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My first 100 days as biosecurity minister…

Hon Jim Sutton, Minister of Agriculture and Biosecurity

Becoming Biosecurity Minister was a baptism of fire for me – shortly after Prime Minister Helen Clark confirmed I was to be acting minister for biosecurity, Britain confirmed it had a foot and mouth disease outbreak.

The rollercoaster hasn’t stopped since then.

Since becoming minister, I have been impressed by the work of MAF Quarantine and MAF Biosecurity staff. Theirs is not an easy task.

The biosecurity and border control measures are vital for this country.

Given that we New Zealanders earn two-thirds of our export earnings from primary products, and that one case of foot and mouth disease could end those exports overnight, the work of quarantine and biosecurity officials is crucial.

I have been impressed by their efforts. It is not easy … the travelling public can be grouchy, tired, and emotional at times. However, the terrible outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Britain has focused the minds of a lot of people on biosecurity and border controls, including those of politicians.

The Government allocated $2.79 million last year to boost border controls, and another $4.6 million was allocated for extra staff, soft-tissue x-ray machines, and sniffer dogs, as confirmed in this year’s Budget. Those machines have been installed in airports now, and the dog teams are being phased in as they complete training.

A public awareness campaign focused on highlighting the risks foot and mouth disease poses for our country has been running well, with good feedback. Television advertisements started from April 11, posters have gone up in airports, and the billboards have sprouted.

All this in an effort to remind everyone that all New Zealanders need to take responsibility for maintaining secure national borders.

Not only do we all need to take responsibility for ensuring our own shoes are clean and that no food is being brought into New Zealand without being declared, it is also vital for all travellers to fill in their quarantine declaration cards correctly, to declare anything that might be a risk, and to tell others of the risks.

We also have a responsibility to ensure that MAF Quarantine staff are alerted to other passengers who might be high-risk. There is a Kiwi tradition against “dobbing people in” but this is about the future of our country, not some schoolyard fight.

MAF Quarantine staff do an incredible job at dealing with people coming into our country and intercepting smuggled products. The figures are horrific.

Last year, 8.5 tonnes of meat and poultry products were taken off passengers. A third of that was undeclared. Two thirds of it came from countries with foot and mouth disease.

On top of that, there were 168 seizures of live animals, including dogs and live eggs. In one case, a pet rat escaped on the plane, which had to be stripped and fumigated.

Some 1.8 tonnes of seed was confiscated in 4500 seizures. Nursery stock – about 12 thousand units – was confiscated in 734 seizures. Another 16 tonnes of potential fruit fly host material has been taken from passengers.

And it is not all foreigners doing this. MAF figures suggest that 42 percent of all passengers with undeclared food are New Zealanders – our own people putting us at risk.

From June 18, all people bringing in undeclared goods will be hit with instant fines of $200. That significant hit in the wallet should bring home to people the consequences of their action.

Extra steps were taken right from the start of the outbreak in Britain to protect New Zealand. The Government and MAF are taking the dangers of foot and mouth disease seriously.

All imports of meat, wool, dairy products, and other unprocessed animal products from Britain were suspended when Britain alerted its trading partners, including New Zealand, of the outbreak.

Since then, all British and other passengers from countries with foot and mouth disease arriving in New Zealand have had their bags sniffed by detector dogs and x-rayed to ensure they are not carrying food products or other risk items. High-risk passengers are being interviewed and, where necessary, their clothing and equipment is disinfected.

But still – despite all these precautions, warnings, and awareness raising – New Zealanders and their friends and family overseas are still sending food and plant material here. They’re still trying to bring it into New Zealand in their bags or on their person.

That’s why 100 percent of all mail, baggage, and passengers are now being screened. There are too many pests and diseases in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the rest of the world that could potentially damage our livelihoods.

We must be eternally vigilant.
When news of Britain’s foot and mouth crisis broke, Ross Cherrington didn’t waste any time. The Devon organic farmer put down straw pads soaked with disinfectant, padlocked the gate and hunkered down with his family to weather the storm.

But it didn’t take long for the deadly plume of foot and mouth (FMD) virus to find his stock. After two weeks of constantly checking his sheep and cattle, the first gut-wrenching signs came with a lame ewe. Even then, Ross wasn’t sure. The blisters he’d expected to see weren’t there. But when a bullock was found shivering, frothing at the mouth its tongue lolling, the signs were very clear.

Vets from the UK MAFF (including vets from the New Zealand support team) had confirmed the disease within hours. From that moment, the scenario that’s played out on over 1650 British farms since late February, began its nightmarish course.

Once the stock had been valued for compensation, slaughter began. Not even the new lambs – some only hours old – were spared. Every cloven-hoofed animal on the farm was killed.

In the early spring conditions the ground was too wet to bury the dead animals, and it was too muddy to get trucks onto the farm to bring the fuel needed to build the a pyre to burn them. It was five days before the decomposing carcasses could be removed from the farm and taken to a rendering plant. On some farms the wait was up to two weeks.

The cleanup came next. A gang moved in and stripped back farm buildings to remove anything that could harbour the virus, and sprayed with a viricide and citricide to blitz any remaining disease organisms. Then they were gone and the Cherringtons were left with a compensation cheque but empty fields and an organic farming business that will have to be restarted from scratch.

Ross Cherrington was in New Zealand earlier this month sharing his story with those who could relate most closely to his experience – New Zealand farmers. He travelled to New Zealand at the invitation of MAF, and with the assistance of Air New Zealand.

At the recent deer industry conference he told the 200 delegates that while friends and neighbours rallied around, it was tough for the families involved. Groceries were left at the gate and, in a kind of mirror image of World War Two, his children were evacuated under a special licence from the hitherto safe haven of the country. The stench of rotting corpses and the constantly burning pyres was heavy in the air for weeks.

Cherrington said the foot and mouth disease crisis will inevitably drive some farmers from the industry for good. He said the average age of British farmers is 57, and on hill country properties the figure is even higher. “A lot of them will retire after this,” he said.

While he is hoping to re-establish his business, he says there are practical difficulties in the short term. With the large numbers of stock slaughtered, replacement animals will be expensive and difficult to source. And if farmers try to re-stock too early and replacements also become infected, they will not be entitled to a second round of compensation.

Understandably there is still an air of uncertainty among farmers.

Asked what he plans to do when he returns to his now empty farm, Ross was philosophical. “I expect I’ll be spending a fair bit of time mowing pasture,” he said.

New Zealand border procedures pass muster

At question time during his presentation to New Zealand deer farmers, Ross Cherrington was quizzed closely on his impressions of this country’s border controls in light of the British foot and mouth disease crisis. He was happy with what he’d seen.

“As I understand it, humans themselves are not likely to be inadvertently carrying the disease. The big danger comes from those who deliberately try to bring in things like gifts of meat products.”

He concedes that there is always a balance to be struck between encouraging tourists to our country and keeping diseases like FMD out. But he was impressed with the thoroughness of his welcome to New Zealand.

“The MAF people gave me a good going over.”
The foot and mouth disease emergency in the UK has sharpened the focus on New Zealand’s biosecurity programmes, both at the border and for emergency response. New Zealanders have been taking a frontline role during the UK outbreak. This article takes a timely look at the current state and future directions of MAF’s animal exotic disease response (EDR) programmes.

The key strategic objectives for the EDR programmes are:

1 **Generic capability**: To have documented systems and trained roleholders within EDR covering all aspects of New Zealand’s generic exotic disease response capability, in accordance with government-agreed standards.

2 **Capability for serious diseases**: To have specific technical control plans agreed between government and the affected industries for incursions of the most serious exotic diseases of animals, to complement the generic capability.

3 **Scale-up**: To have procedures in place for a rapid and coordinated scale-up in the event of a large scale outbreak.

**EDR roleholder activities**

The FMD outbreak in the UK has meant a busy time for EDR roleholders. New Zealanders have been directly involved. Epidemiologists from the Exotic Disease Response Centre (EDRC) have been working in head office of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food in the United Kingdom (MAFF UK), while three contingents of the New Zealand Veterinary Reserves Team have provided field assistance.

