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A national campaign aimed at encouraging people to be more vigilant about biosecurity will be launched in Auckland, Christchurch and Wellington at the end of September.

MAF Biosecurity Group Director Barry O’Neil says educating New Zealanders is the primary focus of the Protect New Zealand campaign.

“We all need to become aware of the risks unwelcome pests and diseases pose to our farming, fishing, tourism, horticulture and forestry industries,” he says.

“Thousands of livelihoods could be wiped out overnight by just one person who didn’t think about what they brought home in their luggage, or failed to report something strange found here in New Zealand.

“We need every New Zealander to understand the threats and if they discover any strange pests or organisms here at home to report these early to ensure our shores remain protected,” he says.

The Protect New Zealand mascot, modelled on the Beagle sniffer dogs at airports, will shortly appear on television screens reminding New Zealanders that our economy, our national health and our plant, animal and marine life needs, and is worth protecting.

Over the past year alone, MAF sniffer dogs helped detect around 2.5 tonnes of meat and poultry products which travellers tried to bring into New Zealand.

Earlier this year the New Zealand Government allocated additional resources to beef up border security. All incoming air passenger baggage is now x-rayed or searched – a jump from 55 percent. There are now also more detector dogs on the case, and instant fines for passengers arriving with undeclared goods have been introduced.

A one-stop web site giving information on biosecurity and what New Zealanders can do to help keep the country free of unwanted pests and diseases will be live at www.protectnz.org.nz from September 27.

Barry O’Neil, Group Director, MAF Biosecurity Authority, phone 04 474 4128, fax 04 498 9888, oneilb@maf.govt.nz

Not welcome: This attempt to smuggle in meat was thwarted by MAF Quarantine Service.

High performance nose

Bess the beagle, pictured here with her handler Sarah Hudson at Wellington airport, is one of MAF’s team of 19 sniffer dogs working at the sharp end of border protection. She’s trained to sniff out a whole array of products on the ‘not wanted’ list – everything from dried meat, eggs and seeds to smuggled parrots and lizards.

While beagles are famous for their sensitive noses and undying enthusiasm for sniffing out trouble, not all make the grade as border protection workers. In fact only one in twelve dogs completes the nine-month training period. To join the elite group, Bess had to get a success rate of 80 percent plus in her validation tests.

MAF has now established its own breeding programme to supply the MAF Quarantine Service border protection team. Trained dogs from the programme can fetch more than $10,000 in the United States and Australia.
California table grape imports resumed under tougher conditions

Imports of table grapes from California have been reinstated following a pest risk analysis and the introduction of more stringent measures.

MAF suspended the import health standard (IHS) for table grapes (*Vitis vinifera*) from the United States of America, (State of California) on 23 January 2001 due to concerns over the recent increase there in the population and distribution of *Homalodisca coagulata* (glassy-winged sharpshooter) (Biosecurity 24:22).

The glassy-winged sharpshooter (GWSS) is a small insect that feeds on the xylem fluid of plants. Through its feeding habits it spreads Pierce’s disease (caused by the bacteria *Xylella fastidiosa*) that live in the xylem fluid.

In recognising the principle of non-discrimination, the IHS for table grapes from Mexico was suspended on 27 February 2001 due to the presence of these same pests in Mexico’s northern states.

During the period of suspension MAF undertook pest risk analyses on GWSS and Pierce’s disease. Based on the findings of these analyses, risk management options were formulated not only for table grapes, but also for a wide range of ornamental nursery stock genera which were identified as alternative hosts of these pests and thereby a potential pathway for introduction.

Extensive consultation on the risk mitigating procedures and revised phytosanitary measures prescribed for the table grape pathway was carried out. The consultation included a working group consisting of government biosecurity agencies and representatives from fresh produce importers and industry.

Accordingly, the suspension of IHS for table grapes from California was lifted on 25 June 2001 with the following additional phytosanitary measures:

- visual inspection of 920 bunches of grapes per consignment by regulatory officials of both national plant protection organisations (c.f. 600 bunches last season)
- zero acceptance level for leaf material detections of poisonous spiders.
- registration and monitoring of treatment facilities conducting the post harvest sulphur and carbon dioxide fumigation for the effective management of poisonous spiders by the California Department of Agriculture
- mandatory cold disinfestation treatment conducted either in-transit or pre-export (under two options depending upon the timing of export) and associated hourly recording of air temperatures enclosed within the export carton
- contingencies for nullified cold treatments and post-border detections of poisonous spiders.

This standard can be seen on the MAF website.

Plant Imports Team appointments

Tamsin Smales recently joined the Plant Imports Team as Technical Adviser, Plant Transitional Facilities. Tamsin came to MAF Biosecurity from the National Plant Pest Reference Laboratory (NPPRL) in Auckland where she had worked as a virologist for four years. Her work at NPPRL included plant virology diagnostics combined with a strong quarantine and surveillance role. She was also involved in outbreak responses when regulated viruses/viroids were detected in the country. Tamsin graduated from Otago University in 1996 with a Master of Science Degree in Ecology. Her thesis was strongly plant virology based but also included agricultural entomology. Tamsin enjoyed working at AgResearch, Invermay in the Biocontrol and Biosecurity Group for a short period where she also completed her thesis, before she joined the NPPRL in Auckland. During July, Gerard Clover joined the Plant Imports Team in MAF Biosecurity as the National Adviser, Genetically Modified Organisms – Plants. He had been working at the National Plant Pest Reference Laboratory (NPPRL) in Auckland for the previous six months as a molecular plant virologist in a quarantine and surveillance role. In these positions he has been seconded from the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food in the UK in which he was employed by the Central Science Laboratory to undertake basic research on wheat viruses of quarantine significance from 1997 until moving to the NPPRL. Previous to this he spent two years working as a research mycologist at Cambridge University. He has a PhD in plant virology from Nottingham University and a BSc (Hons) degree in biological sciences from Bristol University.
One of the roles of the Plant Exports Team is to assist industry obtain access to new markets and negotiate technically justified modifications to existing requirements. A new team member has been appointed to help progress this work.

In many cases a commodity may be prohibited entry to a country because a pest risk analysis has not been conducted or for other phytosanitary reasons. In such cases MAF can help exporters by providing technical data to the importing country and work to develop technically justified phytosanitary requirements for the commodity. All market access projects are carried out on a cost recovery basis.

The Plant Exports Team is currently working on a large number of market access projects, many of which have been going for a number of years. We hope to be able to resolve several of these projects within the next year, and we have recently appointed a new team member (Sarah Wright) to assist with collating the technical information requested by the importing country. There are now three staff spending a proportion of their time on market access projects.

The completion of projects is also very much dependent on the importing country committing the necessary resources to conducting pest risk analyses, and their internal consultative and legislative processes. In providing estimates of costs and time-lines for new projects we take these factors into account as well as any other conflicting priorities. In most cases new access projects are likely to take between one and three years.

The team is currently working on the market access projects shown in the table above.

### Plant Exports Team appointments

**Wayne Hartley**

joined the Plant Exports Team as Technical Adviser, Export Phytosanitary Standards and Negotiations in May. Wayne is responsible for the development and maintenance of export phytosanitary standards which outline importing country requirements. Questions about importing country phytosanitary requirements should be primarily directed to either Wayne Hartley or Nikki Johnson. Previously, Wayne was employed by AgriQuality New Zealand in Tauranga as a quality consultant, undertaking quality assurance and export certification of horticultural products. Wayne graduated from Massey University in 1996 with a Bachelor of Horticulture endorsed in Technology with Honours. He also recently gained a post graduate Business Diploma.

**Sarah Wright** was recently appointed as Technical Assistant in the Plant Exports team. This is a new position primarily established to support other team members involved with market access negotiations and is to be funded from industry cost recovery activities. Sarah will also be involved in the maintenance of pest lists and export phytosanitary standards. She graduated from Massey University in 1998 with a Masters of Science specialising in integrated pest management and sustainable agriculture. Since then Sarah has been working and travelling overseas, including time as a science policy officer at The Royal Society in London.

