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A revised risk analysis proposes new conditions for the importation of horses and horse semen.

The final Import health risk analysis: horses and horse semen is now available from MAF, and represents an attempt to develop a sound technical basis for a comprehensive review of equine import health policy, in consultation with all potentially affected stakeholders.

Along with the risk analysis, a supplementary document has been prepared for public release detailing the consultation process. It summarises all the points raised in individual submissions, and includes a MAF response where this was considered appropriate.

In May 1998 MAF released for public consultation a draft analysis of the disease risks potentially associated with the importation of horses and horse semen (Biosecurity 3: 6). The document also made recommendations for measures to manage these risks.

Twenty-five submissions were received during the initial consultation. Subsequently MAF solicited expert opinion on the issue of equine leptospirosis, and then sought public comment on the experts’ reviews.

During 1999 two events brought many of the issues considered in the risk analysis into sharp focus. New Zealand recorded its first case of equine infectious anaemia (EIA) in a horse imported from Australia. Later that year an outbreak of West Nile virus in the USA that included cases in horses raised further issues to consider in the context of imports.

The risk analysis recommends, on a disease-by-disease basis, safeguards considered necessary when horses or semen are imported from infected countries.

Of particular practical importance for importers is a recommendation for post-arrival quarantine (PAQ) as a risk management measure for a number of diseases for which a high level of protection is considered appropriate. PAQ is recommended whenever measures prior to export cannot be relied upon to detect every infected horse, where rapid spread of infection could occur leading to establishment here, and/or where significant adverse consequences could follow disease introduction and establishment.

One notable disease for which a recommendation of PAQ is made is equine influenza. A level of protection higher than that provided by safeguards based on vaccination and pre-export isolation is considered appropriate for equine influenza, because the consequences of entry and establishment in New Zealand of this disease are likely to be severe. Explosive outbreaks requiring suspension of all race meetings and other events are predicted if this disease were to be introduced. PAQ probably provides the only opportunity to contain an outbreak in imported horses.

This recommendation means that all live horse imports, with the exception of those from Australia, will be required to undergo a period of PAQ.

MAF no longer owns and operates facilities for PAQ. Any individual or company may apply to have a facility registered under the Biosecurity Act 1993. In order to become registered, the facility must be built, operated and supervised according to technical standards issued by MAF.

Reviewed import health standards have been prepared in accordance with the recommendations of the risk analysis. They will undergo a period of public consultation prior to finally being issued.

Sarah Peters, Technical Adviser (International Trade), Animal Biosecurity, phone 04 474 4116, peterss@maf.govt.nz
MAF’s Biosecurity Authority has restated its commitment to consultation.

Public sector managers are increasingly required to consult with the public. Both specific legislative requirements and general administrative law require it. Special interest groups and the public at large demand it. And successive administrations have moved toward more open government.

In light of these trends MAF Biosecurity has prepared a formal statement of its consultation policy, which is included in this issue of Biosecurity on pages 3-5.

The policy statement sets out the Biosecurity Authority’s approach to consultation, and the requirements it has of staff. Specific consultation practices will be documented in procedures to be developed by each group within the Biosecurity Authority.

The Biosecurity Act 1993 and Animal Welfare Act 1999 contain certain requirements for consultation. But the groups in what is now MAF’s Biosecurity Authority have had a commitment to go beyond the legal minimum in consulting with interested parties and the general public, when developing policies or making decisions. Some have had formal policy statements on consultation.

From this background the Biosecurity Authority has developed a single policy statement on consultation, to ensure consistency in consultation policy and practice across the authority. It is supported by appendixes on the legal aspects of consultation, international consultation on biosecurity measures, government expectations regarding consultation, the consultative groups MAF Biosecurity uses, and the Biosecurity Council policy statement on interdepartmental consultation (see Biosecurity 11: 4-5).

Barry O’Neil, Group Director, Biosecurity Authority, phone 04 474 4128, oneilb@maf.govt.nz

1 Refer Appendix 1: Legal aspects of consultation
2 Refer Appendix 2: MAF Regulatory Authority policy statement: Meeting the transparency obligations of the WTO agreement on the application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures, version 2, 26 January 1998
3 Refer Appendix 3: Government expectations regarding consultation
Consultation should be on a document containing the proposed decision, but it may also take place when MAF Biosecurity is developing its policy stance on an issue.

MAF Biosecurity has a role in informing interested parties on the issues under discussion, New Zealand biosecurity in general, and relevant government processes.

5 Timing of consultation

Consultation should preferably occur early in the development of the process so that interested parties have input into the matters being considered and can therefore contribute to decision-making.