EDR roleholders have been communicating with stakeholders in New Zealand to capitalise on the awareness the FMD outbreak has generated.

In New Zealand, the EDRC has completed documentation of its standard operating procedures and been tested through two national simulation exercises and during the response to varroa in 2000. In addition, they investigated 99 reports of suspected exotic animals or exotic animal diseases from July 2000 to March 2001.

An important project for the EDRC during the next year will be enhancing MAF’s epidemic information management systems.

Major projects for the EDR contractors (AgriQuality New Zealand Limited, Asure New Zealand Limited and Massey University) next year will be to incorporate lessons from the UK experience into New Zealand’s EDR system.

Contractors’ work with the processing industries is continuing. A series of six national meetings with the meat industry is being held to discuss the future of their EDR planning. Monitoring of site preparedness in the dairy industry continues, and work has begun with the aquaculture and wool, hides and skins industries to assist their preparedness to respond to an outbreak of disease.

EDR activities in apiculture have benefited from, and remain closely linked with, MAF’s involvement in delivering varroa management programmes to the beekeeping industry.

The focus for the next year for all contractors will be group-specific training, rather than a national simulation. This will allow time for experience from the recent Newcastle disease simulation and the FMD response in the UK to be incorporated into systems. MAF has signalled a shift of the training focus towards regular competency assessments guiding training needs. A national simulation exercise is scheduled for September 2002.

**Technical control plans**

A three-part template for the technical plans has been developed:

- biology/epidemiology/risks
- control measures
- communication strategy.

Disease reviews and consultation on control measures were completed during 1998 and 1999. Work on three specific plans has progressed, with project teams established with industry to develop plans for equine influenza, classical swine fever, and Newcastle disease. Progress in other areas will be pursued next year.

Likely incursion scenarios will be developed, based on research into industry structures and movements. The plans will be subject to cost benefit analysis from the national economy perspective to guide decisions on government investment in control activities. At least three response options will be considered:

- no government-assisted management
- eradication using the preferred technical control policy
- an alternative control policy (such as staged eradication or temporary assistance for management).

We expect to pick up the pace of these projects once the methodology has been established and proven.

**Other initiatives**

A MAF and industry working group has been established under the Animal Biosecurity Consultative Committee to examine funding for EDR activities, including the Australian model for cost-sharing for responses, particularly when economic analysis suggests no (or marginal) net benefit to the national economy from government investment in eradication.

MAF Biosecurity is also moving toward full integration of EDR programmes with existing government crisis management procedures.

Closer links with local government are also being established. A procedure is being drafted to ensure environmental issues are considered during a response. MAF also hopes to achieve agreements with local government authorities on utilising resources such as personnel and machinery during national EDR responses.

Matthew Stone, Programme Coordinator Exotic Disease Response, ph 04 498 9884, fax 04 474 4133, stonem@maf.govt.nz
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When there is an exotic animal disease outbreak overseas

An exotic disease outbreak can present fresh challenges to New Zealand’s biosecurity when it happens in a country we trade with. The foot and mouth disease outbreak in the UK and Europe is a sharp reminder that we are only a plane ride away from such a disaster happening here.

In this article we review the process MAF Biosecurity uses when an exotic disease is reported in a country from which we import.

The International Trade Section of the Animal Biosecurity Group is responsible for ensuring that import health standards safeguard New Zealand’s biosecurity. These standards cover live animals, animal germplasm, such as semen and embryos, or animal products, such as meat, dairy products, hides and skins.

Part of the section’s job is to monitor the animal health status of our trading partners and, if it changes, amend our import health standards appropriately.

The flurry of amended or revoked import health standards, seen in this, and issues 27 and 26 of Biosecurity, is a direct response to the changing animal disease situation of those countries.

How we find out about disease outbreaks

Most of New Zealand’s trading partners report their animal health status to the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE, Office International des Epizooties), who in turn, transmit reports to the other members. Timeframes for reporting vary depending on the disease. OIE List A diseases must be reported to the OIE within 24 hours of provisional diagnosis and are promptly passed on to the OIE delegate in each country. Other diseases have slower reporting timeframes. Some overseas authorities will send notification directly to New Zealand.

The World Trade Organisation is another useful source of information. It also provides information on the changes other countries are making to their import health standards.

Other methods used to monitor trading partners’ animal health status include monitoring reputable email networks, such as AnimalNet and Promed, and personal contact with importers, exporters and staff in the overseas authorities.

Changes to import health standards

In the event of an exotic disease outbreak in another country, the International Trade Section reviews all its current and draft import health standards to see which will be affected by the change in disease status. Those import health standards and the safeguards in them are reassessed to ensure that the new risk is taken into account. Import health standards may be withdrawn and trade in certain commodities stopped while reassessment takes place. The veterinary authority of the exporting country or region is notified of actions that are taken by MAF. If the changes might affect trade, New Zealand also notifies the WTO.

Where safeguards can be put in place to cover the disease in question, revised import health standards can be issued containing those new safeguards. Exports to New Zealand cannot proceed where exporting countries or regions cannot satisfy the new conditions. Decisions also have to be made about treatment of shipments in transit.

Where a disease is subsequently eliminated from the infected country or region, the extra safeguards can be removed from the import health standard, providing that the standard still covers the disease risks presented by importing from that country or region. The previously infected country or region must prove disease freedom in these cases. For some diseases, the OIE sets out conditions that must be met to claim disease freedom. For other diseases, the International Trade Section consults with members of other sections of the MAF Biosecurity Authority and stakeholders to assess a case for disease freedom before trade is reinstated or conditions are renegotiated.

At the border

All changes to import health standards are notified to Import Management staff, who issue import permits, and to the MAF Quarantine Service for implementation at the border.

The Import Management staff determine whether there are any current import permits that will be affected by the change. If so, they notify the permit holder and may either cancel the permit or amend it to meet the new import health standard.

Directions are issued to MAF Quarantine Service describing how affected imports are to be handled. If there are any shipments not covered by the new directions, the Quarantine Service will seek clarification from MAF Biosecurity.

Meeting our standards

When import health standards are developed, the disease status of the exporting country or region is considered and safeguards are put in place for diseases that are a risk from that country or region that are either not present in New Zealand or for which New Zealand has official control programmes in place.

These safeguards might include: proof of freedom from a disease of that country or region; proof of freedom from a disease of the premises, herd or flock of origin of animals being exported or animals providing products for export; or testing or treatment for a disease. Only animals or products that meet the conditions in import health standards can be imported into New Zealand.
Sea container review

MAF is to review the import health standard for the importation of sea containers. A project team consisting of MAF Biosecurity Advisers, MAF Quarantine Service, Department of Conservation, Ministry for the Environment, New Zealand Customs and a representative from the container industry is coordinating the review.

Before the review takes place, MAF will undertake a survey on shipping containers to obtain baseline information for the new import health standard. This information is needed to ensure that the requirements for containers are appropriate for the level of risk they pose.

The objectives of this survey are to:

- ascertain the true internal contamination rate for both certified (with cleaning certificates) and uncertified sea containers entering the country
- determine the nature of contaminants arriving via this pathway
- test whether probe cameras are an effective and efficient tool for container inspection
- verify the accuracy of the manifested contents
- determine the efficacy of the current door inspection methods for sea containers entering the country
- ascertain the movements of imported sea containers within New Zealand.

The survey will take place in Auckland, Tauranga, Napier and Lyttelton over a period of one year. One year is required to ensure that seasonality is taken into account.

The number of containers to be inspected is as follows:

- 12,000 containers will be door inspected on the wharf. For sampling, a random 5 percent of the manifest for that port of discharge will be selected.
- 1000 of the above containers will also be inspected on the wharf by a ‘snake eye’ camera as part of an evaluation of new technology.
- 2000 of the 12,000 containers will be followed up to their point of devanning to ascertain whether door inspection is a reliable means of detecting quarantine material within the container.
- 1000 containers will have their movements traced until leaving the country to assess the likelihood of any pests contacting a suitable host.
- 1500 empty containers will also be inspected. For sampling, 2 percent of those manifested will be selected.