**Dr Stephen Ogden**, National Adviser (Export Phytosanitary Standards and Negotiations), Plants Biosecurity, phone 04 474 4164, fax 04 474 4257, ogdens@maf.govt.nz

**Nikki Johnson**, Technical Adviser (Export Phytosanitary Standards and Negotiations), Plants Biosecurity, phone 04 498 9872, fax 04 474 4257, johnsonn@maf.govt.nz

---

### Market access projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Argentina</th>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>People’s Republic of China</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apples</td>
<td>Seed potatoes</td>
<td>Kiwifruit budwood</td>
<td>Fresh kiwifruit</td>
<td>Apples</td>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>Apples</td>
<td>Stonefruit</td>
<td>Seed (new regs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonefruit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrots (Rhyzoglyphus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily cut flowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capsicums (specimens)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucerne seed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive planting (PEQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truss tomatoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diced fresh herbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watercress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramble fruit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnuts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Indonesia has agreed to remove the cold treatment requirements that were imposed on New Zealand fresh fruit exports following the 1996 Mediterranean fruit fly incursion. This completes New Zealand’s recognition as being free from fruit fly.

The agreement follows the visit to New Zealand by Indonesian plant protection officials, almost five years after the successful eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly. The Indonesian visitors examined New Zealand’s fruit fly monitoring programme and trapping records and concluded that the eradication programme had been successful.

Mediterranean fruit fly was found at Mt Roskill in Auckland in May 1996. MAF immediately undertook a delimiting survey followed by an eradication programme. The eradication programme comprised 146 traps within 200m of the initial trap capture, a further 231 traps out to a 1.5km radius, the examination of 7 tonnes of windfall fruit, and the application of insecticidal bait. This was in addition to New Zealand’s ongoing surveillance programme. No fruit flies were trapped outside the 200m zone, with the last detection of Mediterranean fruit fly on 23 May 1996.

Following the completion of a period of three fruit fly generations, most of our trading partners removed the measures that they had imposed following MAF’s notification of the incursion. However, several countries (China, Philippines and Indonesia) maintained the measure. MAF has now reached agreement with all of these countries and New Zealand is recognised as free from fruit flies.

Dr Stephen Ogden, National Adviser (Export Phytosanitary Standards and Negotiations), Plants Biosecurity, phone 04 4744164, fax 04 474 4257, ogdens@maf.govt.nz

Regulations are proposed under the Biosecurity Act 1993 to ensure vessel-fouling organisms are not spread within New Zealand waters.

Vessel fouling is the second most likely pathway (after ballast water) for exotic organisms to become introduced into our waters.

Controls are proposed to manage the cleaning of both foreign and local vessels with fouled hulls. This would include requirements for containment and treatment of fouling material and for disposal to land of all removed material.

The regulations will be based on the results of a survey of existing cleaning methods and collection systems. The project also identified the filter size required to ensure removal and collection of fouling material from the waste water in order to reduce the biosecurity risk to an acceptable level.

The results of the research will be presented as guidelines for boat maintenance operators and resource consent managers to assist them to comply with the regulations.

While regulations are proposed under the Biosecurity Act, it is hoped that resource managers will also take the guidelines into account when considering discharge consents for vessel cleaning facilities and dive cleaning operations. Regional councils may also consider translating the guidelines into rules under their regional coastal plans. The outcome would integrate the tools available under the Biosecurity Act and the Resource Management Act 1991.

A consultation paper on the proposed regulations will be sent to stakeholders soon. The Ministry of Fisheries hopes to receive policy approval for the regulations before the end of 2001. Once the regulations come into force there will need to be a transition period, possibly two to three years, to allow time for the upgrading of cleaning facilities.

Liz Jones, Ministry of Fisheries, phone 04 470 2598, liz.jones@fish.govt.nz
At the border: what happens to the leftovers?

You arrive at one of New Zealand’s international airports, pick up your luggage which is x-rayed by MAF, then you are out the door. Have you ever wondered what happened to that in-flight meal of chicken that you couldn’t manage to finish on the plane?

Feeding of garbage and food scraps from international craft to livestock has been implicated in the transfer of many animal diseases between countries around the world. New Zealand operates strict controls to ensure that food and garbage from both ships and aircraft does not get into the animal food chain.

The secure removal of garbage and food scraps is a largely unseen but very important part of New Zealand’s biosecurity system. It is one of our most important lines of defence against animal diseases.

Procedures for ships

As soon as an overseas ship arrives, MAF immediately boards. Restricted stores are logged and sealed on board. Crew are restricted as to what they can take ashore and what they use as bait while fishing. At each subsequent New Zealand port visited the ship is checked to ensure that the seal is still secure. The ship is monitored to ensure that stores or other risk goods are not being taken ashore. Ships are required to keep garbage inside vermin- and bird-proof receptacles while in New Zealand waters.

Aircraft

Food is taken from international aircraft by approved transport directly to approved flight kitchen facilities. At the flight kitchens, reusable items such as plates and cutlery are scraped down and washed clean.

Steam sterilisation

The garbage from the aircraft, flight kitchens and vessels is transported to approved destruction/treatment facilities. Incineration of quarantine refuse was the main method of destruction for many years, but as the Resource Management Act has placed controls on emissions from incinerators there has been a move to the use of steam sterilisation. At the steam sterilisation facilities the garbage is cooked inside giant autoclaves killing any pest or disease that may be in the garbage. At an incinerator the effectiveness of the destruction can be measured by seeing that all garbage is reduced to ash. At a steam sterilisation facility monitoring is required to ensure that core temperatures are achieved over the correct time period.

Some smaller ports and airports have been forced to close their destruction facilities due to economics or resource consent problems. High security transport units (HSTUs) were developed to carry refuse from such a port to one that had a destruction facility. HSTUs are built to withstand a major vehicle accident with the garbage being securely contained within the unit. A new approved method is to transport garbage from yachts using a ten-foot sea container where the garbage is frozen solid inside. This container is transported to a refuse treatment facility.

Brendan McDonald, Programme Coordinator, Border Management Group, phone 04 474 4204, fax 04 470 2730, mcdonaldb@maf.govt.nz
The Australian insect, gum leaf skeletoniser (*Uraba lugens*) was found on four eucalyptus trees at the Waikaraka Cemetery in Onehunga on 9 August, during routine surveillance. Following the find, MAF initiated a delimiting survey to determine how far the pest had spread.

In Australia the gum leaf skeletoniser is known to cause periodic defoliation of some Eucalyptus species, and its close relation Lophostemon conferta. There are no known recordings of it feeding on other types of plants. A number of Eucalyptus species have been introduced in New Zealand for commercial wood and fibre production, shelter belts, amenity purposes and soil stability.

**Previous find in Mount Maunganui**

Gum leaf skeletoniser was first discovered at Mt Maunganui golf course in June 1997 (*Biosecurity* 23:14). Regular surveys were part of MAF’s plant pest and disease surveillance programme to obtain up-to-date data on the status of pests (presence only) in New Zealand’s arable and horticultural crops.

During the survey a single female specimen of pineapple mealybug was detected in Oratia, Auckland on a branch of a Japanese plum tree (*Prunus salicina*). Following the identification of *D. brevipes*, MAF conducted two delimiting surveys during March and April 1998 around the site of the find. A range of potentially suitable host plants and soil samples were carefully examined. Although other established mealybug species were detected, no further specimens of the pineapple mealybug were found. As a consequence of this work, MAF concluded that *D. brevipes* is absent from New Zealand.

**Skeletoniser found in Auckland cemetery**

**Initial find limited**

Activity at Waikaraka Cemetery was confined to four mature silver dollar gums (*Eucalyptus cinerea*), growing within 30 metres of each other. Three egg masses were found. Limited feeding damage was reported and caterpillar numbers were low.

The infested trees and host trees within a 100 metre radius were immediately sprayed with the insecticide Decis Forte (Deltamethrin). As some of the trees are 40 metres high, a cherry picker was used to ensure that the tops of the trees were adequately treated. A drop sheet placed under the trees during spraying to collect dead insects did not reveal any further evidence of the pest.

On completion of the initial treatment, 110 host trees within a 1 kilometre radius of the infested area were intensively surveyed. A less intense survey of host trees up to a further 500 metres was also carried out. Trees were inspected over three days, both from cherry pickers and the ground. No further evidence of gum leaf skeletoniser was found. The area will continue to be monitored.

**Recorded hosts in New Zealand**

Caterpillars of *Uraba lugens* have been recorded on the following species in New Zealand:

- *Eucalyptus cinerea*
- *Eucalyptus creanulata*
- *Eucalyptus leucoxylon*
- *Eucalyptus macarthurii*
- *Eucalyptus maidenii*
- *Eucalyptus saligna*
- *Eucalyptus viminalis*
- *Lophostemon conferta.*

**Pineapple mealybug no longer here**

Pineapple mealybug, *Dysmicoccus brevipes*, was detected in New Zealand in early 1998 during a survey of stonefruit crops (see Validated New to New Zealand Reports 1997 to August 2001 insert in *Biosecurity* 29). As only a single specimen of the pineapple mealybug was found, MAF considers this species to be absent, pest no longer present*,” from New Zealand.

