complete a questionnaire, the results of which MAF will use to gain a better understanding of the profile of nervous disorders in the New Zealand dairy cattle population.

MAF will continue to operate its current transmissible spongiform encephalopathy (TSE) surveillance incentive programme, in order to provide TSE monitoring of beef cattle, sheep, goats and deer. For these species, a veterinarian notifies a regional laboratory if they encounter a disease for which TSE might reasonably be included in the differential diagnosis. The incentives for participating farmers and veterinarians in this programme are:

- Free laboratory brain removal and histopathological examination of brains from nervous disease cases in adult (greater than two years old) cattle, sheep, goats, and deer.
- A $100 credit to the practitioner’s laboratory account whenever a TSE is suspected on clinical grounds and the appropriate samples are submitted.

Roger Poland, National Manager (Surveillance), phone 04 498 9820, polandr@maf.govt.nz
Honey and propolis from Pitcairn Island

MAF is proposing to allow the importation of some bee products from Pitcairn Island.

An application to export honey to New Zealand has been received from the Commissioner of Pitcairn Island. MAF is considering this application in line with its existing importation policy for bee products.

MAF proposes that an import health standard for honey or raw propolis from Pitcairn Island will require certification stating:

- a description of the honey or propolis product;
- that it is a natural product produced by the honey bee, and comes only from Pitcairn Island;
- that Melissococcus pluton and Paenibacillus larvae larvae (formerly known as Bacillus larvae) do not occur on Pitcairn Island.

With the exception of the mites and moths, the infectious diseases can be transmitted in honey. However, the absence of the brood diseases on Pitcairn means that honey and propolis present no risks to New Zealand honey bees.

Pitcairn

The European honey bee Apis mellifera mellifera was thought to have been first introduced in the 19th century, and there were two successful introductions (each of two hives) of Italian-type honey bees from New Zealand in 1978 and 1992. Pitcairn Island maintains active biosecurity measures against the importation of honey, other bee products, used beekeeping appliances and live bees. There has been an official government bee officer for about 20 years, and the current Quarantine Act and an active exclusion policy have operated since April 1997.

The Pitcairn Island government is administered by a British Commissioner based in Auckland. There is an appointed government bee officer, but certification is actually signed by the island magistrate on behalf of the government.

As part of the MAF Quality Management visit, Pitcairn beekeepers were trained in a wide range of bee management skills including legislation, biosecurity, disease recognition and control. The diagnosis of bee diseases on Pitcairn will rely on the skills learned during this training and the use of New Zealand laboratories for confirmation of findings.

The contact with AgriQuality is likely to be ongoing, and includes further training for the islanders. The relationship with apiculture experts from New Zealand strengthens the reliance that can be placed on the integrity of the disease reporting from this relatively small island industry.

Jim Edwards, National Manager (International Animal Trade), phone 04 474 4138, edwardsj@maf.govt.nz

The deadline for comments is 15 March 1998

The 1998 survey found that there were at least 26 managed hives and ten feral colonies on the island. Samples from 20 managed hives and seven feral colonies were submitted for analysis at MAF laboratories in New Zealand. Chronic bee paralysis, the greater wax moth, and ‘halfmoon disorder’ were found; all of these are also present in New Zealand and not under statutory control. The survey also looked for evidence of American foulbrood, European foulbrood, chalkbrood, sacbrood, Varroa and Tropilaelaps mites, but found none.

Current policy

New Zealand already imports honey from a number of other Pacific countries: Niue, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Tuvalu. The assessment of the bee disease status and biosecurity procedures of exporting countries has invariably been performed by New Zealand government apicultural officers.

Disease status

In the case of Pitcairn Island, the access request is supported by the results of a study carried out in 1998 by MAF Quality Management (now AgriQuality New Zealand).
**Draft import health standard for consultation**

The following draft import health standard has been developed by MAF and is available for public consultation:

**Anseriforme (duck, goose, swan or muscovy duck) hatching eggs from Canada**

An earlier import health standard (dated 28 March 1996) was withdrawn in 1996 pending the outcome of a review of the import requirements relating to infectious bursal disease (IBD) risk in imported eggs. This import health standard has now been reviewed and it has been confirmed that eggs are not involved in the transmission of IBD. Therefore, following consultation this standard is expected to be available for use after 15 March 1999.

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

The deadline for submissions is 15 March 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.

**Import health standard for salmonids for human consumption**

This IHS was re-issued on 7 January 1999. There are no changes to the zoosanitary conditions within the new standard. The new standard notifies importers of restrictions on the importation of commercial consignments of trout which are not related to biosecurity, but result from the Customs Import Prohibition (Trout) Order 1998. The restrictions are effective from 7 January 1999 to 7 July 2000.

The new standard also acknowledges bilateral negotiations between MAF and the competent authorities in the USA and Australia, which have resulted in approved zoosanitary certification to accompany imports from these countries.