This is required to assess whether or not door inspections on the wharf are adequate to detect contamination. This means that a MAF inspector will be present during devanning, and extra staff will be taken on to carry out these inspections. MAF will make every effort to ensure that an inspector is available when these containers are being devanned, but from time to time an inspector may be unavailable at the exact time a container is to be devanned.

Pests found during the survey will be identified.

The survey is fully government funded and there are no extra charges to shipping companies, ports, agents, importers etc for these inspections. The work is expected to commence on or about 2 July 2001.

MAF is seeking the cooperation of those involved with shipping containers during the survey. Any enquiries should be directed to Ken Glassey at MAF Biosecurity (below).

Ken Glassey, Programme Coordinator (Border Management), phone 04 498 9610 or 025 249 2318, glasseyk@maf.govt.nz

Generic email address for the International Trade Section

The International Trade Section of MAF Biosecurity now has a generic email address. If you need to contact the group as a whole or if you are not sure of a direct email address, please use:

IAT@maf.govt.nz

IAT is an acronym for International Animal Trade, the section’s previous title, and has been used to avoid confusion with the ubiquitous acronym for Information Technology. The address is not case sensitive.
Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM): an update

The 3rd session of the ICPM, held in Rome from 2-6 April, was an extremely productive meeting that saw the adoption of a number of new phytosanitary standards and the continued development of the administrative procedures of the Interim Commission.

The session was chaired by John Hedley (New Zealand) in his last act as the first chair of the ICPM (1998-2001). Richard Ivess (Director Plants Biosecurity) and Ruth Frampton (Director ForestBiosecurity) represented New Zealand. The commission worked through a very large agenda, including:

- the adoption of three standards
- glossary amendments
- a glossary supplement on ‘official control’
- a new constitution for the membership of the standards committee
- a list of priority standards for development
- dispute settlement procedures
- a strategic plan and calendar for 2001-2
- the plan for collaboration with the Convention on Biological Diversity
- a technical assistance programme; and
- a plan for information management.

The full report of this meeting is available on the IPPC web site www.ippc.int

It had been 18 months since the second ICPM meeting, which was held in October 1999. The extra time between the sessions was used by the Secretariat and commission members to pursue a very heavy work programme to develop the Interim Commission as much as possible. The report of the 3rd session of the ICPM confirms the success of this programme. It demonstrates that considerable progress can be made by international organisations when members are dedicated and energetic.

New standards

The three standards adopted were:

- Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests
- Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates; and
- Guidelines for notification of non-compliance and emergency action.

The standards were adopted with only a few minor amendments to the drafts.

The glossary supplement that defines and explains ‘official control’, Glossary of phytosanitary terms: supplement no. 1, Guidelines on the concept of official control for regulated pests, was adopted by the Interim Commission. There was not a consensus on this standard, which was not accepted by Japan. In line with ICPM procedures a vote as held and the standard was adopted 64 votes to 1.

Constitution of standards committee

The main committee of the ICPM is the Interim standards committee. Proposals to change the constitution of the committee were presented to the 2nd session of the ICPM but not accepted. Further proposals were put to the 3rd session of the ICPM. These involved a membership of 21 members, 3 from each of the 7 FAO regions. A group of 7 experts who would draft comments for the examination of the 21 members would be selected from the 21 members. This proposal was accepted except for the reduction of the group of experts from North America from three to two. This matter has been a subject of some dissent so this agreement was a significant step forward which also allowed the Rules of Procedure of the ICPM to be completed.

High priority

It was decided that all standards currently under development should be given high priority for completion. New standards recommended for addition to the programme included:

- Risk analysis for environmental hazards of plant pests
- Defining economic importance (possibly using a supplement to the Glossary)
- Efficacy of phytosanitary measures
- Low pest prevalence; and
- Irradiation.

The ICPM decided that topics for standards should fit into a loose framework of the following categories: urgent issues, foundation standards to address fundamental concepts, developing country concerns and the reviewing of standards.

Cooperation with IPPC

GMOs, biosafety and invasives were discussed extensively. The Chair of the Global Invasive Species Programme, Dr Jeffrey Waage, spoke to the meeting on areas of possible collaboration. Representatives from the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and from the Bureau of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety also spoke to the meeting stressing the usefulness of cooperation with the IPPC.

The Interim Commission adopted the Strategic plan developed in 2000. The plan includes a position statement, a mission statement, strategic directions, goals and calendars of activity. The plan is well structured and comprehensive – but it shows only too clearly the huge amount of work that has to be done.

Developing information exchange

Information exchange has been a difficult subject within the IPPC. The ICPM approved the development of an International Phytosanitary Portal which would have links to Secretariat information and other areas such as diagnostic information, official pest risk analyses, and technical and biological information. The portal would be a website but where a country did not have internet access, a CD would be supplied. Additional resources will be required for the development of this information exchange mechanism.

The meeting elected a new chair – Felipe Canale from Uruguay and two vice chairs – Ralf Lopian from Finland and John Hedley from New Zealand.
MAF Chief Executive retires

MAF chief executive Professor Bruce Ross retired on April 30 after leading the Ministry, and its predecessor the Ministry of Agriculture, for nearly 5 years. He was previously vice-chancellor of Lincoln University for 11 years.

Agriculture Minister Jim Sutton said Professor Ross had made an outstanding contribution to agriculture and rural communities.

“He has always had a good rapport with farmers. In fact, he has told people that if the family had had enough money, he would have gone farming. His continued love for farming and for the land has given him a special rapport, firstly with the Lincoln University community that he led for so long, and more recently, with MAF and the rural industries.”

Mr Sutton said Professor Ross had successfully bridged the gap between the ivory towers of Wellington and the grass roots of rural New Zealand.

Larry Fergusson steps into Acting D-G role

MAF’s new Acting Director-General is Larry Fergusson, who took over the role of ‘caretaker’ chief executive at the beginning of May. Larry has worked at MAF since 1985. He was originally employed in the legal section and more recently has been director of the Ministry’s Policy Group.

He is emphatic about the importance of agricultural and horticultural production to New Zealand’s future. “The recent foot and mouth crisis in Europe reminds kiwis just how vital the rural sectors are to our economy,” he says. “MAF plays no small part in the success of these sectors.”

He says the various groups within MAF work closely. “MAF Biosecurity and the Quarantine Service work together to keep the bio-nasties out so that the primary sectors can succeed. And our excellent animal and plant health status means that MAF can certify our products.”

Biosecurity strategy update

The biosecurity strategy is moving into an ‘issues identification’ phase. All interested people and organisations are invited to identify the biosecurity issues they would like considered as our national biosecurity strategy is developed.

The identification of biosecurity issues is a critical first step in the strategy development process. It is also a valuable early opportunity for stakeholders to influence the overall direction of the final strategy. When you are identifying issues, we encourage you to think about the changes that will occur in New Zealand over the coming decade, and what challenges that will create for our biosecurity programme.

At this stage we are casting our net widely, so please don’t feel constrained. The issues identified now will form the basis of an issues paper for nation-wide public consultation during October to December 2001. A draft biosecurity strategy will then be developed for a second round of nation-wide consultation during May to July 2002.

Stakeholder working groups

In the last edition of Biosecurity we reported that 10 stakeholder working groups were being established to assist with issues identification. The working groups will be identifying sector-specific and generic biosecurity issues, networking to ensure all views are captured, and documenting issues for the strategy development team by 30 June 2001. If you would like to contact a working group, you can do so via the strategy development team. Alternatively, the team would be pleased to accept your issues directly.