6 Exceptions to routine consultation procedure

Standard timeframes for consultation, as set out in the MAF Biosecurity groups’ consultation procedures, do not apply in situations that are classed as emergencies. Emergencies are declared by MAF Biosecurity Directors where action is required for urgent biosecurity-related reasons, and within timeframes that do not permit application of standard times for consultation. In such cases, consultation with interested parties will be initiated as necessary at the earliest opportunity.

Where an established policy or risk analysis has been documented and consulted upon, it is not necessary to consult on individual standards or procedures which implement that policy or risk analysis, although interested parties may need to be notified.

7 Who should be involved in consultation?

Consultation should involve:

- people or organisations whose interests may be affected;
- departments and other agencies whose responsibilities may be affected;
- other relevant parties as identified by the business group;
- other WTO members as required under the Agreement on the application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures (SPS agreement).

To be involved in consultation, MAF staff must have an appropriate level of expertise, competence and be familiar with the issue under discussion.

Unless specified in legislation or agreed in advance by a Director, MAF Biosecurity will not meet any costs incurred by other parties participating in consultation.

8 Consultation documents

The content and presentation of all documents released for external consultation should be objective, well reasoned and reflect the values, image and credibility of MAF. This includes meeting the MAF visual identity and style guide standards, being written clearly and containing (or being accompanied by) at least a summary that is comprehensible to the audience for which it is intended. Documents must be adequately peer-reviewed before being made available for consultation.

Consultation documents can be distributed by post or electronic mail and presented on web sites and/or publications.

9 Consultative committees/groups

Consultative committees/groups are an important part of MAF Biosecurity’s consultation process. The consultation
procedures should detail how consultative committees and groups will be integrated into the overall consultative process of the individual MAF Biosecurity groups and of the wider MAF Biosecurity Authority. Consultative committees/groups will have clear terms of reference that are regularly reviewed, and which describe:

- the committee's purpose;
- composition (i.e.: representation of interested parties);
- role of members;
- stage of the policy formation process at which the committee is involved;
- frequency of meetings;
- expenses and fees policy.

It is recognised that ad hoc consultative committees may be formed, for example in the event of an incursion response, which may not immediately include terms of reference as described above.

Ministerial advisory groups (e.g. Biosecurity Council, National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee and National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee) may from time to time be used for consultation.

10 Responsibilities of MAF Biosecurity groups

Each MAF Biosecurity group will develop procedures based upon this policy statement detailing their consultation processes. The procedures will also cover the process for internal consultation involving appropriate peer review and the review and management of submissions. Directors are responsible for actively reviewing compliance with this policy statement and related procedures.

It is the responsibility of each group in MAF Biosecurity to:

- ensure that staff are adequately trained in consultation practices with skills including writing, media liaison and interpersonal communication skills;
- fulfil obligations set out in other documents or legislation including the Privacy Act, Official Information Act, New Zealand Bill of Rights Act, Biosecurity Act, Animal Welfare Act, Cabinet Office Manual, other MAF procedures and policies;
- ensure a consistent and positive approach to consultation by MAF Biosecurity staff;
- use the most effective means of consultation;
- maintain adequate records of the consultation process;
- maintain lists of all interested parties consulted, which should be the basis (appropriately modified) of future consultation lists.

11 Expectations of interested parties

The MAF Biosecurity consultation process should encourage and promote feedback from interested parties that is:

- related to the issue under discussion;
- technically relevant;
- reasoned argument.

12 Other relevant policies

This policy statement should be read and applied in conjunction with:

Appendix 1 Legal aspects of consultation
Appendix 2 MAF Regulatory Authority policy statement: Meeting the transparency obligations of the WTO agreement on the application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures, version 2, 26 January 1998
Appendix 3 Government expectations regarding consultation
Appendix 4 Consultation committees/groups
Appendix 5 Biosecurity Council policy statement on interdepartmental consultation on risk analyses and import health standards under section 22 of the Biosecurity Act 1993, 17 December 1998

[MAF policy statement on consultation with Maori to be developed]

Barry O’Neil
Group Director
29 February 2000

[POLICY STATEMENT]
**Draft import health standards for consultation**

The following draft import health standard (IHS) has been developed by MAF and is available for public consultation.

**Inedible tallow from the United States of America**

This standard is based on The importation into New Zealand of meat and meat products: a review of the risks to animal health dated March 1991.

Jean-Marie Derouet, Technical Adviser (International Trade), Animal Biosecurity, phone 04 498 9897, derouetj@maf.govt.nz

http://www.maf.govt.nz/AnimalIHS

The deadline for submissions is 1 May 2000

**Horses from Australia**

**Horse semen from Australia**

**Horses from the USA**

**Horse semen from the USA**

**Horses from the EU and Switzerland**

**Horse semen from the EU and Switzerland**

These draft IHSs have been developed following the completion of the generic risk analysis for the importation into New Zealand of horses and horse semen (see page 2 of this issue).