From August 1997 to February 1998 the New Zealand Plant Protection Centre, MAF Quality Management had carried out a national survey of stonefruit crops, which included apricot, cherry, nectarine, peach, European plum and Japanese plum. Over 330 sites were covered. This survey was part of MAF’s plant pest and disease surveillance programme to obtain up-to-date data on the status of pests (presence only) in New Zealand’s arable and horticultural crops.

During the survey a single female specimen of pineapple mealybug was detected in Oratia, Auckland on a branch of a Japanese plum tree (*Prunus salicina*). Following the identification of *D. brevipes*, MAF conducted two limiting surveys during March and April 1998 around the site of the find. A range of potentially suitable host plants and soil samples were carefully examined. Although other established mealybug species were detected, no further evidence of the pineapple mealybug was found. As a consequence of this work, MAF concluded that *D. brevipes* is absent from New Zealand.

**Contact**

For further information, contact:

- Mark Ross, National Adviser, Forest Pest Surveillance and Response, MAF Forest Biosecurity, phone 04 498 9611, fax 04 498 9888, rossm@maf.govt.nz
- George Gill, Technical Adviser, Pest Management, Plants Biosecurity, phone 04 470 2742, fax 04 474 4257, gillg@maf.govt.nz

---

*International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures Number 8, FAO 1999; Determination of Pest Status in an Area. Absent; pest no longer present, is defined as “Pest records indicate that the pest was transient or established in the past, but general surveillance indicates the pest is no longer present.”*
New staff join the Forest Biosecurity Group

National Manager, Forest Import Health Standards

Ian Gear joined the Forest Biosecurity Group in early August as National Manager, Import Health Standards.

Ian, a graduate of Lincoln College, has extensive experience in primary industry science, education, production, enterprise and change management. He has worked as government viticultural scientist at Ruakura where he was involved in planning the horticultural facilities and assessing rootstocks resistant to attack by the grape vine louse, Phylloxera vitifolia.

Over the next 15 years he was responsible for much innovation in primary industry education and training culminating in his appointment as head of the primary industries team at Waikato Institute of Technology (WIT). During his time at WIT he helped introduce and establish arboricultural education and training, as well as silviculture, farm forestry, landscape and garden design, floristry and equine studies.

Ian has more recently been joint managing director of Heritage Horticulture Ltd, a nursery production and plant breeding business.

National Manager, Forest Pest Surveillance and Response

Davor Bejakovich is another recent recruit to the Forest Biosecurity Group, where he is National Manager, Forest Pest Surveillance and Response. Davor’s expertise in the field of entomology and exotic pest response complements the considerable forest pathology and operational experience already within the group.

Davor first joined MAF in 1995 as an entomologist following 10 years as an animal ecology research scientist in his native Yugoslavia. In May 1999, Davor was appointed as the Entomology group leader in MAF’s National Plant Pest Reference Laboratory, managing a group of 16 entomologists.

In his forest biosecurity role Davor has responsibility for ensuring the implementation of MAF’s evolving painted apple moth response, as well as managing other existing responses and responding to new exotic forest pest incursions.

Davor lists amongst his interests a passion for herpetofauna, particularly snakes and lizards.

The inaugural meeting of the Forest Biosecurity Consultative Committee (FBCC) was held on 25 July.

The FBCC provides a vehicle for the various parties to consult with and advise the chief technical officer (CTO) on forest biosecurity issues. Members of the committee include representatives from the Forest Owners Association, Farm Forestry Association, environmental non-governmental organisations, local authorities, Māori, Department of Conservation, Crown research institutes, universities, surveillance and response service providers and the Nursery and Garden Industry Association.

Discussion at the inaugural meeting included MAF’s draft Incursion Policy, the recently released Painted Apple Moth Review, and the Biosecurity (Costs) Regulations amendment currently being drafted. Presentations relating to import health standards and forest pest responses were provided.

Director Forest Biosecurity and committee chair, Dr Ruth Frampton, said feedback received from some of the 26 members and observers present indicates that the newly established committee should prove to be a constructive forum.

The committee will meet at least three times a year, with the next meeting scheduled for October.

Painted apple moth advisory group formed

About 100 West Auckland residents and interested parties attended a meeting in New Lynn on 23 August to hear the latest about painted apple moth and form a community advisory group.

Dr Ruth Frampton, Director Forest Biosecurity, told the meeting that while ground spraying and plant removal were controlling the spread of the pest, aerial spraying may be necessary to achieve eradication. She stressed that scientific advice and community input would be sought before recommendations were made to the Government.

Nominations were received for a community advisory group to provide MAF with a forum to discuss community issues and concerns and seek advice on solutions. Its composition will be finalised over the next few weeks and it is expected to meet in early September.
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Market access gained for capsicums to United States

New Zealand is now able to export fresh capsicums (Capsicum spp.) to the USA. This decision, recently published by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) follows several years of discussion and negotiation by the MAF Biosecurity Plant Exports Team. The publication of the Final Rule allowing imports from New Zealand is timely, as the export season is currently under way.

The USDA has determined that exports of capsicums from New Zealand will need to be from MAF-registered glasshouses insect proofed with self-closing double doors and 0.6mm insect mesh on vents. MAF is required to certify that these conditions have been met, including periodic inspections.

Intending exporters should contact their local Independent Verification Agency (IVA) for further information on how to meet the requirements for exporting capsicums to the USA.

Dr Stephen Ogden, National Adviser (Export Phytosanitary Standards and Negotiations), Plants Biosecurity, phone 04 4744164, fax 04 474 4257, ogdens@maf.govt.nz

Dutch elm disease response continues

Dutch elm disease was detected at eight separate locations in greater Auckland during the 2000/01 season. Only one infection location was in “new” wood, the first since late 1996.

Dutch elm disease, caused by the fungi Ophiostoma ulmi and Ophiostoma novo-ulmi, was first detected in downtown Auckland in December 1989 (Biosecurity 21:4). As the disease and its beetle vector appeared to be confined to a relatively small area, an eradication programme was implemented.

During the 2000/01 season there were three surveys involving 11,300 recorded elm locations, and an intense survey of 2,413 trees for signs of contained infection. MAF, Auckland City, Manukau City, North Shore City and Waitakere City jointly funded the surveys. Auckland City also funded a pheromone trapping system for the vector beetle, Scolytus multistriatus.

As a result of the recent surveys the disease was isolated from eight locations. Six were found in the Howick area, with one each in Papatoetoe and Glen Eden. On confirmation of the disease, the infected trees were removed and destroyed. No beetles were found in association with the infected elm trees.

It is anticipated that the surveys will continue and a meeting of the Dutch Elm Disease Advisory Committee will be held in September to determine the details of the response for the 2001/02 season.

Mark Ross, National Adviser, Forest Pest Surveillance and Response, MAF Forest Biosecurity, phone 04 498 9611, fax 04 498 9888, rossm@maf.govt.nz

Elm infected with Dutch elm disease.
Access requested for Western Australian honey: comments sought

A review that could result in New Zealand importing honey from Western Australia will shortly be available for comment.

Australia has applied to New Zealand for recognition that Western Australia is free of European foulbrood (EFB). Biosecurity Australia has presented MAF with Western Australia’s control measures for the disease. MAF compared them to the New Zealand situation and will shortly be inviting comment.

**Background**

A 1994 risk analysis for honey imports from Australia concluded that Western Australia could qualify for the export of honey to New Zealand if it could demonstrate its regional freedom from EFB. Western Australia is isolated from the rest of Australia by a natural (desert) barrier and by a regulatory barrier to entry of bees, equipment and untreated honey.

**Surveillance and monitoring of bee health**

There are no significant surveillance differences between Western Australia and New Zealand. EFB is notifiable and both use active and passive surveillance methods. Both have precise rules for issuing an international veterinary certificate for exports, and both maintain permanent surveillance under the authority of the veterinary administration (e.g. MAF Biosecurity). The surveillance is performed either by representatives of this administration or by representatives of an approved organisation, with the assistance of specially trained beekeepers.

**Comparison of legislative control**

The Australian two-tiered approach differs from New Zealand’s control programme, which is primarily under the Biosecurity Act 1993. In Australia, both Commonwealth and state legislation applies. The Quarantine Act 1908 provides the legislative basis for the implementation of quarantine and import policies at the nation’s border. Within Western Australia, bee disease control is administered by the state under the Beekeepers Act and the Exotic Diseases of Animals Act. Western Australia beekeepers must immediately notify of any suspicion of a contagious disease under the Beekeepers Act 1963. This applies to EFB, American foulbrood and any parasite of bees.