Reporting your issues

We are asking that people identify issues according to a standard format. This will assist us to collate all the issues we receive, and prepare an integrated issues paper for public consultation. We would like issues to be described under the following broad headings:

- Identification – brief title identifying issue
- Category – what category should the issue belong to?
- Background information – provide a context for the issue
- Justification – why is the issue important?
- Priority – rank issue as Very Important, Important, or Desirable
- Options – how could/should the issue be dealt with?
- Implications – of action or inaction

Workshop process available

The strategy development team has prepared an interactive workshop process to assist groups of up to 30 people to identify biosecurity issues. It involves three main stages:

1. Building a picture of biosecurity in New Zealand
2. Identifying the future issues for biosecurity that the strategy should consider
3. Grouping issues and assigning priorities

The workshop is activity based, and takes 2 – 3 hours. It is best managed by a skilled facilitator, but this is not absolutely necessary. Anyone with an interest in running a workshop, perhaps within an organisation or with an external interest group, should contact the strategy development team. We can provide the workshop format and assist with facilitation, if necessary.

Malcolm Crawley, Biosecurity Strategy Development Team, phone 04 460 8778, fax 04 460 8779, bsdteam@maf.govt.nz
Bovine Tb strategy review: Notification and increase in government funding

The Minister of Agriculture has notified the Animal Health Board’s proposal to review and amend the bovine tuberculosis (Tb) pest management strategy. Submissions are invited.

A primary objective of proposals to amend the strategy is achieving ‘official freedom’ from bovine Tb by June 2013. This is because the presence of bovine Tb in New Zealand cattle and deer herds could become a trade barrier. Though it is quite different from the tuberculosis that usually affects humans, there are consumer perception issues with it in some export markets. An effective bovine Tb control programme is vital to minimise that risk.

Government contribution increased

The proposal to amend the strategy was publicly notified on 3 May 2001. This followed agreement by the Government to increase its financial contribution to the strategy. From 1 July 2001, the government share will be around $33.5 million a year, up from $20.4 million last financial year. As well as getting extra funding, the Animal Health Board will also be allowed to retain savings made through efficiencies, which would enable it to accelerate the vector control programme.

This means the Crown will fund about 50 percent of bovine Tb vector control (mainly possums and ferrets), with industry paying about 40 percent and local councils about 10 percent.

Other changes

Other important elements of the proposal are:

• modifying the definition of management areas, movement controls and testing regimes to reflect the risks in such areas; and
• increasing the area brought under vector control to contain and reduce vector risk areas.

No sign of gypsy moth

No gypsy moths were trapped during MAF Forest Biosecurity’s monitoring programme for the exotic forest pest.

Gypsy moth is present in the Russian Far East and in parts of Asia, Europe and North America. Its caterpillar is known to feed on over 500 plant species and has the potential to damage New Zealand’s forests. The pest particularly favours northern hemisphere host plants such as oak, birch and poplar.

The trapping programme ran from November through to the end of April, to coincide with the moth’s predicted flight season. This year, 1043 traps were deployed by AgriQuality New Zealand throughout the country on properties neighbouring ports, container yards, and identified risk sites such as used car yards. The traps, which are checked fortnightly, are baited with a pheromone, a sex attractant. Male moths, attracted to the pheromone, enter the traps and are caught fast to the sticky interior.

Although no gypsy moths have been caught since MAF began trapping in 1993, continuation of the programme is essential in order to ensure any incursion is detected early enough to facilitate successful eradication.

Comments invited

Everyone with an interest is encouraged to study the Animal Health Board’s proposal and to comment on it. Copies of the review proposal can be obtained from the Animal Health Board.

Crown contributions to regional pest management strategies

The first reviews of regional pest management strategies (RPMSs) are taking place. MAF is working with the Department of Conservation (DoC) to review the regulations that set out DoC’s obligations under each strategy.

Regional councils are revising their RPMSs for the first time. The Crown is only bound to an RPMS to the extent to which it agrees to those costs and obligations by order in council. MAF is preparing to revise the orders in council that apply to DoC in respect of its agreed obligations under RPMSs.

DoC is negotiating with regional councils the level of contributions to be made to each revised RPMS. When these negotiations are complete, MAF will promulgate regulations in line with the new contributions. Some RPMSs are not due for revision until 2002/2003. The regulations that apply to these strategies will be amended to extend their duration until the relevant strategies are revised. MAF expects the new/amended regulations to be in force by August 2001.

No female gypsy moth laying eggs.
Ornamental bulbs: Reviews –

The requirements for importation into New Zealand • The AFFA import risk analysis

In early April the MAF Plant Imports Team met with New Zealand ornamental bulb industry interested parties to talk over the implications of the current review of importation requirements.

The consultation was the first stage of a full review of the import health standard (IHS) for the following more frequently imported bulb genera:

- Allium (ornamental only), Anemone, Dahlia, Freesia, Gladiolus, Hippeastrum, Hyacinthus, Iris, Lilium, Narcissus, Ornithogalum, Ranunculus, Paeonia, Sandersonia (added since the meeting), Tulipa, Zantedeschia.

The requirements for other bulb genera may also need to be modified.

The meeting was advised that pest lists, a more rigorous pest risk assessment (PRA) and technical justification for measures imposed are now both international and MAF Biosecurity requirements. A review is necessary to be confident that MAF has measures in place to prevent the entry of pests that are likely to cause serious problems if they became established in New Zealand or, that are highly likely to enter with imported bulbs as new organisms. This includes viruses which could be vectored to other crops. It is also necessary to have import health standards in a format consistent with other commodity classes.

Discussion took place on the following issues:

- ‘MAF Approved’ bulb schemes in operation in the Netherlands, Israel, UK and Australia and how New Zealand links with these. Further investigation will determine if these still provide assurances of freedom from specific pests/diseases for the bulb species included in the schemes. Some schemes incorporate soil sampling, and virus testing or use of virus tested stock.

- Biosecurity Index and ERMA requirement to provide the specific species names for imported commodities. A practical solution is needed for naming of hybrids classified under international horticultural classifications.

- Pest lists, PRA and high risk pests. MAF already has pest lists for most of the major bulb genera. The assessment process will take time as there are over 1000 pests associated with these bulb genera.

- Documentation. The possibilities of adopting registration systems, e.g. growers/importers, recording more information on phytosanitary certificates, e.g. to assist in tracking requirements for the bulb schemes, and the use of permits were considered.

- Treatments. Current problems and potential possibilities are to be investigated with the use of various chemicals, hot water, cool storage and the timing and effectiveness of the application of treatments.

- Post-entry quarantine as a measure. Open ground Level 1 is not a suitable option where it is known that the bulb species can potentially bring in organisms that cannot be treated in quarantine, such as viruses. Greenhouse Level 2 may be required for genera where the IHS requirements have not been included in this review, i.e. where the existing measures do not meet concerns. MAF recognises that growing conditions for bulbs are often not ideal in a greenhouse and that availability of space could also be a problem.

- Border inspection issues, packaging materials, species without a truly dormant phase or which throw green shoots in transit, audit of overseas declarations, procedures within New Zealand and timing of implementation of the new standards were also discussed.

A consultation network was established for future notification and feedback as the draft Import Health Standards are prepared. A full report from this meeting is available on request.

In February 2001 MAF submitted comments on the Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Australia (AFFA) import risk analysis on ornamental bulbs. The comments mainly related to pest categorisations and the measures proposed to manage certain pests. AFFA is now evaluating the comments of all stakeholders before issuing a final import risk analysis. It is MAF’s understanding that there will be opportunity for further discussion with AFFA during this period.

### Fresh cut flowers and foliage review

MAF Biosecurity is reviewing the approved commodities and countries for the importation of fresh cut flowers and foliage into New Zealand. Currently fresh cut flowers and foliage are allowed entry under generic, historic import conditions. It is MAF Biosecurity’s intention to develop country:commodity specific import health standards (IHSs) for those commodities currently being imported.

As a first step in this process, those historically approved commodities which have not been imported during the two years prior to 17 April 2001 will be removed from the approved list and will no longer be permitted entry. This will be implemented from 1 August 2001. At this time MAF Biosecurity will communicate with exporting countries regarding the development of specific IHSs for the remaining commodities.

Any new commodities will need to have a country:commodity specific IHS developed and issued before being allowed entry to New Zealand.

A list of those commodities and countries affected is available on the MAF website (below).