Butterflies from Australia

References to ‘veterinarian’ and ‘veterinary officer’ have been replaced by ‘supervisor’.

Sheep from South Australia

Clause 7.3 has been altered to not allow the use of hay or straw as bedding when transporting sheep to New Zealand. Only sterilised peat, soft board or other inert approved products may be used.

The following new import health standards (IHSs) have been issued by the Chief Veterinary Officer and are available for use.

**Frozen deer by-products from Australia**

**Untanned cattle hides and skins from New Caledonia**

**Bison from Canada**

These standards were notified for public consultation in Biosecurity 6 and are now current.

**Buffalo embryos from the Netherlands**

This standard was notified for public consultation in Biosecurity 5 and is now current.

Kerry Mulqueen, National Manager (Import Management), phone 04 498 9625, fax 04 474 4132, mulqueenk@maf.govt.nz

**Seminar on the SPS agreement: Have new trading rules for agriculture delivered the goods?**

A MAF seminar in March will take a detailed look at the past and future of the SPS agreement, and what it means for New Zealand.

It’s now four years since the rules changed dramatically for trading in agricultural products, with the advent of the SPS agreement (the agreement on the application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures).

Now when importing countries want to protect their agricultural health, they must use objective and science-based measures.

These measures must be applied only when necessary and in a consistent way.

But what has the SPS agreement done for New Zealand in the past four years? Has it given us the marketing breaks we expected? Has it forced us to take unnecessary risks? How have SPS legal disputes changed our thinking on what the agreement means? Where is the SPS agreement heading as we approach a new round of WTO negotiations?

MAF is organising a seminar for leaders in all agricultural industries, politicians, NGOs, and anyone interested in trade policy and the future of New Zealand’s agricultural markets.

Speakers will include:

- the chairman of the World Trade Organization’s SPS committee, which is based in Geneva;
- from Canada, the president of the world organisation for animal health (the OIE);
- the administrator of the US Department of Agriculture’s veterinary service;
- the New Zealand Minister for International Trade;
- leaders of New Zealand exporting and domestic animal-based industries.

There will be ample time for discussion after each presentation.

The meeting will be in Wellington, at a venue to be advised, on the morning of Friday 19 March 1999.

SPS seminar, Animal Health & Welfare group, MAF Regulatory Authority, PO Box 2526, Wellington, fax 04 474 4240, sps@maf.govt.nz
**Mosquito pest management strategy**

The Ministry of Health is inviting participation in the development of a national mosquito pest management strategy (PMS).

This initiative began well before the current concern about the southern saltmarsh mosquito being found in parts of Hawke's Bay, and once completed will help to ensure that such incursions can be detected and contained as early as possible.

As well as helping to protect people from serious arboviral diseases, the PMS for exotic mosquitoes of public health significance will reduce the likelihood of adverse effects on animal health. The draft PMS, prepared for the Ministry of Health during 1998, will be further developed in 1999 before its release for public comment.

Tenders for PMS development work were called by the Ministry of Health at the end of November 1998 and closed on 15 January 1999. There will also be an opportunity for a limited number of people to participate in a workshop to assist with developing rules and other matters necessary for the effective implementation of the PMS. The workshop is likely to be held during March/April 1999.

The Ministry of Health would like to hear from those interested in participating in the workshop.

- Henry Dowler, Deputy Chief Technical Officer (Health), Ministry of Health, PO Box 5013, Wellington, phone 04 496 2264, fax 04 496 2340, henry_dowler@moh.govt.nz

**Poultry meat risk analysis**

Technical review of MAF’s draft risk draft analysis on the importation of poultry meat is underway, and comments are still coming in from the international reviewers. Depending on the extent of revision required following receipt of reviewers’ comments, MAF anticipates that the technical review process will not be completed until early February at the earliest, after which public consultation can begin.

- Stuart MacDiarmid, National Manager (Agricultural Security), phone 04 474 4223, macdiarmids@maf.govt.nz

**Legislation to support bovine TB strategy**

Three pieces of legislation came into force in January 1999 to support the Animal Health Board’s (AHB’s) national bovine tuberculosis pest management strategy. The strategy came into effect on 1 July 1998 under the Biosecurity (National Bovine Tuberculosis Pest Management Strategy) Order 1998.

**Otago land levy**

The Biosecurity (Bovine Tuberculosis: Otago Land Levy) Order 1998 came into effect on 14 January 1999, and imposes a levy on rateable rural property in the Otago region that is four hectares or more in area. The levy is to be collected by the AHB to fund the regional share of the cost of vector control operations to reduce levels of bovine TB. The levy is to be applied differentially according to the type of vector control operation carried out in the area.