**Measures to prevent the introduction of disease**

Border control systems in Western Australia are similar to those applied in New Zealand for mail and goods, used hive equipment, live bees and apiary products. The exception is that the importation of heat treated (pasteurised) honey is permitted from areas of Australia where EFB occurs.

The importation into New Zealand of unprocessed honey and bee products is permitted only from countries or regions known to be free from EFB. The importation of live bees is currently prohibited although there is one import health standard for bee semen.

**Emergency response provisions for European foulbrood**

Western Australia has compulsory notification provisions and exotic disease response systems for exotic bee diseases that appear equivalent to New Zealand’s. There is no compensation mechanism for an exotic disease outbreak in the Western Australia bee industry, while there is provision for compensation relating to disease control measures under section 162A of the Biosecurity Act 1993.

**Public consultation**

Public consultation on the proposal will start once the last details are received from Australia, and will last for at least six weeks. The information will be distributed to beekeepers through the National Beekeepers Association of New Zealand (Inc) and posted on the MAF website. Copies will also be available on request by contacting:

- Jessie Chan, Technical Adviser, International Trade Section, phone 04 498 9897, fax 474 4227, chanj@maf.govt.nz
- Jim Edwards, National Manager, International Trade, phone 04 474 4138, fax 04 474 4227, edwardsj@maf.govt.nz
- www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/consultation.htm

---

**Apiculture’s foot and mouth disease**

European foulbrood is an OIE List A disease (the same category as foot and mouth disease). It is caused by the bacterium *Melissococcus pluton*. It kills the larvae (brood) and can cause the death of the hive. It spreads through infected bees, equipment and products. In many countries antibiotics are used to control it, which adds costs and affects market access.
Uncooked pig meat imports suspended

Pig meat imports from Canada, Denmark, Mexico and USA will need additional treatment until an import risk analysis on porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS) is completed.

After analysing preliminary research data, MAF has to reassess the risks of introducing PRRS in imported pig meat. The preliminary risk analysis indicates that:

- There is a moderate to high likelihood of a pig from an infected country being infected with either a field or vaccine strain of PRRS virus at the time of slaughter.
- It is likely that infected animals will harbour infectious virus in muscle tissue for a prolonged period.
- It is highly likely that PRRS virus will survive chilling and freezing temperatures for the length of time that pig meat is held at during storage and transport to New Zealand.
- It is possible that pigs fed a large enough dose of meat from an infected pig could themselves contract the infection.

Further work will be done to estimate the likelihood of meat scraps from imported pig meat finding their way into swill for domestic pigs in this country, as well as the likelihood of the virus surviving further processing.

MAF has adopted provisional measures while the import risk analysis is completed. New standards have been issued for pig meat from Canada, Denmark, Mexico and the USA. The products must now be heated or pH treated either prior to export or in a transitional facility in New Zealand before they can be released. Imports of uncooked pig meat products from PRRS-free countries, such as Australia and Sweden, have not been affected.

Transitional facilities are operational and receiving imports for treatment.

Animal Biosecurity is committed to completing the risk analysis in consultation with all interested parties.

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

Varroa update

Bee movement control line to stay

MAF and the National Beekeepers Association have decided that the varroa movement control line should be retained in its current position for another season. Despite the finds south of the line, it has been effective in delaying spread.

Varroa has been detected in an apiary in the upper Wanganui region (Biosecurity 29:7). This was the first time varroa had been detected south of the movement control line, which runs from East Cape to Taranaki.

Intensive testing in the area has since uncovered three more varroa-infected sites. Two of these are located just to the north of Jerusalem, while the third is located at Ranana, 10 km further down the Whanganui River. These three sites are all approximately 10 km south of the movement control line. At this stage, it is not clear how they have become infested with varroa.

MAF met with the National Beekeepers Association on 23 August to discuss North Island movement control issues in light of this evidence of varroa spread. The meeting concluded that despite these incursions, the movement control line had delayed the spread of varroa to the lower North Island and should be retained in its current position for another season. New movement controls for zones immediately north and south of the line will be developed.

No varroa has been detected in the South Island. About two thirds of the sticky boards have been examined in the laboratory at the time of writing.

Paul Bolger, Varroa Programme Coordinator,
phone 04 474 4144,
fax 04 474 4133,
bolgerp@maf.govt.nz

Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS) is a recently recognised viral disease of pigs. The origin of the disease is unknown but it is caused by an arterivirus. Initially recognised in the United States in 1987, the disease has subsequently spread rapidly to other pork-producing countries. PRRS is characterised by reproductive failure of sows and gilts, increased pre-weaning mortality and respiratory disease in young growing pigs. Financially significant production losses occur in infected herds.
New facility for smuggled birds and eggs

A new bird quarantine facility at Auckland airport has already been put to work handling a consignment of smuggled eggs.

MAF has recently completed the construction and commissioning of the transitional facility. It is designed for the quarantine of birds and eggs that have either been intercepted at the border, smuggled, or do not comply with an import health standard.

There is a risk that these birds may be infected with exotic avian diseases such as Newcastle disease and avian influenza. The facility has been designed to contain these virus infections which, if released in New Zealand, could have similar effects to that of foot and mouth disease in cattle and sheep.

Only bird species that are endangered and protected under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) will be held until re-export. Birds and eggs will be exported as soon as is practicable. New Zealand has an obligation to do what it can to save them but not at the expense of biosecurity. The Department of Conservation will attempt to find an overseas zoo that will care for the birds. No attempt will be made to try and raise fledglings that have hatched from imported eggs.

Any other bird species will be destroyed or exported immediately if that option is available to the importer.

The facility is located near Auckland airport and meets the requirements of the MAF high security avian facility standard. The MAF Quarantine Service will operate it. It has already been used for a consignment of smuggled eggs, which was destroyed after collection of evidence.

Biosecurity strategy update

The biosecurity strategy Issues Paper will soon be available.

The Minister for Biosecurity will launch the paper on 27 September 2001, in association with the launch of the Biosecurity Awareness Programme. Immediately afterwards, the Issues Paper will be both widely distributed and posted on the biosecurity strategy development website. The paper will then be used as the basis for nation-wide public consultation. Everyone is invited to contribute to strategy development by making a submission on the Issues Paper or by attending the nation-wide workshops and public meetings.

**Issues Paper**

The Issues Paper is based on information contained in about 400 issues identified by government biosecurity agencies and working groups of stakeholders from sector organisations and interest groups. The biosecurity strategy development team spent early August collating and integrating the issues, checking with sector organisations, interest groups and agencies that all their issues had been covered, and writing the paper.

“We consolidated the 400 individual issues into about 40 topics or themes for the Issues Paper,” says Biosecurity Strategy Development project manager, Dr Malcolm Crawley. “We were able to do this because many of the issues identified by agencies and groups were on similar topics, albeit viewed and presented from different perspectives. By using the thematic approach we were able to simplify the paper, making it easier to read and absorb, without sacrificing the diversity of viewpoints and opinions on the topics concerned.”

**Public consultation**

Nation-wide public consultation based on the Issues Paper will run from mid-October to mid-December. It will involve up to 60 workshops and public meetings, and a national hui. The consultation process should ensure that all issues are identified; generate a range of approaches to dealing with them; inform regional stakeholders and the public about the strategy development process; and invite everybody to contribute to strategy development.

The biosecurity strategy team hopes to come away from the workshops and meetings feeling confident that it is aware of all the important biosecurity issues, and is sufficiently well informed to write a comprehensive, cohesive and balanced draft Biosecurity Strategy suitable for further consultation.

The regional workshops and public meetings will be well advertised to ensure that everyone interested in biosecurity will have the opportunity to attend.

Malcolm Crawley, Biosecurity Strategy Development Team, phone 04 460 8778, fax 04 460 8779, bsdtteam@biostrategy.govt.nz

Deadline for submissions is 31 December 2001

www.biostrategy.govt.nz
For the first time, a New Zealand workshop exploring the links between human and animal neglect or cruelty has been held.

Sponsored by UNITEC and the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand, the May meeting brought together New Zealand professionals working in animal protection, care and control with their counterparts in human services dealing with abused children and other victims of family violence.

Dr Randall Lockwood provided the keynote address on the roots of cruelty and the psychology of abuse. Dr Lockwood is the Vice President of the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS). His organisation has undertaken significant research that indicates a clear link between animal and human abuse. In a family, the physical abuse or neglect of an animal may be a signal that other family members are being treated badly or require social support.