- Sean Newland, Technical Coordinator (International Operations), Plants Biosecurity, fax 04 474 4257, newlands@maf.govt.nz
- www.maf.govt.nz/Plants/import/flowersfoliage
Views sought on new biosecurity charges

The charges for various biosecurity services are being revised. A discussion document will be released soon seeking comment on the new charges.

MAF's charges for biosecurity services are outlined in the Biosecurity (Costs) Regulations 1993. These charges have not been updated for over seven years. There is a pressing need to revise them to ensure they accurately reflect the cost of providing services.

Services that MAF charges for under these regulations include border inspections, treatment or destruction of risk goods, applications for import permits and supervision of transitional facilities (e.g., quarantine facilities).

Previous efforts to review the regulations were deferred to address urgent priorities such as pest and disease incursion responses. MAF is now giving this review a high priority.

All charges under the current regulations are being reviewed. Proposals to amend the regulations will be completed soon. MAF aims to enact new costs regulations by the end of 2001.

MAF will consult with stakeholders on the proposed charges over the coming months. Consultation will start with the release of a discussion paper. Those with a direct interest in the new charges will be sent a copy of the paper, including:

- port companies
- shipping companies
- operators of transitional and containment facilities
- major importers and importers' associations
- research institutes (including universities).

You can register your interest in receiving a copy of the discussion paper when it is ready. There is no need to register if you are among the groups listed above.

Mary Craythorne, Senior Policy Analyst, MAF Policy, phone 04 498 9830, fax 04 474 4265, mary.craythorne@maf.govt.nz

Forest product imports to come under the Biosecurity Act

The current requirements for the importation of non-viable (non-propagatable) forest products were first published in 1993 and are implemented under the Forest Produce Import and Export Regulations 1989. The anticipated repeal of these regulations means import health standards will be required under section 22 of the Biosecurity Act 1993.

Bringing the importation of forest products under the Biosecurity Act will align forestry commodities with the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement), the activities of other groups within the MAF Biosecurity Authority, and with the importation requirements for propagatable forest products, such as seeds and nursery stock.

Development of the new standards will be undertaken in two stages:

**Stage 1:** Development of import health standards that comply with section 22 of the Biosecurity Act. These standards will need to be issued prior to the repeal of the Forest Produce Import and Export Regulations 1989.

**Stage 2:** Review of the current phytosanitary requirements for the importation of forest products. This will involve the development of import risk analyses to assess the potential risks and risk-mitigating measures associated with forest product import pathways.

For the purpose of this project, forest products will include:

- roundwood, sawn timber, wood chips, and logs
- wood used to separate, brace, protect or secure cargo in transit (i.e. wood packing, including dunnage)
- manufactured wood items
- household items such as antiques, artefacts, furniture, implements; and
- reconstituted products such as plywood and panel products.

The development of an import health standard(s) for wood packing materials (such as cases, crates, and pallets) will parallel the development of an International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) for these commodities. The Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures is overseeing the development of this ISPM.

MAF will seek comment on the details of this proposal at the first formal meeting of the Forest Biosecurity Consultative Committee, and will invite industry participation on the project team.

Dr Mike Ormsby, National Adviser, (Import Health Standards), MAF Forest Biosecurity, phone 04 498 9630, fax 04 498 9888, ormsbym@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/imports/forests/index.htm

**Orchardist registered mark**

Under Regulation 5 of the New Zealand Grown Fruit and Vegetable Regulations 1975 every commercial orchardist, with an orchard of not less than 4,000m² for the purpose of growing fruit for sale, is required to obtain a registered mark from MAF. A commercial orchardist is the owner of the land or a person with a tenancy of at least 12 months or with the right to occupy the land by virtue of a lease, licence or other authority. The purpose of this mark is to enable fruit for sale to be traceable to its place of production.

Applicants wishing to obtain an orchard registration mark may obtain an application form and further relevant information from the MAF website.


- Processing of an application for a registered mark may take up to 5 days.
- The fee for registration is $73.15 (incl.GST) per registered mark, payable on application.
- Applicants may apply for more than one registered mark where they have more than one place of production.

Applicants will need to complete the details requested on the application form and return it to MAF. If you have any difficulty completing the form, contact:

Lisa Collins, Administration Assistant - Exports, Plants Biosecurity, phone 04 470 2732, fax 04 474 4257, ors@maf.govt.nz
MAF negotiates with China on log import standards

MAF Forest Biosecurity has engaged Chinese authorities in negotiations over proposed changes to phytosanitary standards for imported logs. Import phytosanitary standards, promulgated by the State Administration for Inspection and Quarantine, require all logs arriving in China after July 1, 2001 to be debarked or insecticide treated.

Mark Self (MAF Forest Biosecurity) and Wei-Young Wang (New Zealand Forest Owners Association) will travel to Beijing in early June to discuss with Chinese authorities their requirements for the importation of New Zealand logs.

The 20 submissions received on the draft National Pest Plant Accord indicated that they support the accord in principle. The Pest Management Strategy Advisory Committee has recommended that the accord be subject to conditions specified by the existing parties.

Parties will have until 1 August 2001 to join the accord without conditions. After this date, acceptance as an accord party may be subject to conditions specified by the existing parties.

Other interested groups are also encouraged to participate in the future development of the accord. Nominations are still being accepted for a consultative group involved in the ongoing review of the list of unwanted organisms covered by the accord.

The list of unwanted organisms covered by the accord will appear in the next issue of Biosecurity.

Painted apple moth response under scrutiny

An independent review of MAF's painted apple moth response was conducted in May. The review was commissioned in response to concerns, mainly from the forest industry, about the process adopted to manage the incursion.

Painted apple moth (Teia anartoides) was first detected in Auckland and reported to MAF in May 1999. A Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was established to help MAF manage the response, and steps were put in place to control the pest.

The response to date has included surveys, trapping, host removal and spray treatments, as well as moth rearing and pheromone development and moth rearing programmes. By March 2001, the results of caged-female trapping potentially closed the gap between the Glendene/Kelston and Titirangi finds. In contrast, the results of trapping and surveys provide good evidence that the Mt Wellington population is well under control.

Dr Andrew (Sandy) Liebhold, a research entomologist with the USDA Forest Service in the United States, was the technical expert on the review. He worked closely with New Zealander Bruce Simpson, Director of Biosecurity Ltd, who was contracted as the administration and management expert.

Sandy is an expert in lymantriid biology and has particular experience with the ecology and spread of gypsy moth in North America. He has been on the Technical Committee of the Gypsy Moth National Slow the Spread Project since 1992 and is very familiar with forestry pest incursions. Bruce has had considerable management experience, and has conducted a number of reviews in the animal and meat assurance area.

The review team spent a week in early May focusing on technical matters, after which Bruce concentrated on management aspects of the response. While conducting the review, the team interviewed as many parties involved in the response as possible. They toured the infestation zones in Auckland and visited HortResearch's painted apple moth rearing facility at the Mt Albert Research Centre.

The outcome of the review will be reported in the next issue of Biosecurity.

National pest plant accord nearing implementation

The 20 submissions received on the draft National Pest Plant Accord generally indicated continued support for the proposal. The accord partners are working towards its implementation by 1 July 2001.

The accord will coordinate measures against the sale and distribution of an identified list of undesirable plants through a partnership between regional councils and government biosecurity departments.

Most regional councils and biosecurity departments have indicated that they support the accord in principle. The Pest Management Strategy Advisory Committee's endorsement of the accord will be sought before parties will be invited to join.

Regional councils and biosecurity departments are encouraged to join the accord by the 1 July 2001 implementation date.

@ billdyck@voyager.co.nz.
The fifth meeting of the trans-Tasman Animal Welfare Committee (AWC) was held in Palmerston North on 19 and 20 March. This committee includes representation from all the Australian States and Territories, the Federal Government, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) and New Zealand. The committee last met in New Zealand, in Hamilton, in 1994. In addition to the meeting itself, the opportunity was taken to familiarise committee members with animal welfare research activities currently underway at Massey University.