The regional share of vector control operations in other regions is funded by various mixes of special or general rates collected by regional councils. While Otago Regional Council does contribute some funding to the TB control programme, this does not meet the full regional share of vector control costs.

**Cattle slaughter levy**

A new levy on the slaughter of adult cattle in licensed premises came into effect on 14 January 1999 under the Biosecurity (Bovine Tuberculosis: Cattle Levy) Order 1998. The levy is one of the principal means of funding the TB strategy, and is to be used by the AHB to fund the testing of cattle for the presence of bovine TB and national vector control operations to reduce bovine TB levels.

This levy replaces a levy under the Meat Act 1981 and is imposed on the same basis as that levy. The AHB is able to set the levy annually but the maximum rate that can be imposed is $10 per head of adult cattle (exclusive of GST).

**TB testing cost recovery**

The Biosecurity (Deer and Other Testing Costs) Regulations 1998 came into effect on 19 January 1999. These regulations provide for the recovery of costs for testing deer for the presence of bovine TB, in the event that a deer farmer fails to arrange for deer to be tested after being given the opportunity to do so. They also provide for the recovery of costs (e.g. mustering costs) when a cattle or deer farmer fails to comply with a direction to present any animal for testing. The ability to recover testing costs in the event that a cattle farmer fails to arrange for cattle to be tested is not covered by these regulations, because such costs are covered by the cattle slaughter levy.

**Additional legislation**

Further legislation to support the TB strategy is expected to be passed during 1999, implementing an identification scheme for cattle and deer (see Biosecurity 8: 11).

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

**Operational plan for TB**

The Animal Health Board has prepared its operational plan for the national bovine tuberculosis pest management strategy. The plan sets out the board’s operating arrangements, disease and vector control policies, and budgeted income and expenditure for 1998/1999. The plan is a requirement under the Biosecurity Act 1993, and must be reviewed and reported on annually.

The operational plan was submitted to the Associate Minister for Food, Fibre, Biosecurity and Border Control for his assessment, and was considered consistent with the TB pest management strategy. The Associate Minister is able to disallow a plan if he considers it to be inconsistent with the strategy.

Copies are available from the Animal Health Board for $15.

- Nick Hancox, Animal Health Board, PO Box 3412, Wellington, phone 04 472 2858, fax 04 473 8786, hancox@ahb.org.nz
**New biosecurity agency**

Biosecurity issues will come into sharper focus with the establishment of a biosecurity agency within MAF.

The Minister for Food, Fibre, Biosecurity and Border Control, John Luxton, announced in December that MAF Regulatory Authority will be split into two agencies from 1 July 1999. One will be a food assurance agency and the other a biosecurity agency.

The move to set up a separate biosecurity agency follows a government decision that MAF should continue to manage biosecurity risks to primary production sectors and administer the Biosecurity Act, but also undertake a biosecurity coordination role.

The biosecurity agency will be responsible for border control, quarantine services, export assurance, pest and disease surveillance and emergency response capabilities. It will also be responsible for providing animal and plant health assurances to New Zealand’s trading partners, developing operational and regulatory policy, and risk management. The new agency will consult widely with other government departments and stakeholders.

The group director of the biosecurity agency will be charged with maintaining and enhancing New Zealand’s position as an innovative leading exporter of primary products while balancing the needs of the environment and human and animal health.

The positions of group directors for both the biosecurity and food assurance agencies are currently being advertised, and appointments should be made by early March. The appointees will have responsibility for establishing the two agencies by 1 July 1999.

The food assurance agency is being established in response to the government’s aim of creating greater consumer confidence in food safety. The agency will combine responsibility for food safety in the domestic and export food supplies, and will encompass staff from MAF and the Ministry of Health in a single food agency based within MAF.

The biosecurity and food assurance agencies will overlap in the areas of international technical trade policy and risk management methodologies, and will avoid duplication by sharing common resource groups such as compliance and enforcement.

Barry O’Neil, Chief Veterinary Officer, phone 04 474 4128, oneilb@maf.govt.nz

**Review of border services and deferral of border cost recovery**

Two decisions on the delivery and funding of border control services were announced in December by the Minister for Food, Fibre, Biosecurity and Border Control, John Luxton; a review of all border operations and a delay in some cost-recovery provisions.

Firstly, Cabinet has decided to establish an independent review of the government’s operations at the border. The review will commence in February 1999, and will focus on the efficiency and effectiveness of border control arrangements. It is intended that a report will be ready for Cabinet by 1 December 1999.

Alternatives to the current delivery arrangements will be considered, including the desirability of amalgamating all government border functions into a single border agency. In his announcement, the minister stated he is seeking a future-focused approach to the review, which takes into account the government’s desire to ensure protection of New Zealand and visitors to New Zealand from biosecurity and other threats, while facilitating the safe and efficient movement of goods, people and craft across the border.