**Family violence affects people and pets**

According to HSUS research, families in crisis are more likely to have pets than more stable families, but the ‘turnover’ rate of these animals is likely to be higher than the norm. Family violence has the potential to harm both people and pets. Such abuse can isolate human victims and perpetuate a climate of terror. It can prevent a victim from leaving or exposing the violence. Abused children are also more likely to harm their own pets. At the extreme end of the scale, many serial killers had a history of torturing animals in their childhood.

**First Strike programme a model**

In America, the First Strike programme, championed by the HSUS, attempts to address some of these problems. It has two main goals: to increase public and professional awareness of the connection between animal cruelty and human violence and to encourage professionals involved in anti-violence efforts to work together. Agencies and individuals involved include social services, animal control workers, lawyers, family crisis groups and health professionals. More information on the First Strike programme can be accessed via [http://www.hsus.org/firststrike/index.html](http://www.hsus.org/firststrike/index.html)

Other New Zealand workshop speakers included Merepeka Raukawa Tait (head of the Women’s Refuge), Roger McClay (Commissioner for Children), Ruth de Souza (Mental Health Trainer) and Bob Kerridge (Auckland SPCA). All stressed the value of promoting safe, healthy communities.

To work towards a safer community for humans and animals, UNITEC is planning to establish a working group or coalition of interested agencies, using the principles of the First Strike programme. MAF will be represented on this group.

Dr Judy MacArthur Clark, Biozone UK, and successor to Professor Sir Colin Spedding as the Chair of the UK Farm Animal Welfare Council (FAWC) visited New Zealand in June 2001.

Judy, who has a background in veterinary medicine with experience in research, teaching, management and consulting in academic, government and industrial environments, spoke at the joint Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching (ANZCCART) and National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee (NAEAC) conference in Hamilton.

In her presentation, Dealing with the emerged technologies – benefits and burdens, Judy explored the wide range of animal-based technologies that have been introduced in the last decade or so, and the many more currently in active development. She discussed the need to ensure appropriate controls to assure both animal welfare and environmental protection, and posed some key questions:

- How can societies determine and express their wishes in the sphere of emerging technologies?
- Should scientists or politicians take responsibility for the consequences of technological discoveries?

During her time in New Zealand Judy also met with the Hon Jim Sutton and the Hon Peter Hodgson and with staff from the Auckland School of Medicine, the Animal Health Services Centre at Massey University, the Environmental Risk Management Authority, the New Zealand Veterinary Association and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

Dr Judy MacArthur Clark.
Kiwi vets succeed in inaugural animal welfare examination

Four New Zealand veterinarians were among the seven successful candidates who recently sat the membership examination for the Australian College of Veterinary Scientists (ACVSc).

MAF and the New Zealand Veterinary Association (NZVA) took the lead in initiating the establishment of an ACVSc Animal Welfare Chapter, some four years ago, drawing on syllabus material used for a similar post-graduate examination set by the UK Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS). It is anticipated that this new ACVSc Chapter will prove popular with veterinarians on both sides of the Tasman.

College provides continuing education opportunities

The Australian College of Veterinary Science was established in 1971, at the Australian Academy of Science in Canberra. Speaking at the Annual General Meeting of the College a year after its inauguration, the President, Dr DF Stewart said:

"The establishment of the College now provides the opportunity for the recognition of advanced professional skills and proficiency for those members of the profession who are not in a position to devote the time to acquire higher academic qualifications, or who do not have the desire to, but who aspire to a higher standard of proficiency in their chosen field. The means by which they can obtain an additional qualification in recognition of these skills and proficiency are now established by this College."

The College has a clear brief to encourage veterinarians in practice, in industry, in government employment, and in other fields to seek to improve themselves and to provide additional post-graduate qualifications as a goal.

Animal Welfare Chapter established

The College has 16 separate Chapters, with topics ranging from anaesthetics, emergency and critical care to epidemiology and veterinary pharmacology. In 1997, MAF and the New Zealand Veterinary Association commenced liaison with the RCVS and Professor David Morton, with the aim of developing a New Zealand post-graduate veterinary qualification comparable to the RCVS Diploma in Animal Welfare.

A syllabus was finally approved by the College Board of Examiners in 1999 and the new Animal Welfare Science, Ethics, Policy and Law Chapter was established.

The Chapter objectives include:

- the advancement of the science and art of veterinary science as it relates specifically to animal welfare and in particular to encourage and aid recruitment to the College and the Chapter
- the furthering of professional education and training of veterinarians with a special interest in animal welfare
- the encouragement of research in animal welfare
- facilitation of the exchange of knowledge between veterinarians with a special interest in animal welfare
- the encouragement of the exchange of knowledge and collaborative work with other scientists working in the field of animal welfare
- the encouragement of publications in the sphere of animal welfare.

The Animal Welfare Chapter provides a forum for the training of veterinarians to a detailed knowledge and above average competence in animal welfare in all species. This capability is drawn from a broad base of knowledge across all body systems. Course content includes the ethics of animal use, physiological and psychological aspects of adverse states, animal environments, the veterinary profession's role in animal welfare, veterinary aspects of animal welfare, specific welfare issues, legislation and animal welfare and human – animal relationships.

Membership in this subject equips veterinarians to understand the scientific basis for optimum animal welfare and to be able to reason and debate coherently the legal and ethical aspects of animal welfare.

Inaugural examinations

Dr Robert Baker, ANZCCART Executive Director and Australian Veterinary Association President, and David Bayvel, MAF’s Director Animal Welfare, were appointed to set two written examination papers and also to conduct oral examinations. Four New Zealand and three Australian candidates enrolled for the Chapter examinations in October 1999 and all seven were successful in the examination held in July 2000. These candidates were drawn from academia, research, veterinary clinical practice and government service.

It is interesting to note that 100 percent success for candidates was not achieved in all other Chapters. Several other Chapters reported failures at both the membership and fellowship level. The Chapter’s first year candidates in animal welfare have clearly set a standard of performance that those who follow in 2002, and beyond, will wish to emulate.

Future activities

New Zealand will continue to be actively involved in this nascent ACVSc Chapter, with Professor Kevin Stafford serving as the President of the Chapter and David Bayvel being re-appointed as an examiner for 2001.

Membership candidates should enrol by 31 October 2001 and full details can be obtained from:

Mrs Elaine Lowe
ACVSc
PO Box 34
Indooroopilly
Queensland 4068
AUSTRALIA
E-mail acvsc@gil.com.au

David Bayvel, Director Animal Welfare Phone 04 474 4251, fax 04 498 9888, bayveld@maf.govt.nz
Exploring the relationship between humans, animals, and the environment was the theme of the Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching (ANZCCART) and the National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee (NAEAC) conference held in Hamilton in June.

Speakers included:

- **Professor Bruce Baguley** from the Auckland Cancer Research Institute on Alternatives to the use of animals in experimentation in the future
- **Professor John Marbrook** on The Animal Welfare Act 1999 and its impacts and issues
- **Hon Pete Hodgson** on The next Animal Welfare Act
- **Dr Judy MacArthur Clark** from the United Kingdom on Dealing with the emerged technologies.

The conference comprised four sessions: primary and secondary education, tertiary education and research, testing and teaching, future challenges, and care and regulation.

Much of the conference focused on the influences in learning and society that impinge on the acceptability of research, testing and teaching. There was also extensive discussion on how society should move forward in dealing with the regulatory aspects of animals and the environment, and with emerged technologies.

For a copy of the conference proceedings contact: The Executive Officer, ANZCCART, c/- The Royal Society of NZ, PO Box 598, Wellington, anzccart@rsnz.govt.nz

NAEAC Secretary, c/o MAF, PO Box 2526, Wellington, phone 04 474 4296, fax 04 498 9888, naeac@maf.govt.nz

**Biosecurity People**

**Appointments to the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee**

The Minister of Agriculture has appointed Mary Mountier and Mavis Mullins to the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee.

Mary Mountier replaces Judi Jones on the committee. Mary is a freelance writer and editor with an extensive knowledge of the horse and greyhound racing industries. A member of the board of the Consumers’ Institute of New Zealand, she was nominated by that body. Mary will contribute to the committee’s knowledge and experience in relation to the public interest in respect of animals.

Mavis Mullins is a new appointment to the committee. From Rangitane o Tamaki Nui a Rua iwi, Mavis will provide a valuable Maori perspective to the committee. In addition, Mavis runs a shearing business, is a wool-handling instructor and is involved in a number of business, rural and community groups.