Role of AWC

Established in 1980, AWC supports the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Resource Management (SCARM) which, in turn, supports the ministerial Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand (ARMCANZ). AWC’s terms of reference (revised in 1999), membership and modus operandi are as follows:

Terms of reference

- To advise and recommend policy to SCARM, as necessary, on all issues relating to animal welfare as these affect agricultural industries
- To identify for SCARM emerging animal welfare issues of strategic importance for policy development in consultation with industry and other stakeholders
- To facilitate the development, implementation and harmonisation of animal welfare standards and legislation
- To identify areas of need and advise strategic areas for research on animal welfare
- To respond to animal welfare issues brought to it by SCARM
- To provide an annual report to SCARM including a workplan for the coming year as well as details of outcomes/achievements from the preceding year.

Membership

- Representatives of relevant SCARM member agencies
- Industry observers as appropriate.

Method of operation

AWC meets once a year, with as much business as possible dealt with out-of-session between meetings. Development of Australian model codes of practice tends to be by specialist working groups comprising government specialists, representatives from the particular industry, and stakeholder groups as appropriate. New Zealand takes note of these model codes when developing New Zealand codes of welfare.

Meeting agenda

Topics discussed at the 2001 Palmerston North meeting included:

- Endorsement of Australian Model Codes of Practice for the Welfare of Animals – Ostriches
- Review of Model Code of Practice for the Welfare of Animals – Destruction or Capture, Handling and Marketing of Feral Animals
- Consideration of Industry Code of Practice for Deer
- National Collection of Animal Welfare Statistics
- National Animal Welfare Strategy

Animal ethics

Animal ethics committees are pivotal to the New Zealand system of regulating research, testing and teaching involving the use of live animals.

In practice, animal ethics committees (AECs) have been a part of the regulatory system since 1987 (and some organisations had voluntarily established them before this). However, the Animal Welfare Act 1999 enshrined in law the principle of those with an approved code of ethical conduct (code holders) establishing an AEC.

Composition

The minimum legal size for an AEC is four members. Membership must conform to the following:

- the code holder (if the code holder is an organisation, this must be a senior staff member appointed by the chief executive);
- a veterinarian nominated by the New Zealand Veterinary Association;
- Animal Welfare and International Trade
- Export of Livestock
- Model Codes of Practice
- Slaughter Code.

Massey University Research

Massey University researchers gave presentations on:

- The Role of the Animal Welfare Science and Bioethics Centre
- Kaimanawa Wild Horses
- Ethics, Animal Welfare and the Future
- Welfare Issues raised by Possum Poisons
- Bobby Calf Welfare
- Husbandry, Distress and its Alleviation
- Animal Welfare in the New Zealand Dairy Industry
- Welfare of Hunted Whales

Additional information on any of these topics, or the meeting itself, are available on request.

A C David Bayvel, Director Animal Welfare, phone 04 474 4251, fax 04 498 9888, bayveld@maf.govt.nz
committees

- a person nominated by an ‘approved organisation’. (At present this would include the Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals or the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand.);
- a person nominated by a territorial authority or regional council.

Larger organisations will normally appoint additional members of staff (for instance other scientific or veterinary staff, the senior animal technician and/or farm manager) to bring a wider range of expertise to the committee.

Organisations that operate at a number of locations around the country may establish more than one AEC to approve and oversee projects in particular areas.

The role of external members of animal ethics committees

The public would have little faith in the system if AECs were made up of staff members only. Thus, the external members of AECs play a vital role in assessing projects. They bring independence and a fresh set of eyes to all applications and are in a position to ask ‘the hard questions’ about the necessity, value or benefits of the project and whether all that could be done to mitigate any animal distress or suffering will be done.

Members who believe that the committee or code holder are failing to comply with the law or their code of ethical conduct are able to report this non-compliance, in confidence if necessary, to the Director-General of MAF.

Members are also protected from personal liability for any act or omission made in good faith in the course of the operations of the committee.

At the time of writing, there were 46 AECs established around the country. While some may deal with only occasional applications, most AECs meet regularly and deal with a moderate to large number of applications in a year. Without the willingness of external members to serve on AECs, often for minimal reimbursement for their time, the system would collapse.

Functions and powers

The functions and powers of AECs are also set by law. The main task of the committee is to consider and determine applications for projects involving the manipulation of live animals for research, testing and teaching purposes and to monitor compliance. This includes applications from an external individual/organisation who/which has made a legal arrangement to use the code holder’s code of ethical conduct and AEC.

Linda Carsons, Senior Policy Adviser, Animal Welfare,
phone 04 470 2746,
fax 04 498 9888,
carsonsl@maf.govt.nz

Update

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 or origin and commodity/species have been revoked.

Scoured animal fibre from Australia

Scoured animal fibre from Peru

These new import health standards dated 4 April 2001 have been issued by the Director of Animal Biosecurity and are based on the generic risk analysis Unprocessed fibre of sheep and goats, ISBN: 0-478 07980-X, November 1998.

Scoured, uncarded animal fibre from Australia

This new import health standard dated 27 April 2001 has been issued by the Director of Animal Biosecurity and is based on the generic risk analysis Unprocessed fibre of sheep and goats. A clause relating to further procedures while in the transitional facility is included.

Inedible animal products and biologicals

This import health standard has been amended to remove the clause relating to import of scoured animal fibre from Australia.

This clause has been replaced by the new import health standard for scoured animal fibre from Australia.

Dairy products for human consumption

New import health standards for dairy products for human consumption from The Netherlands, France and the Republic of Ireland have been issued, dated 5 April 2001.

The import health standard for dairy products for human consumption from the United Kingdom has been updated to include clause 10.2 relating to cheese, and replaces that dated 21 March 2001.

Equipment used with animals

The import health standard has been changed with respect to used shearing equipment. Equipment from countries with foot and mouth disease must now be disinfected or fumigated upon arrival in New Zealand. Clause 7.1 has been amended and 7.2 has been added.

Re-instatement of import health standards for Denmark and Sweden

- bovine semen from Denmark (IHS has been reinstated)
- irradiated bovine colostrum for feeding to livestock from Denmark (IHS has been reinstated)
- porcine/bovine blood for animal food from Denmark (IHS has been reinstated)
- pig meat products from Denmark (IHS has been reinstated)
- porcine enzymes from Denmark (IHS has been reinstated)
• bovine semen from Sweden (IHS has been reinstated)
• dairy products for human consumption (Denmark and Sweden have been added as countries of origin)
• dairy product samples (Denmark and Sweden have been added to clause 5.4)
• deer velvet (IHS has been reinstated)
• specified products for human consumption (Denmark and Sweden have been added to clauses 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 8.9)
• scoured fibre from specified countries (Denmark and Sweden have been added as countries of origin)
• dairy products not for human consumption from specified countries (Denmark and Sweden have been added countries of origin)
• animal repellent containing bovine/porcine blood from Sweden (IHS has been reinstated)
• pig meat products from Sweden (IHS has been reinstated)
• meat samples from specified countries (Denmark and Sweden have been added to clause 8.1)
• sheep from Sweden (IHS has been reinstated).

Product import health standards amended to include BSE safeguards
• specified products for human consumption containing dairy products, eggs or meat
• spray-dried bovine and porcine blood products for further processing into animal food from Denmark
• pre-cooked heat-and-eat meals containing animal products for human consumption from Canada, European Community and the United States of America
• specified protein digested animal products from France.

Fibre import health standards
These current import health standards have been reissued after being entered into the PAQIS database.

In addition, clauses relating to processing have been amended in the standards for scoured New Zealand/Australian origin animal fibre from People’s Republic of China and New Zealand/Australian origin wool tops from Germany.

• scoured New Zealand/Australian origin animal fibre from People’s Republic of China.
• New Zealand/Australian origin wool tops from Germany.
• possum fibre from Australia.
• mink fibre from the United Kingdom.
• macropod hides and fibre from Australia.

Semen from Europe
The following import health standards have been reinstated as New Zealand MAF now considers these European Union member states to be free from FMD. These IHSs were revoked on 14 March 2001 due to FMD in Europe.

• cattle semen from Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany and Italy
• buffalo semen from Italy.