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

http://www.maf.govt.nz/AnimalIHS

The deadline for submissions is 1 May 2000

**New import health standards issued**

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

**Dogs and cats from specified countries and territories recognised as countries or territories in which canine rabies is absent or well controlled:**

This standard was altered by adding the Czech Republic and South Korea to the list of countries able to export dogs and cats to New Zealand.

The following standards were amended in accordance with the requirements of the Biosecurity (Ruminant Protein) Regulations 1999:

Cooked pet food from Australia

Raw pet food for further processing from Australia

Spray-dried bovine/porcine blood for animal food from the United States of America

Spray-dried egg products for animal food from the United States of America

Bovine by-products from the United States of America and Canada

Deer by-products from Canada

Deer by-products from New Caledonia

Deer by-products from Norway

Animal by-products from Australia

Inedible beef serosa from Australia

Green runners from Australia

Bovine, deer, sheep, goat meat from Australia

Beef from Canada and the United States of America

Beef from Japan

Sausage casings from Australia

Organic fertiliser from the United States of America

Pork from Australia

Pork from Mexico

Pork from the Republic of South Africa

Pork from the United States of America

Specified inedible animal products and biologicals

This standard replaces the previously referenced 152.10.05.105 (ox gall), 152.10.05.310 (Chinese/oriental medicines), 152.10.05.320 (homeopathic medicines) and the list “These biologicals are not risk goods”.

Bovine semen from the United Kingdom

This standard was notified for consultation in Biosecurity15: 8 and includes the safeguards prescribed in the OIE international animal health code.

Mink fibre from the United Kingdom

This standard was notified for consultation in Biosecurity16: 8 and includes a requirement reflecting safeguards recommended for anthrax.

Sheep and goat meat products for human consumption from Chile

This standard was notified for consultation in Biosecurity15: 10 and was prepared according to the safeguards within the MAF risk analysis. The importation into New Zealand of meat and meat products - a review of the risks to animal health of 1991. Chile is a country free from foot and mouth disease.

Specified bee products

This standard replaces the previously referenced 152.10.03.401 (beeswax excluding foundation sheets), 152.10.03.401 (beeswax with foundation sheets), 152.10.03.501 (bee products in food), 152.10.03.510 (medicines containing bee products), 152.10.03.520 (pollen), 152.10.03.601 (honey from selected countries), 152.10.03.605 (honey - trade samples), 152.10.03.606 (honey - New Zealand returning).

Meat and meat by-products samples for evaluation and destruction

This standard has been amended by lifting the restrictions on bovine products from the United Kingdom and by adding Chile as a country of origin.

New Zealand origin deer velvet/meat products/meat by-products returning from other countries

This standard has been amended by adding deer velvet to clause 1. The clauses relating to the identification of the products have been clarified.
Tropical butterfly pupae

This standard is based upon the risk analysis notified for consultation in Biosecurity 16:8. Submissions on this analysis led to one additional risk management measure being included.

The safeguards in the import health standard specify that:

- species of butterflies shall be approved by the Environmental Risk Management Authority (ERMA New Zealand);
- the exporter shall certify the species of the pupae and that they are free of clinical signs of disease;
- imports will be into a transitional and containment facility, registered by MAF, with destruction of diseased pupae, normal pupae of the same species and waste occurring under the supervision of MAF;
- pupae or butterflies shall not be given a biosecurity clearance, i.e. they must remain in containment for life, with transfer to another containment facility occurring only with the permission of the Director Animal Biosecurity, MAF.

Kerry McQueen, National Adviser (Import Management), Animal Biosecurity, phone 04 498 9625, fax 04 474 4132, mulqueenk@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/AnimalIHS

Proposed changes to MINDA

The Livestock Improvement Corporation has advised MAF of changes to the MINDA identification system. MINDA is an approved system for the national identification of cattle and deer for bovine tuberculosis control (see Biosecurity 13:11). The changes are planned for introduction from April 2000.

The changes include extra reporting options for animal health and welfare information, and website access for filing records, ordering eartags and receiving reports. A new data report will be offered that farmers can use to meet the requirements of the national vendor declaration recently introduced by the MAF Food Assurance Authority.

Two new MINDA options for information management will be promoted to beef and deer farmers. The least-cost service will record each animal’s sex, date of birth and breed against its official identification, and any subsequent movements between herds. MINDA reports will be available for purchase summarising animal movements in and out of the herd.