Mary Mountier  

Mavis Mullins  

Linda Carson, Senior Policy Adviser, Animal Welfare, phone 04 470 2746, fax 04 498 9888, carsonsl@maf.govt.nz
Submissions sought on Biosecurity Amendment Bill

The Biosecurity Amendment Bill 2001 was introduced on 7 August 2001. It has been forwarded to the Primary Production Select Committee who are calling for submissions by 24 September 2001.

The bill makes changes to the Biosecurity Act 1993 as a result of experience in applying the Act to new situations, because of changes to organisations that play a part in New Zealand’s biosecurity, and to provide greater clarity or resolve inconsistencies. It also repeals provisions of the Forests Act 1949 that deal with the exclusion, control and eradication of organisms that may harm forest health. These provisions are considered redundant in light of the Biosecurity Act, and in some cases, conflict with internationally agreed approaches to the implementation of biosecurity measures.

Proposed amendments to the Biosecurity Act 1993:

- clarify that persons not employed under the State Sector Act 1988 may be appointed as inspectors
- clarify that persons appointed as chief technical officers must be employed under the State Sector Act
- provide that the criteria in section 92 that a minister must be satisfied of, before recommending a levy to fund a pest management strategy, are consistent with the general principles for funding a pest management strategy
- provide that levy orders may contain a provision for the payment of the levy by persons who object on conscientious or religious grounds to paying in the manner provided in the order
- provide that in defined circumstances the notice of approval to apply an article or substance to a place, from the air space above that place, may be given by any appropriate means (including television and radio), and may take effect 24 hours after making the notice
- provide that the provisions of the Wildlife Act 1953 do not apply to the exercise of any powers under the Biosecurity Act when those powers are used in respect of an unwanted organism under the Biosecurity Act
- ensure appropriate use of the term ‘pest agent’ throughout Parts IV to VI of the Act
- provide that an inspector may process unaccompanied goods in a biosecurity control area
- impose a general duty on every person to inform authorities upon becoming aware of the presence of an organism not normally found in New Zealand, and add a related offence for a breach of the duty which would apply to those who know, or should reasonably know, that the organism is not normally found in New Zealand
- provide that the contents of a pest management strategy must include a general description of the measures to be taken to implement the strategy
- provide that both uncleared risk goods and unauthorised goods may be taken by a police officer conducting a search under section 108
- provide that the power of entry and inspection is extended to include the purpose of confirming compliance with the Act or any regulations made under the Act
- extend the power to examine organisms to enable those taking action in default to recover costs and expenses reasonably incurred and to correct the omission of a reference to authorised persons
- provide that an inspector or authorised person may direct that goods or organisms in a restricted place be identified
- extend the enforcement of area controls to prohibit persons from making arrangements to move things in breach of a controlled area notice
- make editorial changes as necessary.

The Forests Act 1949 is to be amended to:

- repeal those provisions of the Act dealing with the exclusion, eradication and management of pests and unwanted organisms
- repeal those sections of the Act dealing with export of forest products.

Sue Cotton, Biosecurity Policy Coordination Manager, phone 04 474 4283, fax 04 470 2730, cottons@maf.govt.nz
Sign-up underway for National Pest Plant Accord

The National Pest Plant Accord has been finalised and is now with regional councils and government departments with biosecurity responsibilities for signing up. Confirmation of the parties’ commitment to the accord is being sought before it takes effect on 1 October 2001.

The accord was intended to begin on 1 July 2001, but was delayed due to the process involved in determining the targeted plants as unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993.

Maintaining and updating the plant list will be an ongoing process. The accord provides for the creation of working groups to assess recommendations for amendment to the list. These groups will be established before the end of 2001 to review and add to the initial list.

The accord is a partnership between central government and regional councils and is designed to coordinate regional council surveillance of commercial outlets for specified harmful plants. The list of plants follows, and the accord itself can be viewed on the MAF website.

David Harrison, Policy Adviser, Biosecurity Policy Coordination, phone 04 474 4173, fax 04 470 2730, harrisond@maf.govt.nz
www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/pests-diseases/plants/accord.htm

The initial National Pest Plant Accord list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Common name/s</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Common name/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acmena smithii</td>
<td>monkey apple</td>
<td>Erigeron karvinskianus</td>
<td>Mexican daisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternanthera</td>
<td>alligator weed</td>
<td>Gunnera tinctoria</td>
<td>Chilean rhubarb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philoxeroides</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnocoecronis</td>
<td>Senegal tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anredera cordifolia</td>
<td>madeira vine; mignonette vine</td>
<td>spsiantlhoiodes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araujia sericifera</td>
<td>moth plant</td>
<td>Hedychium flavescens</td>
<td>yellow ginger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asparagus asparagusoides</td>
<td>smilax; bridal veil creeper</td>
<td>Hedychium gardnerianum</td>
<td>kahili ginger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asparagus scandens</td>
<td>climbing asparagus; ferny asparagus</td>
<td>Homena collina</td>
<td>Cape tulip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlettinia sordida</td>
<td>bartlettina</td>
<td>Hodtuyxia cordata</td>
<td>chameleon plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbersis darwinii</td>
<td>Darwin’s barberry</td>
<td>Hydrilla verticillata</td>
<td>hydriila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryonia dioica</td>
<td>white bryony</td>
<td>Hydroclys nympoides</td>
<td>water poppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesalpinia decapetala</td>
<td>Mysore thorn</td>
<td>Ipomoea indica</td>
<td>blue morning glory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calluna vulgaris</td>
<td>heather</td>
<td>Iris pseudacorus</td>
<td>yellow flag iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiospermum</td>
<td>balloon vine</td>
<td>Lagarosiphon major</td>
<td>oxegy wedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandiflorum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lantana camara</td>
<td>lantana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiospermum</td>
<td>small balloon vine</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>free privet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halicacatum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lonicera japonica</td>
<td>Japanese honesuckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulerpa taxifolia</td>
<td>Caulerpa taxifolia</td>
<td>Ludwiga peolpoides</td>
<td>primrose wilow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celastus orbiculatus</td>
<td>climbing spindleberry; oriental bittersweet</td>
<td>Ludwigia peruviana</td>
<td>water primrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunb.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lythrum salicaria</td>
<td>purple losstrife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceterophyllum</td>
<td>hornwort</td>
<td>Menyantes trifoliata</td>
<td>bog bean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demersum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Myrica faya</td>
<td>fire tree, candle-berry myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cestrum parqui</td>
<td>green cestrum</td>
<td>Myriophyllum aquaticum</td>
<td>parrot’s feather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysanteihemoides</td>
<td>bone seed</td>
<td>Myriophyllum spicatum</td>
<td>Eurasian watermilfoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monilifera spp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Najas guadalupensis</td>
<td>southern naiad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monilifera</td>
<td></td>
<td>Najas marina</td>
<td>sawtooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemaiis vitalba</td>
<td>old man’s beard</td>
<td>Nassella tenuissima</td>
<td>Mexican feather grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobea scandens</td>
<td>cathedral bells</td>
<td>Nuphar lutea</td>
<td>yellow waterlily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortadera jubata</td>
<td>purple pampas</td>
<td>Nympoides geminata</td>
<td>entire mashwath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortadera selloana</td>
<td>pampas</td>
<td>Nympoides peltata</td>
<td>fringed waterlily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipogon lignosus</td>
<td>mile-a-minute</td>
<td>Osmunder regalis</td>
<td>royal fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egeria densa</td>
<td>egeria; oxygen weed</td>
<td>Passiflora mixta</td>
<td>ntn banana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnara villosa</td>
<td>pyo grass</td>
<td>Passiflora mollissima</td>
<td>banana passionfruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eichhornia crassipes</td>
<td>water hyacinth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equisetum arvense</td>
<td>horsetail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equisetum hyemiale</td>
<td>rough horsetail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eragrostis curvula</td>
<td>African love grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial National Pest Plant Accord list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Common name/s</th>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Common name/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennisetum alopecuroides</td>
<td>Chinese pennisetum</td>
<td>Pennisetum macrorum</td>
<td>African feather grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennisetum purpureum</td>
<td>elephant grass; Napier grass</td>
<td>Pennisetum setaceum</td>
<td>African fountain grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phragmites australis</td>
<td>phragmities</td>
<td>Pinus contorta</td>
<td>lodgepole pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistia stratiotes</td>
<td>water lettuce</td>
<td>Plecitratus ciliatus</td>
<td>plecitratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygonum perfoliatum</td>
<td>devil’s tail tearthamb</td>
<td>Potamogeton perfoliatus</td>
<td>clasped pondweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhamnus alaternus</td>
<td>evergreen buckthorn</td>
<td>Sagittaria montevindens</td>
<td>arrowhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagittaria platyphyllia</td>
<td>sagitaria; delta</td>
<td>Sagittaria sagittifolia</td>
<td>arrowhead; Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix cinerea</td>
<td>grey willow</td>
<td>Schinus terebinthifolius</td>
<td>Christmas berr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvinia molesta</td>
<td>salvinia, kariba weed</td>
<td>Sedalingia kraussiana</td>
<td>sedalingia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solanum carrotinse</td>
<td>horse nettle</td>
<td>Solanum marginatum</td>
<td>white-edged nightshade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparganium erectum</td>
<td>bur reed</td>
<td>Stratieres aloides</td>
<td>water soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradescantia fluminensis</td>
<td>wandering jew; tradescantia</td>
<td>Trapa natans</td>
<td>water chestnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropaeolum speciosum</td>
<td>Chilean flame creeper</td>
<td>Tussilago farfara</td>
<td>coltsfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typha domingensis</td>
<td>southern cattail</td>
<td>Typha latifolia</td>
<td>great reedmace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utricularia gibba</td>
<td>bladderwort</td>
<td>Vallisneria gigantea</td>
<td>eelgrass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zizania latifolia</td>
<td>Manchurian wild rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bovine tuberculosis (Tb) update