Commercial consignments of dairy products for human consumption from specified European Union countries
This temporary import health standard, dated 8 May 2001, was issued to enable the importation of commercial consignments of dairy products from Austria, Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal and Spain.

Reinstated import health standards for European Union countries considered to be free from foot and mouth disease
The import health standards listed below have been amended to resume imports from European Union member states that the New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry now considers to be free from FMD. The European Union member states are Austria, Germany, Portugal, Belgium, Greece, Spain, Denmark, Italy, Sweden, Finland, Luxembourg.

• frozen deer by-products from Germany. Replaces the IHS dated 16 March 2000 (revoked on 14 March 2001)
• colostrum for livestock feed from Germany. Replaces the IHS dated 13 January 1998 (revoked on 14 March 2001)
• cheese containing salmon from Germany. Replaces the IHS dated 7 June 1995 (revoked on 14 March 2001)
• irradiated bovine colostrum for feeding to livestock from Denmark. Replaces the IHS dated 11 April 2001
• specified products for human consumption containing dairy products, eggs or meat. Replaces the IHS dated 8 May 2001
• dairy product samples for evaluation. Replaces the IHS dated 17 April 2001
• dairy products for human consumption from Japan. Replaces the IHS dated 14 March 2001
• dairy products for human consumption from specified countries. Replaces the IHS dated 17 April 2001 and the temporary standard dated 8 May 2001
• scoured animal fibre from specified countries. Replaces the IHS dated 17 April 2001
• untanned hides/skins from specified countries. Replaces the IHS dated 30 March 2001
• dairy products not for human consumption from specified countries. Replaces the IHS dated 17 April 2001
• dairy products not for human consumption from Japan. Replaces the IHS dated 14 March 2001
• meat and meat byproduct samples for evaluation and destruction. Replaces the IHS dated 17 April 2001

Information
Kerry Mulqueen, National Adviser (Import Management), Animal Biosecurity, phone 04 4989 625, fax 04 4744 132, mulqueenk@maf.govt.nz

Draft import health standard for consultation
The following draft import health standard has been and is available for public consultation. The deadline for submissions is 1 August 2001.
Dairy products for human consumption from Singapore


Jessie Chan, Technical Adviser, International Trade, phone 04 498 9897, fax 04 474 4227, chanj@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/AnimalIHS/riskanal.htm

Facility standards cancelled

Four obsolete standards for transitional and containment facilities have been cancelled:

- the standard for goldfish quarantine facilities and its companion supervision standard, both dated dated 17 March 1995
- the standard for the Wallaceville containment facility for *Schistosoma mansoni* and *Biomphalaria glabrata* and its supervision standards, both dated 24 October 1996.

The goldfish standards were developed in anticipation of an import health standard for goldfish being issued. It never was nor are there any import health standard for goldfish under development.

The two containment standards were developed to accompany the equivalent of a containment approval for a scientist at AgResearch Wallaceville. They are obsolete because the facility has transferred to the generic vertebrate laboratory animals containment facility standard.

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

Codes of ethical conduct – approvals, notifications and revocations since the last issue of Biosecurity

All organisations involved in the use of live animals for research, testing or teaching are required to adhere to an approved code of ethical conduct.

Codes of ethical conduct approved

- Animal Health Services Centre

Notifications to MAF of minor amendments to codes of ethical conduct

Nil

Notifications to MAF of arrangements to use an existing code of ethical conduct

- Wilson, Maurice (to use the University of Auckland’s code)

Codes of ethical conduct revoked or arrangements terminated

- Ministry of Agriculture (sic)

Approvals by the Director-General of MAF for the use of non-human hominids

Nil

Approvals by the Minister of Agriculture of research or testing in the national interest

Nil

Suzanne Main, Senior Policy Adviser, Animal Welfare, phone 04 470 2746, fax 04 498 9888, email carsonsl@maf.govt.nz

New import health standard issued

The following import health standard of the commodity sub-class: Fresh Fruit/Vegetables was issued on 29 May 2001:

**Capsicum frutescens (Chilli) from Tonga**

Sean Newland, Technical Adviser (International Operations – Plant Imports), Plants Biosecurity, fax 04 474 4257, newlands@maf.govt.nz

Notifiable organisms

Four plant pests and six marine pests are to be added to the list of notifiable organisms in New Zealand. MAF is seeking public comment on this amendment.

A notifiable organism is one that every New Zealander is required to report to a chief technical officer if they become aware of its presence in an area for the first time. Generally, notifiable organisms are those that will have a serious impact if they establish in this country.

Organisms become notifiable by being included in an order in council. The Biosecurity (Notifiable Organisms) Order 2000 will be amended to include the 10 new organisms.

Proposed notifiable organisms

**Organisms affecting plants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Type of organism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homalodisca coagulata</td>
<td>Glassy winged sharpshooter</td>
<td>Insect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum pox potyvirus</td>
<td>Plum pox</td>
<td>Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthomonas campestris pv.citri</td>
<td>Citrus canker</td>
<td>Bacterium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xylella fastidiosa</td>
<td>Pierce’s disease</td>
<td>Bacterium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisms affecting the marine environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Type of organism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asterias amurenis</td>
<td>Northern Pacific seastar</td>
<td>Echinoderm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carcinus maenas</td>
<td>European shore crab</td>
<td>Crustacean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green crab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulerpa taxifolia</td>
<td>Green seaweed</td>
<td>Algae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eristoea sinensis</td>
<td>Chinese mitten crab</td>
<td>Crustacean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potamocorbula amurenis</td>
<td>Asian clam</td>
<td>Mollusc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabella spallanzanii</td>
<td>Mediterranean fanworm</td>
<td>Polychaete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suzanne Main, Policy Adviser, Biosecurity Policy Coordination, phone 04 498 9930, fax 04 470 2730, mains@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/UO for current list of notifiable organisms

Deadline for submissions is 3 August 2001
Biosecurity is about managing risks – protecting the New Zealand environment and economy from exotic pests and diseases. MAF Biosecurity Authority devotes much of its time to ensuring that new organism records come to its attention, to follow up as appropriate. The tables below list new organisms that have become established, new hosts for existing pests and extension to distribution for existing pests. The information was collated by MAF Forest Biosecurity and MAF Plants Biosecurity during 31/3/01 – 11/5/01, and held in the Plant Pest Information Network (PPIN) database. Wherever possible, common names have been included.

**Forest Biosecurity records 31/3/01 – 11/5/01**

### Validated new to New Zealand reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holocola sp. cf. trianguliana (pink blackwood leafminer)</td>
<td>Acacia longifolia (Sydney golden wattle)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Although this is the first 'published' record of this insect in New Zealand, its presence has been noted in Auckland and Nelson for some time. Dugdale et al. (in prep.) suggest it has occurred in New Zealand since at least 1999.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphanomyces cochlioides (aphanomyces root rot)</td>
<td>Spinacia oleracea (spinach)</td>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>This fungus is known to have been present in New Zealand for many years. This is the first formal record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternaria sp. (alternaria leaf spot)</td>
<td>Plantago lanceolata (narrow leaved plantain)</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>This fungus is an undescribed species of Alternaria and is unlikely to be a significant problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New host reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stegommata sulphuratella (banksia leaf miner)</td>
<td>Banksia integrifolia (coastal banksia)</td>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN distribution records include Coromandel and Bay of Plenty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphanomyces cochlioides (aphanomyces root rot)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus viminalis (Manna gum)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus ovata</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Other PPIN distribution records include Auckland, Bay of Plenty, Gisborne, Hawke’s Bay, Taranaki, Taupo and Waikato.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternaria sp. (alternaria leaf spot)</td>
<td>Olea europaea (olive)</td>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include feijoa and cotula.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Extension to distribution reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holocola sp. cf. trianguliana (pink blackwood leafminer)</td>
<td>Acacia longifolia (Sydney golden wattle)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Although this is the first 'published' record of this insect in New Zealand, its presence has been noted in Auckland and Nelson for some time. Dugdale et al. (in prep.) suggest it has occurred in New Zealand since at least 1999.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphanomyces cochlioides (aphanomyces root rot)</td>
<td>Spinacia oleracea (spinach)</td>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>This fungus is known to have been present in New Zealand for many years. This is the first formal record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternaria sp. (alternaria leaf spot)</td>
<td>Olea europaea (olive)</td>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include feijoa and cotula.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forestry records: Ruth Frampton, Director Forest Biosecurity, MAF Forest Biosecurity, phone 04 498 9639, fax 04 498 9888, framptonr@maf.govt.nz