The second announcement relates to the recovery of passenger and craft border clearance costs. Following a decision taken in December 1997 to recover these costs, border control agencies have been discussing with affected parties how to implement a charging regime.

In September 1998 the government released an implementation proposal and sought industry comment. A preliminary analysis of submissions has identified some potentially significant difficulties with implementing the proposals. On balance, these difficulties are largely related to timing, but the Cabinet has concluded they are sufficient to prevent introduction of the preferred location-specific cost recovery by the intended start-up date of 1 July 1999.

Implementation of passenger and craft clearance cost recovery will therefore be deferred until 1 July 2000. Officials will also be carrying out work on a broader range of implementation options. One option the Cabinet is particularly interested in exploring is the potential for recovering the cost of air passenger clearance through a charge on passenger tickets.

The Cabinet is very aware of the inequity between funding arrangements for border clearance at regional airports (where costs are already recovered) and major international airports (where services are currently paid by the taxpayer). This issue will be further considered by Cabinet shortly.

Finally, there are a number of very important and difficult issues to be addressed during 1999 in relation to the delivery and funding of border control services. The minister and a number of his colleagues will meet with industry representatives soon to begin discussions on a way forward.

Chris Baddeley, Team Leader (Biosecurity Policy), MAF Policy, PO Box 2526, Wellington, phone 04 474 4266, fax 04 474 4206, baddeleyc@maf.govt.nz

**Registration of transitional facilities**

MAF Regulatory Authority is currently updating the registration of transitional facilities, and when the process is completed will publish the full list of registered facilities on its web site.

At 18 January 1999 there were 421 transitional facilities registered. The increase in number of transitional facilities results from amendments to the Biosecurity Act November 1997, which required risk goods and uncleared goods to be placed into transitional facilities.

Kerry Mulqueen, National Manager (Import Management), phone 04 498 9624, mulqueenK@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 19 November 1998 and 12 January 1999.

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>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/12/98</td>
<td>Bovine animals and their meat, semen and other named animal products originating from Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8/1/99</td>
<td>Bovine semen and BSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>25 add1</td>
<td>14/12/98</td>
<td>Extension of comment deadline to 9 January 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>27 add1</td>
<td>14/12/98</td>
<td>Extension of comment deadline to 9 January 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10/12/98</td>
<td>Farmed raffe meat and Crimean Congo hemorrhagic fever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8/1/99</td>
<td>Animal casings from third countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>64 con1</td>
<td>15/12/98</td>
<td>G/SPS/N/ITS/1 Incorrectly circulated as G/SPS/N/EEC/64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/12/98</td>
<td>Live bovines, bone in beef, offal and meal of animal origin from Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14/12/98</td>
<td>Animal products from foreign countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4/12/98</td>
<td>Bovine animals from Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8/12/98</td>
<td>Cost recovery when rendering specified high-risk material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8/12/98</td>
<td>Good manufacture practice (GMP) for animal feed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8/12/98</td>
<td>Good manufacture practice (GMP) for animal feed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8/12/98</td>
<td>Health certificate for zoo animals, ornamental fish, reptiles, amphibians and pigeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6 add.1</td>
<td>9/12/98</td>
<td>Countries from which raw hides and skins may be imported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/12/98</td>
<td>Theileria parva bovis testing for cattle from Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>8/12/98</td>
<td>Exemption from testing for dourine and glanders in horses from Australia and New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>18/12/98</td>
<td>Poultry products and exotic Newcastle disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>12/1/99</td>
<td>Ruminants and ruminant products from Liechtenstein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honey from Western Australia

MAF Regulatory Authority has received a request from the Australian Quarantine Inspection Service (AQIS) for access to the New Zealand market for honey from Western Australia.

Importation of Australian honey has not been permitted because of the risk of importing Melissococcus pluton, the cause of the disease European foulbrood (EFB) which does not occur in New Zealand honey bees.

The case for market access for honey from Western Australia rests on that state being free of EFB. AQIS has provided information on WA's EFB surveillance programme and effective state border control measures to maintain its EFB-free status.

MAF invites comment on the AQIS information.

Jim Edwards, National Manager International Animal Trade, phone 04 474 4138, fax 04 474 4227, edwardsj@maf.govt.nz

The deadline for submissions is 15 March 1999

Pest summit: towards 2004

The third national pest summit is to be held in Palmerston North from 7–9 April 1999.

The summit aims to examine issues facing the biosecurity industry both now and in the next five years. It will provide a forum to increase awareness of current and future issues, plan an agreed industry direction and develop future strategies in pest management.

The summit is hosted by the Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council, and registration forms are available from them.

Wendy Butcher, Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council, Private Bag 11025, Palmerston North, phone 06 357 9009, fax 06 356 7477, wendy.butcher@mwrc.govt.nz

Photo credits: Andrew Matheson; cover, p4