Changes to cattle slaughter levy

The Animal Health Board (AHB) wrote to over 60,000 cattle owners in May this year advising them of its proposal to increase the maximum rate of the cattle slaughter levy from $10.00 to $15.00. The actual rate of the levy may be less than the maximum and is set from time to time by the AHB.

Around 275 submissions were received on the Board’s proposal. Key issues raised in opposition to the AHB proposal included:

- Tb vector management is a national issue.
- Levies should be used in the regions where they are collected.
- Crown (Conservation) lands are not effectively managed and are havens for vectors.
- Lack of accountability for and feedback on implementing the national Tb strategy.
- Targeting farmers ‘finishing’ cattle to pay the levy is not equitable.
- Farmers are already paying through their own vector control, regional rates, taxes and industry grants.

All submissions were forwarded to the Hon Jim Sutton, Minister of Agriculture and have been given due regard. The Minister determined that the requirements of the Biosecurity Act 1993 are satisfied in relation to the AHB proposal. Accordingly, the Minister recommended the amendment of the levy order.

Notice of the amendment appeared in the Gazette on 2 August 2001 and took effect 28 days after that date. The AHB will notify any changes to the actual rate of the levy in the usual way.

National Tb strategy amendment proposal

The AHB’s proposal to amend the national Tb pest management strategy was notified by the Minister of Agriculture in May 2001 and attracted 94 submissions.

Submissions came from:

- farmers (46)
- national and regional producer organisations (17)
- local government (8)
- other individuals (8)
- regional animal health committees (5)
- veterinary professionals including the national association (3)
- agribusiness (3)
- universities and academic interests (2)
- Maori landowners (1)
- road transport interests (1).

Submissions were collated and analysed during July-August 2001. The Minister of Agriculture considered the submissions and determined that an independent board of inquiry should inquire into, and report on, the AHB proposal. Once arrangements for the inquiry have been made, submitters will be advised so they can confirm whether they wish to be heard by the inquiry.

Biosecurity issues and concerns shared

The similarity of biosecurity issues facing New Zealand and Australia was apparent when leading Australian biosecurity experts and policy makers came together at the ‘Biosecurity 2001’ conference last month in Sydney.

It is clear that Australia and New Zealand share many similar risks and policy challenges. Maintaining and building upon our close working relationship with Australia will therefore deliver considerable benefits on both sides of the Tasman.

Like New Zealand, Australia takes biosecurity very seriously. For example, efforts to upgrade x-ray arrangements at the Australian border mean they will soon establish a level of screening close to that already being achieved by the MAF Quarantine Service in New Zealand.

The Hon Warren Truss, Federal Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, reminded the conference that while border control is important, risks must be managed across the biosecurity continuum (pre-border, border and post-border). The Minister also stressed that while governments have a leadership role, all stakeholders must participate and contribute to protecting and enhancing the social, economic and environmental benefits that arise from excluding and managing harmful organisms.

Small-scale management information paper available

An information paper on small-scale management programmes is now available on the MAF website.

Section 100 of the Biosecurity Act 1993 enables a regional council to undertake small-scale management of unwanted organisms. To help ensure consistent and appropriate implementation of section 100 provisions, representatives from regional councils and the Department of Conservation cooperated with MAF Biosecurity to develop the paper.

The paper considers matters arising directly from the provisions of section 100 of the Act. It is intended to inform decision-makers and others with an interest in the small-scale management of unwanted organisms.
Consultation begins on new biosecurity charges

The charges for various biosecurity services are being revised. A discussion document has been released seeking comment on the new charges.

Charges for biosecurity services (such as border inspections, treatment or destruction of risk goods, applications for import permits and supervision of transitional and containment facilities) are being updated.

Most (but not all) charges are proposed to increase. Significant increases are proposed for inspections of plant products and personal effects less than 0.5 m³, treatment of passengers’ risk goods and sea container inspections (when not complying with import requirements).

The main changes proposed include:
• revoking the Forest Disease Control Regulations 1967 and the Forest Produce Import and Export Regulations 1989
• ending the payment of a 10 percent collection fee to shipping companies for collecting forest product inspections payments
• updating charges in the Biosecurity (Costs) Regulations 1993
• introducing a levy under the Biosecurity Act 1993 to fund the gypsy moth surveillance programme. It is proposed that this charge would be levied at 85 cents per unit on all landed sea containers and imported used vehicles.

Submissions are invited on the proposals. MAF aims to enact new costs regulations by the end of 2001.

For a copy of the document:
Denise Robinson, Personal Assistant, MAF Policy, phone 04 474 4189, fax 04 474 4265, denise.robinson@maf.govt.nz

For information on the proposals:
Mary Craythorne, Senior Policy Analyst, MAF Policy, phone 04 498 9830, fax 04 474 4265, mary.craythorne@maf.govt.nz

Deadline for submissions is 5 November 2001


Policy statement: Responding to an exotic organism incursion

MAF Biosecurity has finalised its policy statement on responding to an exotic organism incursion. A copy of the statement is available on the MAF website or from the author.

The statement is not an incursion response manual. Rather, it provides context and direction for primary incursion response decisions and actions. As appropriate, operational arrangements and standards can be adjusted and developed to ensure consistency with the policy statement.

The statement was developed through consultation with practitioners and a wide range of stakeholders. Submissions on the consultation draft and recommendations from the independent review of the MAF response to the incursion of painted apple moth resulted in a number of changes and refinements. A summary of submissions received and the MAF response to those submissions has been sent to submitters.

Henry Dowler, National Adviser Biosecurity Coordination, Biosecurity Policy Coordination, phone 04 470 2745, fax 04 470 2730, dowlerh@maf.govt.nz


Update

Import health standards issued

Marine fisheries products for human consumption
This import health standard has been amended to include Kiribati, Wallis & Fortuna and Tokelau in the eligibility clause for origin of marine finfish (clause 6.2) and is now dated 2 July 2001.

Antarctic fish
This import health standard, now dated 8 August 2001, has been amended to clarify that only the 10 species named are allowed entry into New Zealand. Editorial changes have also been made and superseded references updated.

Fish food
New import health standards dated 13 July 2001 have replaced the standard for fish food, fish meal, fish bait and Artemia salina, dated 23 July 1998. They are:
• Marine fish meal from all countries
• Fish food, fish bait and Artemia salina from all countries
• A separate standard for fishmeal, which requires certification against BSE that “The product is manufactured entirely from marine fish and does not contain any protein derived from ruminant animals”.

Dairy product samples for evaluation
This import health standard, now dated 2 July 2001, has been amended to clarify that no zoosanitary certification is required.

Dairy products not for human consumption
The following import health standards are dated 17 July 2001:
- Dairy products not for human consumption from specified countries: Canada and USA have been removed and included in a new separate IHS
- Dairy products not for human consumption from Australia: products containing tallow has been added to the eligibility section (clause 6.2)
- Dairy products not for human consumption from Canada and the USA.

Dairy products for human consumption from Singapore
This is a new import health standard based on the risk analysis, The Importation of dairy products: Risks to New Zealand livestock, January 1998. It is dated 7 August 2001.