MINDA and the Animal Health Board (AHB)-approved identification systems both require a primary and a secondary eartag to be applied before a deer or cattle beast is moved between herds. MINDA users will now be able to purchase secondary eartags for their animals without buying the corresponding primary identifications at the same time, because the individual animals are recorded on the MINDA database when they are identified. In self-contained herds there may be no need for further official identification to be applied until it is time to take up the direct-to-slaughter tag option. The slaughter eartag contains the same information as a primary eartag but the tag itself is cheaper because it is only temporary.

MINDA users will be able to apply for a ‘permit-to-move’ to shift their own animals to a show and back again without having applied the official eartags. Any such movement must not compromise the national TB strategy. The conditions that will apply to such a permit are the same as those for AHB system users (Biosecurity 15:11).

Ashley Edge, Policy Adviser, Biosecurity Policy Coordination, phone 04 474 4213, edgea@maf.govt.nz

MINDA identification system, 0800 264 632

Amendment to animal ID regulations

An amendment is proposed to the regulations that require farmers to use an animal identification system for cattle and deer for bovine tuberculosis control. The amendment would specifically authorise the system administration fee of 5 cents per identification device that is paid to the Animal Health Board Inc (AHB) by the users of their identification system.

After 1 June 2001 the AHB would be able to determine the system administration fee, to a maximum of 5 cents (plus GST). The fee, as now, would be based on the estimated costs of the administration of the AHB identification system and the national herd registry, approval of suppliers and ID devices, and the coordination of the national identification programme for cattle and deer. The AHB would have the power to waive the fee if an approved identification device is reissued through no fault of the user, other than as a result of normal wear and tear.

The amendment to the Biosecurity (Animal Identification Systems) Regulations 1999 is expected to be in effect from 1 July 2000.

Ashley Edge, Policy Adviser, Biosecurity Policy Coordination, phone 04 474 4213, edgea@maf.govt.nz

Biosecurity research strategy update

Submissions on the draft biosecurity research strategy closed on 29 February 2000 (Biosecurity 17:4). A working group consisting of the government agencies represented on the Biosecurity Council and regional councils is to convene in mid-March to consider the submissions received and finalise the strategy. Comments were received from an array of groups including production industries, and health, research and Maori groups.

The research strategy will then be forwarded to the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology who will use the strategy to assist with decision making on the allocation of Crown funds for biosecurity-related research. The strategy will also assist the four departments with responsibility for biosecurity (Agriculture and Forestry, Conservation, Fisheries and Health) with their research decisions.

Suzanne Main, Policy Adviser, Biosecurity Policy Coordination, phone 04 498 9930, mains@maf.govt.nz
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 Biosecurity Authority. The group within the authority to which they belong is also indentified.

All MAF staff can be contacted by e-mail, and the standard format for all addresses is surname@maf.govt.nz. For example Ralph hopcroft would be hopcrofr@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 Biosecurity group, except Director
• International Agreements group
• Biosecurity Policy Coordination group
(+64) 4 498 9888
• Group Director and Executive Manager, Biosecurity Authority
• Director, Animal Biosecurity

MAF Biosecurity on the world wide web

MAF Biosecurity Authority now has its own official presence on the web. The website contains detailed information on the work the authority does and the groups it is made up of.

The MAF Biosecurity website was officially launched at the authority's six monthly update in November 1999. Since then the authority's web coordination group has worked to improve the information already present. MAF Biosecurity is pleased to announce access to its website to all interested stakeholders and members of the public.

DIRECTORY

International animal health regulations

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 13 January and 25 February 2000.

Keawe Woodmore, Technical Adviser, International Agreements, phone 04 474 4226, sps@maf.govt.nz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date notified</th>
<th>Summary of content</th>
<th>Comments deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14/1/00</td>
<td>Trichinella spiralis parasite in pork and pork products</td>
<td>1/2/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>54 Add1</td>
<td>25/2/00</td>
<td>Trichinella spiralis parasite in pork and pork products - extension for comments</td>
<td>1/3/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31/1/00</td>
<td>Extension of ban on US honey bees</td>
<td>21/2/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8/2/00</td>
<td>Specified animals and products from Ecuador and foot and mouth disease virus</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14/2/00</td>
<td>Requirements for producers and importers of animal feed</td>
<td>15/3/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25/2/00</td>
<td>Live animals and living products</td>
<td>27/3/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>8/2/00</td>
<td>Acetochlor and pyridate in or on food</td>
<td>23/2/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>11/2/00</td>
<td>Animal semen</td>
<td>27/3/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>15/2/00</td>
<td>Poultry products from Mexican states free of exotic Newcastle disease</td>
<td>10/4/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>22/2/00</td>
<td>Stability testing for for biotechnological and biological veterinary medicinal products</td>
<td>3/4/00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>