**Plants Biosecurity records 31/3/01 – 11/5/01**

### Validated new to New Zealand reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternaria selini (alternaria crown rot)</td>
<td>Petroselinum crispum (parsley)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>MAF National Plant Pest Reference Laboratory (NPPRL)</td>
<td>MAF has advised industry of the detection. Little is known about this fungus and it is therefore unlikely to be a significant problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphanomyces cochlioides (aphanomyces root rot)</td>
<td>Spinacia oleracea (spinach)</td>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>This fungus is known to have been present in New Zealand for many years. This is the first formal record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternaria sp. (alternaria leaf spot)</td>
<td>Plantago lanceolata (narrow leaved plantain)</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>This fungus is an undescribed species of Alternaria and is unlikely to be a significant problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New host reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cercospora violae (cercospora leaf spot)</td>
<td>Viola odorata (violet)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>No other hosts are recorded in PPIN. This fungus has been recorded on Viola X wittrockiana (Pennycook 1989).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphelenchoides fragariae (foliar nematode)</td>
<td>Asplenium nidus (bird nest fern)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include Japanese anemone, hen and chicken fern, summer lilac, bindweed, <em>Cymbidium</em> sp., Asiatic lily, kawakawa, king fern, scabiosa, comfrey and cruel plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricenoma californicum (ring nematode)</td>
<td>Rhododendron sp. (rhododendron)</td>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include feijoa and cotula.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Extension to distribution reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudocercospora rubi (brown leaf spot)</td>
<td>Rosaceae: Rubus sp. (wild blackberry)</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>No other distributions are given in PPIN. This fungus is also common in Auckland on blackberry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Extension to distribution reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helicotylenchus digonicus</td>
<td>Olea europaea (olive)</td>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>This is a historical entry from an identification made in 1994.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotylenchus robustus</td>
<td>Prunus armeniaca (apricot)</td>
<td>Central Otago</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN distribution records include Mid Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meloidogyne fallax</td>
<td>Solanum tuberosum (potato)</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN distribution records include Gisborne, Mid Canterbury, South Canterbury, Taranaki, and Wanganui.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Biosecurity regulations notified internationally

These biosecurity (sanitary and phytosanitary) 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 28 March 2001 and 18 May 2001.

(Under ‘Reference’, Add. refers to an addendum or additional information for an existing notification, Corr. to a corrigendum or correction to an existing notification, and Rev. to a revision of an existing notification. ‘Status’ refers to the type of regulation - either routine ‘R’ or emergency ‘E’.)

For further information contact the New Zealand SPS Notification Authority by quoting the ‘member’ and ‘reference’ number of the regulation that you are interested in.

Keawe Woodmore, Coordinator, New Zealand SPS Notification Authority, phone 04 474 4226, fax 04 470 2730, sps@maf.govt.nz

### Directory

#### Extension to distribution reports

- **Helicotylenchus digonicus** (spiral nematode) - Olea europaea (olive) - Mid Canterbury - NPPRL - This is a historical entry from an identification made in 1994.
- **Rotylenchus robustus** (spiral nematode) - Prunus armeniaca (apricot) - Central Otago - NPPRL - Other PPIN distribution records include Mid Canterbury.
- **Meloidogyne fallax** - Solanum tuberosum (potato) - Waikato - NPPRL - Other PPIN distribution records include Gisborne, Mid Canterbury, South Canterbury, Taranaki, and Wanganui.

---

#### Biosecurity regulations notified internationally

These biosecurity (sanitary and phytosanitary) 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 28 March 2001 and 18 May 2001.

(Under ‘Reference’, Add. refers to an addendum or additional information for an existing notification, Corr. to a corrigendum or correction to an existing notification, and Rev. to a revision of an existing notification. ‘Status’ refers to the type of regulation - either routine ‘R’ or emergency ‘E’.)

For further information contact the New Zealand SPS Notification Authority by quoting the ‘member’ and ‘reference’ number of the regulation that you are interested in.

Keawe Woodmore, Coordinator, New Zealand SPS Notification Authority, phone 04 474 4226, fax 04 470 2730, sps@maf.govt.nz
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WTO member</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date notified</th>
<th>Summary of content</th>
<th>Comments deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/9/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for Argentina</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5/15/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for Uruguay</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>4 Corr1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/4/01</td>
<td>Correction to item 11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5/2/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for Uruguay</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5/2/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for United Kingdom, France, Netherlands, Ireland and Argentina</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5/2/01</td>
<td>BSE measures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/20/01</td>
<td>BSE measures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/26/01</td>
<td>Ban of day-old chicks from Mauritius</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/18/01</td>
<td>FMD measures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/10/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for the United Kingdom</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/10/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for European Communities</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/23/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for Zimbabwe and South Africa</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/18/01</td>
<td>FMD measures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/10/01</td>
<td>Chronic wasting disease measures for Canada</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>133 Corr1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/10/01</td>
<td>Removal of Canada from list of countries</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/24/01</td>
<td>BSE and scrapie measures for the European Communities</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/3/01</td>
<td>Quarantine centres and isolation zones for live animals</td>
<td>4/22/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/4/01</td>
<td>BSE measures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/30/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for Europe</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/2/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for the Netherlands</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/2/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for Ireland</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5/18/01</td>
<td>FMD measures for Uruguay</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5/18/01</td>
<td>FMD measures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/19/01</td>
<td>FMD measures in Europe</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/4/01</td>
<td>BSE measures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/11/01</td>
<td>BSE measures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>54 Corr1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5/8/01</td>
<td>Notification already circulated as THA/53</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/20/01</td>
<td>Guidelines on veterinary medicinal products: anthelmintics</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/20/01</td>
<td>Irradiation of animal feed and pet food</td>
<td>5/10/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/24/01</td>
<td>Stability testing of new biotechnological/biological veterinary medicinal products</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/26/01</td>
<td>Residues of lasalocid in edible tissus of poultry</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/26/01</td>
<td>Horses from Iceland</td>
<td>6/18/101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/26/101</td>
<td>TB testing for imported cattle</td>
<td>6/19/101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/26/101</td>
<td>Testing exemption for cattle from Australia and New Zealand</td>
<td>6/19/101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5/9/01</td>
<td>BSE measures for Germany, Italy and Spain</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>405 Corr1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/12/01</td>
<td>Correction to error in notified text</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>20/4/01</td>
<td>Rust-resistant barberry plants</td>
<td>14/5/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>70 Add1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/5/01</td>
<td>Comments period extended</td>
<td>11/5/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>71 Add1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/5/01</td>
<td>Comments period extended</td>
<td>11/5/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>30/4/01</td>
<td>Cotton weevil pest</td>
<td>8/5/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>20/4/01</td>
<td>BSE measures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>11/4/01</td>
<td>Amendment to quarantine pest list</td>
<td>31/5/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4/4/01</td>
<td>Cannabis sativa seeds for sowing</td>
<td>31/5/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>24/4/01</td>
<td>Transport of plants and plant products</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19/4/01</td>
<td>Plant Health Act</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>26/4/01</td>
<td>Unshu oranges</td>
<td>18/6/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>20/4/01</td>
<td>Rust-resistant barberry plants</td>
<td>14/5/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>11/4/01</td>
<td>Amendment to quarantine pest list</td>
<td>31/5/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>170 Add1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>20/4/01</td>
<td>Cancellation of emergency measures</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>24/4/01</td>
<td>Transport of plants and plant products</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19/4/01</td>
<td>Plant Health Act</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>26/4/01</td>
<td>Unshu oranges</td>
<td>18/6/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>26/4/01</td>
<td>Artificially dwarfed plants</td>
<td>19/6/01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>