Specified products for human consumption containing dairy products, eggs or meat
The following amendments have been made to this standard, which is now dated 13 August 2001:
- Under 8.1, "plastic" is no longer an acceptable form of packaging. Meat products packed in plastic have often not been subjected to the same amount of cooking as meat products packaged in cans, glass or foil. This clause has also been amended to specify that the meat products must be free of bone.
- Clause 8.2 iv has been added regarding meat stock powders, stock cubes, meat floss, meat ingredients in dry soup mixes, dry camping food mixes and instant noodle flavourings.

New Zealand origin meat products, meat byproducts and deer velvet returning from other countries
This standard is now dated 19 July 2001. The following amendments have been made:
- The title has been changed to avoid confusion.
- Additional eligibility clauses have been added (clause 6.3 and 6.4):
  "6.3 The importer must supply a copy of the New Zealand export certificate.
  "6.4 Meat products, meat byproducts and deer velvet of New Zealand origin are eligible for import."
- Clause 7.2 has been added, requiring consignments to be sent to a New Zealand premise licensed under the Meat Act 1981
- Appendix A has also been added, outlining the requirements under the Animal Products Act 1999 with regard to imports of meat products or meat by-products.

Specified inedible animal products and biologicals
This import health standard, now dated 24 July 2001, has been amended to allow the importation of an additional type of surgical implant under clause 6.14.

Import health standards for Northern Ireland
New Zealand MAF now recognises Northern Ireland to be free from foot and mouth disease. These are new import health standards for Northern Ireland dated 13 August 2001:
- Dairy products for human consumption – the code for this standard has also been amended, for consistency, and a typographical error corrected.
- Dairy products not for human consumption.
- Commercial shipments of untanned cattle, sheep, goat and deer hides.
- Frozen deer by-products.
- Bovine semen – this standard allows the importation of semen collected either prior to 1 January 2001 or after 1 July 2001.

Cooked meat products from Canada, Denmark and the USA
The following are new import health standards dated 23 July 2001. They are based on the preliminary import risk analysis of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus in chilled or frozen pig meat:
- Cooked pig meat products from Canada
- Cooked pig meat products from the USA
- Cooked pig meat products from Denmark.

Changes to scrapie safeguards in Australian import health standards
The following standards, dated 26 July 2001, have been amended to prohibit the importation from or through Australia of sheep and goats and their germplasm originating from countries with endemic scrapie:
- Goats from Northern Australia
- Goats from Southern Australia
- Goat embryos from Australia
- Goat semen from Australia
- Sheep from Northern Australia
- Sheep from Southern Australia
- Sheep embryos from Australia
- Sheep semen from Australia.

Dogs and cats from Australia
The following amendments have been made to this import health standard, which is now dated 30 July 2001:
The veterinary certificate has been amended to update the test kits for heartworm (clause 3.1.2) and add another approved treatment form for heartworm (clause 3.2.4). Various typographical errors have also been corrected.

Kerry Mulqueen, National Adviser, Import Management, phone 04 498 9625, fax 04 474 4132, mulqueenk@maf.govt.nz
www.maf.govt.nz/animalIHS

Draft import health standard for the importation of turkey hatching eggs from Australia, Canada, England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland
This draft IHS is based on the standard of the same name, dated 20 March 1995, but has been amended to include the
following technical changes:

- Text referring to pre-export quarantine has been changed to refer to the current transitional facility standard.
- Fowl plague has been given the modern name highly pathogenic avian influenza.
- Testing requirements have been changed to align with the recommendations from the *Import risk analysis: avian paramyxovirus type 1 in hens’ hatching eggs*, dated 15 March 2001.
- *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *M. synoviae* have been deleted from the testing requirements because they are endemic in New Zealand.
- The following clause has been deleted: “NOTE: Egg drop syndrome and avian reticulo-endotheliosis have not occurred in Canada. Section 5.2 applies to Australia and Great Britain only.”

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

www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/consultation.htm

The deadline for submissions is 1 November 2001

 Escort of animal shipments into New Zealand

This standard has been updated and reissued. There have been no changes to the technical requirements.

This standard describes the veterinary supervision required for animal imports from countries other than Australia when the method of transport is by air or sea and the import health standard requires such supervision.

The people providing the escort will have to show MAF how the requirements of the standard will be met.

Kerry Mulqueen, National Adviser, Import Management, phone 04 498 9725, 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 Nil

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

- Caledonian Holdings Ltd (to use Agvet Consultants Ltd’s code)
- Neuronz Ltd (to use the University of Auckland’s code)
- Wanganui Veterinary Services (to use Crown Research Institutes Palmerston North Campus code).

Codes of ethical conduct revoked or arrangements terminated Nil

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

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

 Religious slaughter: discussion paper update

Submissions on the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC) discussion paper The animal welfare standards to apply when animals are slaughtered in accordance with religious requirements closed in early June 2001 (Biosecurity 29:21).

NAWAC met on 24 July with those submitters who requested to speak personally to their submission. These included the Meat Industry Association, Meat New Zealand, the New Zealand Islamic Meat Management and representatives of the Wellington and Auckland Hebrew Congregations.

NAWAC has been preparing the position on religious slaughter that it will recommend for inclusion in the draft code for the commercial slaughter of animals. Recommendations were expected to be finalised by the end of August 2001.

It is anticipated that the draft code for the commercial slaughter of animals will be released for public consultation in November 2001.

NAWAC Secretary, c/o MAF, PO Box 2526, Wellington, phone 04 474 4296, fax 04 498 9888, nawac@maf.govt.nz

 Guidelines for drafting codes of welfare

MAF Policy has produced a policy information paper (no. 36), Guidelines for drafting codes of welfare. Its purpose is to assist people drafting codes under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 to ensure that they are consistent and legally sound. Guidance is provided on how to draft, format and structure codes.

The document is available on MAF’s website or by contacting:

Pam Edwards, Executive Coordinator Animal Welfare, phone 04 474 4129, fax 04 498 9888, animalwelfare@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/animal-welfare/
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 23/6/01 – 3/8/01, and held in the Plant Pest Information Network (PPIN) database. Wherever possible, common names have been included.

### PLANTS BIOSECURITY RECORDS 23/6/01 – 3/8/01

#### 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 sp.</td>
<td>Thunbergia alata (black-eyed Susan)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>MAF National Plant Pest Reference Laboratory (NPPRL)</td>
<td>This leaf-spot producing fungus is undescribed, and known only from Thunbergia. Its known distribution is Australia, USA, Malawi and the UK. MAF doesn’t consider this detection to be of any significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudocercospora sawadae (pseudocercospora leaf spot)</td>
<td>Lophostemon confertus (brush box)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>This wind-borne leaf spot fungus is also known to infest tropical guava. MAF does not consider this detection to be significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratylenchus (Gracilacus) goodeyi (pin nematode)</td>
<td>In soil beneath grasses, weeds and willows</td>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>This nematode is not known to be a significant plant pest. It is most often found in association with grasses in undisturbed sites. MAF does not consider this detection to be significant.</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>Phytophthora porri (stem rot)</td>
<td>Brassica oleracea ssp. botrytis sub group cauliflora (cauliflower)</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include spring onion and onion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudomonas fluorescens (no common name)</td>
<td>Oxalis tuberosa (oca, yam)</td>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>This saprophytic bacterium is also associated with pea, potato, onion, passionfruit, tamarillo, carrot, capsicum, calla lily, primrose, Populus spp. and nikau palm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternaria panax (alternaria leaf spot)</td>
<td>Schefflera actinophylla (Queensland umbrella tree)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include puka. This fungus is also known from a range of Araliaceae in New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Extension to distribution reports: No new records for this period.

#### FOREST BIOSECURITY RECORDS 23/6/01 – 3/8/01

#### 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>Cryptosporiopsis aff. Eucalyptus (no common name)</td>
<td>Oxydendrum spectabile (kohekohe)</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>There are no other hosts recorded in PPIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrocercops laciniosa (black butt leaf miner)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus saligna (Sydney blue gum)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN host records include: Eucalyptus bridgesiana, E. calophylla, E. ficifolia, E. nitens, E. sideroxylon, E. globulus ssp. globulus, E. pulchella, E. melliodora and Eucalyptus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strepisicrates macropetana (eucalyptus leafroller)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus fraxinoides (white ash)</td>
<td>Wanganui</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN host records include feijoa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vizella tunicata (no common name)</td>
<td>Pseudopanax discolor (no common name)</td>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>There are no other hosts recorded in PPIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalocerus virescens (red rust)</td>
<td>Banksia serrata (saw banksia)</td>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN host records include passionfruit, Eucalyptus ficifolia and Acmena sp.</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
Exotic disease and pest emergency hotline: 0800 809 966
Animal welfare complaint hotline: 0800 327 027
www.maf.govt.nz/Biosecurity/index.htm